

Commentary VI

VI.1 Agni

VI.1.1: As noted ad loc., the first hymn of Maṇḍala IV begins identically (IV.1.1.a): *tvám hí agne*, with the same puzzling use of ordinarily causal *hí* in the first pāda of a hymn. It might be possible here to tr. the first hemistich as a causal clause subordinate to cd: “Because ... you became the first minder of this insightful thought and the Hotar, you made ...”

On the stem *manótar-* see comm. ad II.9.4 and IV.1.16, 5.10. Note also that the HvN pausal resolution of the word as *manóta* is faulty; it should end in a long *-ā*.

Ge construes the gen. *asyā dhiyāḥ* with both *manótā* and *hótā*, but the latter doesn’t usually govern a genitive.

The *sīm* in c presumably refers to the *dhī-* of b. The publ. tr. could be slightly altered to “made it into power ...”; so Ge “... machtest es zu ... Macht.” On the infinitival construction in cd, see also Keydana (253). Note the attraction of the object of *sāhadhyai* into the dative case (*vísvasmai sáhase*). Pāda d is also noteworthy in having three forms of *√sah*, though two belong to the same *s*-stem.

VI.1.2: Pāda b ends with one of the rare examples of non-concessive *sán*, nom. sg. m. pres. part. to *√as*. Its presence here may be due to an effort at metrical adjustment. The stem *īḍya-* is almost invariably read distracted as here, and it is extremely common in pāda-final position. This is fine for dimeter meter and for Jagatī, but the distracted stem obviously doesn’t fit a Triṣṭubh cadence. The addition of monosyllabic *sán* allows such a cadence here. Note also that *sán* rhymes with *gman*, which closes the next two hemistichs (2d, 3b). The only ex. of a non-distracted form of *īḍya-* (save for a lone Xth Maṇḍala gen. sg.) is found likewise in a Triṣṭubh cadence in IV.24.2 *sá vṛtrahátye hávyah sá īḍyah*, where a non-distracted *īḍyah* sits uncomfortably after a distracted *háv’yah*. So, two different solutions to the problem of fitting *īḍya-* into a Triṣṭubh cadence.

Ge suggests that the second hemistich “spielt auf Agni’s Flucht ins Wasser an.” I don’t myself see this, and I do not know what his evidence is, beyond *ánu gman* ‘have followed’. In this ritual context, the “god-seeking men” “have followed Agni first,” because he is the conduit of their offerings to the gods and the divinity who is installed in their own houses. They must go through him, as it were, to reach the gods. The first hemistich emphasizes this ritual connection: Agni “sits down” (that is, is installed) as Hotar and superior sacrificer, and the place where he is installed is specified as “the footprint of refreshment” (*īlās padé*), a kenning for the ritual ground (see, for a similar installation scenario, I.128.1 and II.10.1).

On *mahó rāyé* see comm. ad IV.31.11. The interp. of the rest of pāda d is uncertain, primarily because of the multiply ambiguous *citáya-* stem. The pāda most resembles V.15.5 *mahó rāyé citáyann átrim aspah*, rendered by Ge as “du hast jetzt zu grossem Reichtum dich offenbarend dem Atri (aus der Not) herausgeholfen” (though in our passage here he takes *citáyantah* as “aufmerksam,” a completely different sense of *citáya-*) and in the publ. tr. (JPB) as “...then appearing greatly for wealth, you have rescued Atri.” My publ. tr. here (“distinguish themselves”) is closest to Ge’s tr. of V.15.5, though I think it adds a crucial element. The point must (or at least may) be that the men

seek to make especially conspicuous offerings to the gods, via Agni, for the sake of acquiring the wealth that accrues to the successful sacrificer. The apparent reflexive tr. ‘distinguish oneself’ is really just an extension of the common value of *citáya*- ‘appear’/ ‘appear (good), be conspicuous’. Re’s “fixant leur pensée sur la richesse (pour l’atteindre) grandement” is an extension of Ge’s “attentive” sense, but I think he has extended too far.

VI.1.3: The first hemistich of this vs. presents some difficulties. One of the problems is that the acc. *yántam* in the first pāda most naturally invites Agni as referent, since the main verb of the clause, *ánu gman*, is the same as in 2cd, where Agni was definitely the acc. complement. But in pāda b Agni is represented by a loc. *tvé* and there is a different acc. *rayím*. One solution has been to construe *rayím* loosely (or not so loosely) with the pf. part. *jāgrvāṃsaḥ*, leaving *yántam* in pāda a as the only acc. with *ánu gman*. This is the solution Old favors (ZDMG 55.271–72 = KISch 730–31: “bei dir Reichtum erwachend”), but *√gr* ‘be awake’ does not otherwise take an acc. Both Ge and Re supply a parenthetical non-finite verb more or less dependent on *jāgrvāṃsaḥ* to govern ‘wealth’: “das sie bei dir Reichtum (erwartend) gewacht haben” and “... vigilants, (pour atteindre) en toi la richesse.” Since I prefer not to supply anything I don’t have to, I’ve tried another tack -- making *yántam* (with Agni as referent) and *rayím* conjoined goals of *ánu gman*. In other words, the wakeful men (presumably the priests alert at the sacrifice) pursue both Agni as he comes with goods and the goods themselves that are nearby him after he has deposited them on the ritual ground. I don’t, however, find this very satisfactory -- though I don’t find the other possibilities satisfying either (and I simply don’t understand Ludwig’s interpr., as reported by Old, 271–72 = 730–31). Somewhat in favor of my interpr. is Re’s comment that *tvé rayím ... ánu gman* is a “variation inorganique” (whatever he means by that adj.) of *tvā ... rāyé ... ánu gman*. I would rephrase it slightly to say that my “they follow you *and* wealth” (3ab) is a variant (inorganic or not) of “they follow you *for* wealth” (2cd)

In any case, the string of accusatives in cd all clearly refer to Agni, and we are back on firm ground.

VI.1.4: Again Ge claims that this verse is about the myth of the flight of Agni, presumably on the basis of *padám devásya ... vyántaḥ*, but the track of the god doesn’t have to be his flight, but simply the ritual cursus.

How one interprets the larger sense of the vs. depends on how one interprets the verb forms: *āpan*, *dadhire*, and *raṇayanta*, esp. the first. Both Ge and Re take *āpan* as preterital (“... haben sie ... erlangt,” “ont obtenu”), presumably taking it as a pluperfect or a thematic aorist (both either augmented or not) to *√āp*, and Ge clearly thinks the subj. is the Aṅgirasas. (Gr takes it as an aor.) But nothing prevents it from being a pf. subjunctive. In that case, the priests pursuing the ritual cursus in pāda a, who are seeking fame (*śravasyávaḥ*), will obtain fame through their priestly activities. The pf. *dadhire* in c can then have, as often, immediate past reference (“they have assumed names” – presumably their priestly titles), and the injunctive *raṇayanta* in d is easily compatible with that scenario as a general timeless presential. Because of the otherwise exclusive focus on the ritual function of Agni in this hymn, my interpr. seems preferable to one that goes haring off into the mythological past.

Note *śrávaḥ ... ámr̥ktam* “indestructible fame” as a variation on the formula *śrávaḥ ... ákṣitam*.

VI.1.5: The referent of the phrase “both riches of the people” (*rāya ubháyāso jánānām*) is not entirely clear. The standard assumption is that it refers to material goods of some sort, but which are the two kinds? Ge (n. 5b) cites Sāy on the TB for heavenly and earthly riches -- though Sāy on our passage suggests rather (domestic) animals and non-animals (*paśvapaśurūpāṇi*). Ge’s own suggestion is our own goods and those of our enemies, based on VII.83.5 *yuvám hí vásva ubháyasya rājathah*, where the publ. tr. (JPB) tentatively suggests rather those of war and peace. Acdg. to Re, they are material and spiritual goods, which he thinks are *rayí-* and *vásu-* respectively -- a completely arbitrary and ad hoc differentiation of these two extremely common stems, not supported in other passages as far as I can see. Ge’s interpr. is more plausible, but it seems strange to announce that goods of whatever sort “strengthen” Agni -- esp. as in vss. 2–3 Agni is depicted as the bringer and provider of goods for us. I have a completely different view of the phrase -- that it refers metaphorically to manpower. In VI.14.3 the “riches of the stranger” (*rāyo aryáḥ*) contend with each other (*spárdhante*), where the verb invites an animate referent for the subject. Moreover, *ubháya-* regularly refers to two different groups of beings: e.g., I.60.2 *ubháyāsaḥ ... usíjo yé ca mártāḥ* “both ... his (ancient) priests and mortals (now)”; II.2.12 *ubháyāsaḥ ... stotāraḥ ... sūráyaś ca* “both praisers and patrons.” In II.6.7 *jánmobháyā* “both breeds” refers to the human and divine races, similarly *jātām ubháyān* in IV.2.2. Here either human/divine or patrons/singers (or some other division of mortals) would be possible, but I favor the latter, given the concentration on humans and their ritual activities here.

VI.1.6: Pāda b *hótā ... ní śasāda yájīyān* closely echoes 2a *ádhā hótā ny àsīdo yájīyān*. The opening of pāda c (as well as 7a), *tām tvā*, also matches 2c, and *dīdivāṃsam* of c matches the same adj. in 3d.

Whatever the exact posture described by *jñubādhah* (for detailed disc. see Scar 343–45), the Engl. idiom “on bended knee” conveys the same sense of physical reverence.

VI.1.6–7: I do not understand why 6c has the act. pf. part. *dīdivāṃsam* while, in the same metrical position, qualifying the same entity, and apparently meaning the same thing, 7c has the middle part. *dīdiyānaḥ* (whose tense-aspect stem affiliation is not entirely clear: its accent weakly suggests that it already belongs to the new redupl. pres. [reinterpreted from the pf.], but the redupl. forms to this root are in flux; see my “perfect impv” paper in the Lubotsky Fs.). Of course a nom. form of the act. part. would not fit this slot in 7c, but an acc. form of the middle part. would be fine in 6c. I doubt that the poet is contrasting old perfect and new pres., or trying to draw a semantic difference between the voices. The participle *dīdiyāna-* is the only medial form to this root; all the finite forms are active, with intrans. value, as are the two act. participles, old-style pf. *dīdivāṃs-* and new-style redupl. pres. *dīdyant-*.

VI.1.7-8: Both Ge and Re take *návyam* in 7a as an adv. (e.g., “aufs neue”), but since the adj. *návyā-* in the nom. (hence not a possible adverb) regularly qualifies Agni (V.12.3,

VII.4.8, VIII.11.10, X.4.5), I see no reason not to take it as an adj. here. The reference of course is to the newly kindled ritual fire.

Ge, flg. Ludwig, thinks that 7c concerns battle, which again I find difficult to see. I am more persuaded by Proferes's reading (pp. 29–30), that the hymn in general presents Agni as the fire held in common by the larger community and that in vss. 7–8 “this common fire is a symbol of centralized sovereignty,” therefore a leader of the clans and, in 8a the clan-lord of each and every clan.

VI.1.8: Vs. 8 is couched entirely in the acc., referring to Agni. It can't be directly attached to either what immediately precedes or what immediately follows, since both 7cd and 9ab have Agni in the nom. However, it follows nicely after the accusatives in 7ab, with 7cd an intrusion. To indicate that the description of Agni is in the acc., I have resupplied “we implore” from 7b. It should also be noted that the acc. phrase *viśām kavīm viśpátim* is found also in III.2.10 and V.4.3, in both of which the acc. is syntactically at home.

As disc. ad III.2.10 I take *viśām ... viśpátim* as a discontinuous NP; here the gen. po. *śásvatīnām* must modify *viśām*.

On the semantics of the root $\sqrt{tuś}$ in *nitósana-*, see comm. ad VIII.38.2.

The hapax cmpd. *prétiṣaṇi-* is curiously formed and its sense not entirely clear, esp. because the root affiliation of *-iṣaṇi-* is uncertain and because the cmpd type is muddled, at least by its interpreters. Ge takes the 2nd member with $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘seek, desire’: “der das Auftreten (des Opferpriesters) wünscht”; while Re opts for $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘impel’: “qui pousse en avant l’incitation,” with alternatives in the notes “qui aspire à aller de l’avant” ($\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘seek, desire’) or “qui fait avancer l’incitation (des humains)” ($\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘impel’). The ‘seek, desire’ root is also represented by Debrunner’s “zum Vormarsch strebend” (AiG II.2.208). In my interpr. I take Old’s point (Noten ad loc.; he doesn’t discuss in ZDMG 55) that the accent suggests a bahuvrīhi, and I favor a connection of the 2nd member with $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘impel’ and esp. the 2ndary verbal stems *iṣanaya-* and *iṣaṇya-*, both ‘impel’. A literal rendering would then be something like “having the impulsion of the forward progress (of the sacrifice),” but in English the bahuvrīhi gloss is too awkward, hence my “impelling ...” The point here is that Agni controls the pace and movement of the sacrifice, which progress is often expressed by the idiom *prá vi* (cf. the common loc. absol. *prayaty ādhvaré* “while the ceremony is advancing”) found in the 1st member *préti-*. The 2nd member *iṣaṇi-* is immediately followed by the part. *iṣáyantam*, but I think this is a playful juxtaposition: the two words have nothing to do with each other, and the sense ‘prospering’ for the latter was established in the fuller expression in 2b.

VI.1.9: There are a few small questions in this vs. In b both Ge and Re take instr. *samídhā* as referring to the concrete material kindling stick, as often -- while I think it refers to abstractly to the moment of kindling (as also, in my view, in VI.2.5 and quite possibly VI.5.5). The abstract sense is allowed by Scar (52–53), and the fact that the dat. to the same stem, *samídhe*, can be used as an infinitive (see, inter alia, Keydana 186 n. 160) supports this interpr. It has to be admitted, though, that the same instr. in the following vs. (10b) does refer to the physical object.

In c my “knows his way around” is a literal calque of *pári védā* into an English idiom (cf. almost identical passage I.31.5). (A more chaste rendering would have been “thoroughly knows.”) In both passages we might have expected univerbation of the

preverb and verb with loss of accent on *pári* in the rel. cl.; I have no explanation for why this did not happen, save for the possibility that *pári* does not function as a conventional preverb but as an adverb or postposition and also given the fact that such univerbation is not generally obligatory.

Ge and Re take c with d rather than ab; this is certainly possible and there are no implications either way.

VI.1.10: The doubling of the 2nd sg. enclitic *te* by init. *asmaí*, the here-and-now demonstrative, is somewhat unusual, though in the same general vein as *tám tvā* (2c, 6c, 7a).

Ge and Re (see also Klein DGRV I.329, Oberlies II.133) take *védī* as a loc., but in this passage, embedded in a long series of instrumentals, there seems no reason not to interpr. it as the instr. it appears to be. See AiG III.155, where Wack identifies it as an instr. here. The very similar passage VI.13.4 *yás te sūno sahaso gīrbhír ukthaīḥ ... vedyānaḥ* (that is, probably to be emended to **védyānaḥ* and analyzed **védyā ...*), supports the instr. interpr. -- which is argued for for both passages by Bloomfield (RR ad VI.1.10) and Old (Noten ad VI.13.4).

Re (see also Klein DGRV I.52, 71) take *bhāsā, śrávobhiś ca* as a conjoined NP, with Re putting immediately following *śravasyāḥ* into a separate syntagm (Klein doesn't treat anything but the two nouns). Although *ca* does generally conjoin nominals, both the pāda break between the instrumentals and the etymological figure *śrávobhiḥ ... śravasyāḥ* suggest that the two instr. belong with different parts of the clause.

VI.1.12–13: These two vss. play on the two words *purú-* 'many' and *vásu-* 'good' in this final explosion of begging for a suitable return from the god.

VI.1.12: I take *nrvát* as an adverb, since this neut. is almost always so used. Ge and Re instead take it as a full adj. 'consisting of men, accompanied by men' modifying a gapped noun (Besitz, la richesse) and implicitly parallel to *bhūri ... paśvāḥ* "abundance of livestock." I am not convinced, and curiously the passage Ge cites in his n. 10a as support for the interpr. contains a *nrvát* that must be adverbial. Still, I do have to admit that a few such expressions do exist outside of the neut. sg.: I.92.7 *nrvátaḥ ... vājān*, IX.93.5 *rayīm ... nrvántam*.

VI.2 Agni

VI.2.1–2: The opening of the first hymn in this maṇḍala, *tvám hí* (see above), is replicated in the first two vss. of this hymn. The *hí* is similarly hard to account for in both these vss.

VI.2.1: The etymology and therefore the sense of the vṛddhi form *kṣáita-* (IX.97.3), *kṣáitavant-* (here) are disputed; see EWA s.v. The question is whether it belongs with *kṣítī-* 'settlement' (Aves. *šiti-*), etc., to *√kṣi* 'dwell', or is the counterpart of YAves *xšaēta-* 'lordly' vel sim., to *√kṣā* 'rule over'. As the Avestan forms show, the two interpr. are not etymologically compatible. With Ge (hesitantly) and Re (sim. AiG II.2.127 [though see 933]), I have opted for the former. For one thing the various 'people,

settlement’ words are prominent in this run of hymns: *kṣití-* VI.1.5, *carṣaṇí-* in this vs. and twice in the next (VI.2.2), as well as VI.1.8, *vís-* VI.1.8, and it also makes sense for Agni, as the ritual fire in the household and the focus of the extended family and clan unit, to be associated here with the glory of those people. Another reason emerges from consideration of the whole vs.: the verb stem *púṣya-* (see *puṣyasi* pāda d) is formulaically associated with *kṣéti* ‘dwells in peace’, belonging to the same root $\sqrt{kṣi}$ ‘dwell’ (cf. *kṣéti púṣyati* I.64.13, 83.3, VII.32.9 and similar expressions); see esp. in this very same hymn VI.2.5cd ... *sá puṣyati, kṣáyam* ... “he prospers his dwelling place.” However, the other interpr., ‘lordly’, is certainly not excluded, esp. since both occurrences of *kṣáita-* are associated with *yásas-* ‘glory’ (*kṣáitavad yásaḥ* here; *yaśástaro yaśásām kṣáitah* IX.97.3 of Soma).

The simile *puṣtīm ná puṣyasi* “you prosper X like prosperity” seems a bit lame. I suppose the idea was to capture the cognate accusative. Or it can be a placeholder for *puṣyati kṣáyam* in vs. 5 and the very awkwardness of the first expression focuses attention on the “repaired” (or perhaps “enhanced”) phrase in vs. 5.

VI.2.2: I doubt that the *vājín-* of the 2nd hemistich is just any horse. It could be a mythical horse: Dadhikrā is called *vājín- viśvákrṣṭi-* “a prize-winner belonging to all communities” in IV.38.2. Or a god, perhaps Soma, Indra, or the Sun.

VI.2.3: The standard tr. take *juhvé* to \sqrt{hu} ‘pour, offer’, but this causes a problem with the main cl. verb, the pres. *indhate* ‘kindle’, if we assume that the pf. of \sqrt{hu} has some kind of preterital sense. It does not make ritual sense to offer the melted butter in the fire before kindling it. Ge avoids the problem by translating with a present, but this is ad hoc. With Sāy. I take the verb to $\sqrt{hvā}$ ‘call’ instead, since invocations can be and regularly are made after the fire is kindled. Although Kü follows the \sqrt{hu} interpr. (605), he admits that the alternative should be seriously considered (n. 1316). It might be objected that a pf. to the set root $\sqrt{hvā}$ should be read trisyllabically (*juh^{ve}*), as it indeed is in X.149.5, but as Kü points out (n. 1317), an undoubted 3rd sg. pf. to $\sqrt{hvā}$, *juhve* in I.32.6, is disyllabic. (The sequencing of actions problem with \sqrt{idh} -- \sqrt{hu} could be avoided if the former means something like ‘fan the flames’, an action that could indeed follow the pouring of the butter into a banked fire. But I don’t know that we have any evidence for this sense -- beyond the fact that *indhate* belongs to a pres. stem and could have durative value.) For further support for my interpr. of this vs. see immed. below.

VI.2.4–5: These two vss. are in some ways an expansion of VI.1.9: 4ab are the equivalent of VI.1.9a (for disc. see below); 5ab corresponds to VI.1.9bc. Note esp. VI.1.9b *yás ta ānaṭ samídhā havyádātīm* “who after kindling you [lit. with the kindling of you] has achieved your oblation-giving” and VI.2.5ab *samídhā yás ta āhutīm, nísitim mártyo náśat* “The mortal who after kindling (you) [lit. with the kindling (of you)] will achieve the offering to you and the whetting of you.” (A side note: *havyádātīm* in VI.1.9b is the counterpart of *āhutīm* in VI.2.5a, but note that VI.1.9 also has *āhutīm* in the immediately following pāda (c).) In both VI.1.9b and VI.2.5a the root noun instr. *samídhā* seems to express priority of action: “with X (then) Y” → “after X (then) Y.” If this interpr. is correct, it provides support for my assertion ad VI.2.3 that kindling must precede oblation and therefore the pf. *juhvé* cannot belong to \sqrt{hu} ‘pour’. For further evidence for the

priority of kindling to oblation, see II.37.6 *jōṣi agne samídham jōṣi āhutim*, VIII.19.5 *yáḥ samídhā yá āhutī / yó védena dadāśa mártō agnáye*, X.52.2 *brahmā samíd bhavati sāhutir vām*.

It might be observed in passing that the temporal priority I'm assigning to the instr. *samídhā* also accounts for a much more widespread syntacto-semantic development -- that of the standard preterital use of the gerund. Since by most lights the gerund in *-tvā* (and most likely the one in *-ya*) is a frozen instr., we can envision a development of the type "with going" → "having gone," etc. See my review of Tikkanen, *The Sanskrit Gerund* (1987), in *JAOS* 109 (1989): 459-61.

VI.2.4: The problematic form in this vs. is the first word *ṛdhat*. It clearly belongs with the root aor. attested primarily in the opt. (*ṛdhyāma*, etc.) but also found once in the participle *ṛdhánt-*, with expected suffixal accent. It is the root accent that distinguishes the form here. Old (ZDMG 55.279 = KISch 738; also Noten) suggests that it is a neut. part. used adverbially, with accent shift (**ṛdhát* → *ṛdhat*) -- claiming that adverbial accent shift can go either way, simply marking an oppositional formation. But the standard exx. (*dravát* to *drávati*) involve a rightward shift, and in any case the whole notion of adverbial accent shift has recently been called into question (see Emily Barth's Cornell diss.). Re considers both possibilities and opts finally for the adverb, while Ge takes it as a finite form. I prefer to take it as an aor. subjunctive (see also Lub, Concordance, where it is so identified) parallel to *śaśámate*. Although I cannot entirely explain the zero-grade root syllable for expected full-grade **árdhat* (though see below), I can suggest a local explanation for the (supposedly) unexpected root accent. The next hymn contains the hapax verbal-governing compd. *ṛdhád-vāra-* 'bringing wishes to success'. Whatever the original grammatical identity of the 1st members of this fairly common compd. type, synchronically they appear to be neut. sg. participles in *-át* with accent consistently on the suffix (type *bharád-vāja-* [in fact, the name of the poet of this hymn and of the VIth Maṇḍala in general], *dhārayát-kavi-*, etc.; see AiG II.1.317–20), and the verbal stems from which they are derived regularly are accented one syllable to the left. So, for the examples just given, 1st class pres. *bhárati*, *-áya*-formation *dhāráyati*, etc. I would therefore suggest that our poet, who had *ṛdhát-vāra-* in his repertoire, back-formed the root-accented finite form *ṛdhat* on this model. A possibly simpler alternative is to begin with a hypothetical root aorist paradigm, whose injunctive act. sg. **árdham*, **árd/t*, **árd/t* should have full grade and root accent and whose subjunctive should likewise have both: **árdhā(ni)*, **árdhas(i)*, **árdhat(i)* (cf. injunc. *kár* and subj. *kárati*, e.g.). As it happens, the root aor. of *ṛdh* is attested only in forms where we expect zero-grade root and suffixal accent, but the starred forms just given are the paradigmatically expected act. sg. forms. Under this explanation, the root accent of subjunctive **ṛdhat* is not the problem; its zero grade is. And we can explain that either by the influence (at time of composition or of redaction) of *ṛdhád-vāra-* in VI.3.2 or by the absence of other attested full-grade verbal forms to this root (though cf. gerundive *árdhya-*) and consequent generalization of the zero-grade. Of the two explanations just given, I mildly favor the first -- in part because the poet Bharadvāja would have been acutely aware of the accentual properties of his name.

A minor support for the interpr. of *ṛdhat* as finite subjunctive, not adverbially used participle is provided by formulaics. As Re sketches, *ṛdh* can take *yajñám* as

object; cf. X.110.2 *mánmāni dhūbhír utá yajñám ṛndhán* “bringing the thoughts and the sacrifice to fulfillment through his visionary thoughts.” The VP *yajñám √rdh* “bring sacrifice to fulfillment” can be seen as a variant of simplex *√yaj* ‘sacrifice’, and *√yaj* and *√śam* form a conjoined pair for our poet in nearby hymns: VI.1.9 *só agne īje śāsāme camárto* “O Agni, that mortal has sacrificed and ritually labored” and VI.3.2 (the same vs. that contains *rdhādvāra-*) *ījé yajñébhiḥ śāsāmé sámībhiḥ* “he has sacrificed with sacrifices, he has labored with ritual labors.”

X.110.2 quoted above also suggests that, despite the pāda break, *dhiyā* in our passage is better construed with *ṛdhat* as in the publ. tr. than with *śāsāmate* with, e.g., Ge “... (und) mit Andacht den Dienst versieht.”

Note the sandhi *ūtī śá*, with retroflexion despite the lack of a close syntactic connection, as well as the unusual position of ordinarily pāda-init. *śá*. An incomplete collection of relevant passages shows that this retroflexion of non-initial *śá* in ruki contexts is standard but not invariable: IV.26.4 *prá sú śá* ..., VI.2.4 *ūtī śá* ..., VI.14.1 *bhāsan nú śá* ..., VI.20.5 *urú śá* ..., VII.104.10 *ní śá* ..., VIII.20.16 *abhī śá* ..., IX.73.8 *trī śá* ..., IX.79.3 ... *arír hí śá*. But I.64.13 *prá nū śá* ..., without ruki.

VI.2.5: The two adjectives *vayāvantam* and *śatāyusam* are best taken as proleptic, with Ge and Re.

For extensive disc. of this vss., see comm. ad VI.2.4–5 above.

VI.2.6: Just as in VI.1.2 there is a nom. sg. masc. pres. part. *sán* without any obvious concessive value; unlike VI.1.2 there is no metrical explanation available. The close sandhi in the phrase *diví śán* might seem to give us a clue -- that the two words should be read as a constituent and are the equivalent of a circumstantial clause: constituency could account for the ruki. This is responsible for my tr. “when it is in heaven” (sim. Ge), instead of construing *diví* with *ātataḥ* like Re (“s’étendant au ciel”). However, assembling the retroflexion data both for *sán /śát* in a ruki environment and for *diví* with following *s-* weakens this hypothesis. In the former case *sán /śát* generally doesn’t exhibit retroflexion; see III.9.2 *dūrē sán*, IV.15.1 *vājī sán*, IV.27.1 *nú sán*, VIII.43.9 *gárbhe sán* (though the first and third phrases are constituents); V.44.3 *sacate śád*, VI.27.2 *máde śád + niśádi śát + vividre śád*, X.129.1 *nó śád*. However, there is retroflexion in II.41.10 *abhī śád*; *ánti śád* IV.5.10, VIII.73.1 (though the two forms don’t form a syntactic constituent in any of these passages) and in IX.61.10 *diví śád* (almost exactly our phrase). In other words, the data are equivocal. On the other hand, the loc. *diví* regularly retroflexes the initial *s-* of forms of *√as*, as here: I.108.11 *diví śthó* [dual verb], V.2.10 *diví śantu*, V.60.6 *diví śthá*, VI.33.5 *diví śyāma*, and the just cited IX.61.10 (cf. also VI.52.13 *dyávi śtha*), though it does not retroflex other initial *s-*s; cf. I.125.6 *diví sūryasya*, V.27.6 = V.85.2 *diví sūryam*, V.35.8 *diví stómam*, VIII.56.5 *diví sūryo*, X.75.3 *diví svanó*, X.85.1 *diví sómo*. It thus appears that the retroflexion of *śán* here is an automatic product of a rule that induces ruki in *s-*initial forms of the verb ‘to be’ after *diví* and does not give information -- or at least high-quality information -- about constituency. I have no idea why *√as* should exhibit this behavior; it cannot be due to (lack of) accent, since several of the ruki-ed forms are accented (including the one here). MLW comments: “But maybe it was despite its accent somehow a clitic just as there are

accented 2nd pos. clitic. This reminds me of the loss of *s* in Old Latin comedy which is especially well attested before the verb ‘to be’.”

VI.2.7: The 2nd hemistich presents some interpretational problems, generated by the standard assumption that *jūrya-* belongs to $\sqrt{j\dot{r}}$ ‘be/get old’. Not only is the expression “delightful like an aged one in his stronghold” odd, but such interpr. require bleaching out the gerundive value of *jūrya-* (esp. unlikely given that it’s parallel to *trayayāyyah* in d and *īḍyah* in a). Cf., e.g., Ge’s “behaglich [cozy, snug] wie ein Greis in seiner Burg,” which also pushes *raṇvā-* into a meaning otherwise unknown to it. Re’s “joyeux, tel un vieil (homme) dans la forteresse” maintains the meaning of *raṇvā-*, but the connection between it and the simile seems strained. Old (ZDMG 55: 279 = KISch 738) cleverly suggests that there’s a crisscross word order, with the son of the simile in d appropriate to the adj. in c and vice versa: so something like [he doesn’t actually translate] “delightful like a son, to be protected like an old man in his stronghold.” But this is an ad hoc response to dissatisfaction with the apparent pragmatics of the passage.

These problems can be solved in twofold fashion. 1) I take *raṇvāḥ* as a pun, a word common to both similes. In both cases it applies to Agni, but in two different senses. 2) This reinterpretation is enabled by a different analysis of *jūrya-*. I take it to the root \sqrt{jvar} ‘burn, flame’, showing the same zero-grade as in *jūrṇí-* ‘firebrand’ (<*jvrH-C, with loss of -v- before *ū* / *u*, as in *urú-* < *vrH-u). I can see no possible formal objection to this analysis, despite the apparently universal insistence that *jūrya-* must belong to $\sqrt{j\dot{r}}$.

Starting with these assumptions, we can take the two gerundives, *jūryah* in c and *trayayāyyah* in d, as the predicates of their respective pādas (as *īḍyah* is of pāda a). One of the drawbacks to the standard interpr. is that this syntactic parallelism is broken. In c the picture is of a battle-eager (warrior) (for a similar usage of *raṇvā-* see X.115.4 and remember that *rāṇa-* means both ‘joy’ and ‘battle’) who is to be enflamed / set blazing; in the simile *jūrya-* is metaphorical, but of course the word is literally applicable to Agni the fire, who is the upameya, the target of the simile. One minor problem with this interpr. is that the simile marker *iva* is in the wrong position: we would expect to find it after *raṇvā-*. But there are enough displaced simile markers in the RV that this positioning is not a major obstacle.

When applied to the simile in d, *raṇvā-* has its more usual meaning ‘delightful, bringing delight’, which is appropriate to the son and helps explain the desire to protect him. Here the publ. tr. adds “to the home” to “a son who brings delight.” I made this addition because I think there’s a buried pun. On the one hand, in c *raṇvāḥ purí* (“battle-lustful warrior in a fortress”) construes a locative with the subject (acdg. to my view of the constituency) and we might expect a similar loc. in the corresponding expression; on the other, *raṇvā-* in its meaning ‘delightful’ is often a descriptor of a home or construed with a loc. of ‘home’. Cf. I.69.4–5 *raṇvó duroṇé* “bringing joy to the house,” precisely of Agni. It may be that *pūrí* can be directly applied to the simile in d and in that context means ‘home’ -- though I doubt it: RVic *púr-* does not have domestic associations. Instead I think that *raṇvā-* in the “protected son” context evokes *duroṇé*, and this subsurface evocation is realized in the next verse by the phonologically similar loc. *dróṇe* ‘wood(en) cup’. The unexpected and unusual use of *dróṇa-* in that vs. (for which see comm. ad loc.) suggests that it may have been deployed there in order to play on the unexpressed (*)*duroṇé* here. This may seem overclever; in that case the tr. could stop

short at “to be protected like a son who brings delight.” In any case, it would probably better to put “to the home” in parens.

The result of all this: “*to be protected like a son who brings delight (to the home), (but also) to be enflamed like a battle-lusty (warrior) in a stronghold.*”

A last comment on the hemistich: I have tr. cd in the opposite order, so that the domestic half (d) immediately adjoins the “dear guest” of b. This is not necessary, but given that my interpr. of c involves a radical rethinking of the standard view, it seemed best to make the new reading easier to assimilate.

The gerundive of d, *trayayāyīya-*, is a hapax and a striking formation -- in the first instance, just because of the rhythmic rollout of -VyV- sequences. With regard to its derivation, as Debrunner points out (AiG II.2.285–86), it seems to pattern with -āyīya-gerundives built to -āya-stems: *panayāyīya-*, *mahayāyīya-*, *sṛhayāyīya-*. However, there is no such verb stem **trayāya-*. Debrunner adds the parenthetical remark “von v. Präs. *trāya-*,” but of course in that case we should expect **trāyāyīya-*. Both the short root vowel and the extra -ya- remain unexplained by that derivation. I have only the wispiest gestures towards an explanation. For $\sqrt{trā}$ we would probably expect an -āya-formation **trāpaya-*; however, it might have followed the model of $\sqrt{pā}$ and $\sqrt{pyā}$ with a -y-hiatus filler instead (*pāyāyati* and *pyāyāyati* [AV+] respectively), hence **trāyāyati*. We might then invoke the tendency of roots with the shape *CRā* to shorten their root vowel in the *p*-causative, type *jñāpayati* and, specifically with *Crā* root, *śrapāyati* (both AV+). For disc. see my 1983 monograph on the -āya-formations, pp. 208–11. So one might posit such a shortening to the differently formed causative to a *CRā* root **trayāyati*, which could serve as base for our *trayayāyīya-* here (encouraged by the short root vowels of the -āya-stem -āyīya-gerundives quoted above). But the chain of assumptions and unattested forms seems too long, and we might instead just attribute *trayayāyīya-* to a poet’s whimsical multiplication of -ya-s -- his version of tra-la-la. MLW suggests: “From *i*-extended form of **terh₁-* ‘rub’ (Lat. *trivi*, etc.), with double sense ‘to be rubbed’, i.e., caressed, and also referring to the fire drill?” This is an appealing suggestion, but the lack of other representatives of this root in IIr. might disfavor it.

VI.2.8: The voc. *agne* was omitted in the publ. tr. I would insert “o Agni” after “purpose.”

Note that the first hemistich begins with *krátvā* and ends with *kṛtvīyah*.

This vs. displays the same verbal intricacy as the immediately preceding vs. 7. As also in vs. 7 the first hemistich is less complex than the second, but that doesn’t mean it lacks puzzles. The principal question is the root affiliation of *ajyāse*. With Ge, I take it as a pun, as passive to both $\sqrt{añj}$ ‘anoint’ and \sqrt{aj} ‘drive’ (Old opts for \sqrt{aj} , Re for $\sqrt{añj}$)—a pun that we also find frequently in Maṇḍala IX. The primary connection is presumably to $\sqrt{añj}$: the ritual fire is “anointed” with the offering butter; cf. the nearby occurrences of the ppl. *aktā-* ‘anointed’ (VI.4.6, 5.6). But the loc. *dróne* casts a shadow on the clarity of this association. Though the stem *dróna-* is doubtless a deriv. of *dāru-/drú-* ‘wood’ (see EWA s.v.), it doesn’t refer to wood as a general material, much less to firewood. It is specialized as the (wooden) cup for soma; the stem is mostly limited to the Soma Maṇḍala, but even in its two other occurrences in VI (37.2, 44.20) it refers to the soma cup. Therefore, if we want to take *dróne ajyāse* here to mean something like “(the fire located) on the (fire-)wood is anointed,” we must take *dróne* as a specialized stand-in for

vāne or the like (see the passages assembled by Ge in n. 8a; cf. also *druṣádvā* ‘sitting on the wood’ in the next hymn, VI.3.5), whose meaning has been twisted. This unusual substitution pushes us in two directions. On the one hand, if *dróṇe* here is meant to evoke *duroṇé* ‘at home’ in the previous vs. (7cd), we can explain its unusual employment here and the twisting of its referent from wooden cup to wood -- and even take it as gesturing to ‘home’ here as well, ‘home’ being Agni’s fireplace as well as the home of the sacrificer. On the other hand, since the soma after its purification is regularly driven into its containers, we can take *ajyáse* also to *√aj* ‘drive’ and see the common identification of the two ritual substances, fire and soma, that pervades much of the RV. One of the characteristic ritual actions performed on Soma would here be attributed to Agni. The simile in b, *vājī́t ná* “like a prize-seeker” works with either verb, since horses are both anointed and driven. Moreover, both *vājín-* and *kṛtvya-* are regularly used of soma -- further strengthening the Agni/Soma connection sketched in pāda a.

The similes in the next two pādas cause further problems. In c the first question is the case of *svadhā́*. Ge and Old favor nom., Re and I instr. If *svadhā́* is nom., the series of similes with Agni as implicit subject and upameya is disrupted. The next issue is what is meant by a *párijmā ... gáyaḥ*. Both Ge and Re take it as some sort of mobile home (e.g., Ge “ein fahrender Hausstand”). Although in a pastoral society like that of the RV such a notion is not as comic as it might at first seem -- and although fire is frequently depicted as burning across the land -- I do not think that that is the image meant there. Note first that *gáya-* is several times associated with the preverb *pári* (esp. *pári √pā* VI.71.3, X.66.3, though as an object not a subject, I have to admit). And from its literal sense ‘earth-encircling’, *párijman-* can develop the sense ‘encircling, encompassing’. That is the sense I see here, with the domestic deity Agni compared to the extended family that embraces everything belonging to it -- a likely reference to the ritual fire as the joint possession and symbol of the Ārya clans.

The second simile depends on the meaning of *hvāryá-*. This stem must belong to the root *√hvy* ‘go crookedly’. Ge thinks it refers to a bird, which has little to recommend it since there’s already a horse in the passage; others (Re, Th [KlSch 78]) to the meandering or zig-zag movement of the fire (e.g., Re “(il va) zigzaguant ...”). I originally preferred to take it as a gerundive (despite the accent, which is unusual for such a formation) and indeed one to an underlying causative. My further assumption was that the “young steed” of the simile is being trained, by being run in circles (around someone in the middle holding a rope attached to the horse -- a standard part of horse training today it seems from images and videos conjured up by Google -- and recall the Mitanni horse-training tablets with their numbers of ‘turns’ [*vartana*]). Although *√hvy* often refers to more random motion, it implicitly contrasts with motion in a straight line, which a circle is not. The advantages to this interpr. are 1) it would refer to something that the ritual fire actually does or is made to do: the Paryagnikaraṇa or the circling of the sacrificial animal (and associated paraphernalia) with a firebrand; 2) it would implicitly pick up *párijmā* from the beginning of the hemistich, with a more literal sense of ‘encircle, encompass’ than in pāda c. If this latter suggestion is correct, as in 7cd the first word of pāda c, *párijmā*, would be applicable to the similes in both c and d with slightly different senses, just like *raṇvāḥ* in 7c. The disadvantage to this interpr. of *hvāryá-*, however, is probably fatal: it is difficult to harmonize with the only other occurrence in V.9.4 (q.v.). There I suggest the sense ‘skittish’ (< moving unpredictably), and I would

now reluctantly substitute “skittish like a young steed,” which would unify the two occurrences.

VI.2.9: With Ge, I supply the verb ‘eat’ in pāda a. Although Ge does not give his reasons, the existence of a parallel passage in this Agni cycle gives a clear warrant: VI.15.1 *jyók cid atti gárbho yád ácyutam* “For a long time the embryo eats just what is immovable.” Re supplies a different verb in a from the one he supplies in b: “(tu ébranles) ... comme le bétail (dévore) ...” But this violates the structure of the RVic simile.

Pada b is identical to V.9.4d, in the same vs. as *hvāryá-* just disc. ad 8d above. This fact makes reconciling the meaning of that word in these two passages even more desirable.

The problem in the 2nd hemistich is the form *dhāmā*. Gr, fld. by Lub, interprets it as a 1st pl. root aor. injunctive, but though a 1st person would work in some hymns, there seems to be no personal intrusion in this one -- nor can I figure out how a 1st pl. “we establish(ed)” would fit here. Both Ge and Re take it as a neut. pl. to *dhāman-* and therefore the subject of *vrścānti*. However, this requires an interpr. of *dhāman-* -- Ge “Kräfte,” Re “pouvoirs-d’état” (whatever that means) -- that I do not think is possible for this word, and, in any case, can “powers” hew? On the basis of VI.6.1 (also in this cycle) *vrścādvana-* ‘wood-hewing’ (the compounded version of our *vānā vrścānti*), which modifies Agni, I think that the subject of *vrścānti* must be Agni, or rather some parts of Agni, since a plural is required. I therefore take *śíkvasaḥ* as a nom. pl., not gen. sg. (with Ge, Re), referring to Agni’s flames or his various embodiments. This leaves *dhāmā* stranded; I take it as an annunciatory main clause with *yád* as the definitional relative clause: “(this is your) principle, that ...” My tr. assumes a neut. *singular dhāmā*, allowed by Wackernagel (AiG III.272), Old (ZDMG 55: 280 = KISch 739), etc. It would also be possible to tr. as a plural: “(these are your) principles, that ...” A different possibility is enabled by Ge’s suggested alternative tr. of *dhāmā* (n. 9c) as “Erscheinungsformen,” which is more palatable than his “Kräfte.” If we allow the meaning of *dhāman-* to stretch to this extent, we could tr. cd “when the forms of you, the dexterous one, hew the woods,” with *śíkvasaḥ* a genitive with *te*. Nonetheless, I still prefer the publ. tr.

VI.2.10: I interpr pāda a (which is identical to IV.9.5a) as a variation on passages like X.2.2 *vēṣi hotrām utā potráṃ jánānām* “pursue the office of Hotar and of Potar of the peoples,” but with gapping of the terms for the priestly offices.

The standard tr. take *samṛdhāḥ* as an abstract ‘success’ (e.g., Ge “Schaff ... Gelingen”; cf. also Re, Scar [67]), but the only other occurrences of this root noun, in the frog hymn VII.103.5, clearly means something like ‘unison’, referring to the frog chorus. One of the two finite forms of this lexeme, *sám āṇṛdhe* in X.79.7, also seems to have this sense: Agni “comes together” with his parts or limbs (*párvabhiḥ*). The other, in X.85.27, has a sense closer to simplex *√rdh* ‘be (completely) realized, come to success’. In our passage here, the ‘unison’ interpr. makes sense, esp. in the larger context of this hymns (and also VI.1), with the focus on Agni as clanlord of the separate Ārya clans, which are nonetheless working towards a common goal. On the other hand, the appearance of simplex *īdhat* in this hymn (4a, on which see comm. ad loc.) and in the cmpd. *īdhādvāra-* in the next (VI.3.2) might suggest a rendering closer to the simplex here as well.

VI.2.11: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. forms a slight ring with vs. 1, with voc. *mitramahaḥ* echoing *mitró ná* of 1b.

Both Ge and Re take *vīhí* as having a double acc., with *svastīm sukṣitīm* the secondary object expressing benefits we seek from the gods whom we pursue (e.g., Ge “Ersuche die Männer des Himmels um Glück, um gutes Wohnen.” But this seems unnecessary (and is not the usual syntax of \sqrt{v}); the root \sqrt{v} takes a variety of objects, including concrete inanimates, as in VI.12.6 (in this cycle) *véṣi rāyāḥ* “you pursue riches,” and here I see it as having both inanimate and animate objects.

Pāda d *dviṣó āṃhāṃsi duriṭā tarema* is a reprise of 4d *dviṣó āṃho ná tarati*.

VI.3 Agni

VI.3.1: The standard tr. take *te* with *jyótiḥ*, i.e., “your light.” Because of its somewhat unusual pāda-final position, however, I construe it rather with immediately preceding *devayúṣ* “seeking you as god.” The retroflexion in *devayúṣ te* might have been interpr. as an indication of constituency and therefore as support for my interpr., but this argument does not hold. For retroflexion of *te* after a rukified or -fiable -s, cf. I.11.6, 7 (I.131.4, IV.42.7) *vidúṣ te*, I.48.6 (I.69.7, VIII.24.17) *nákiṣ te*, I.104.1 (VII.24.1) *yóniṣ te*, IV.4.3 (VIII.71.8) *mākiṣ te*, IV.10.4 *ābhíṣ te*, V.38.1 *urós te*, VI.44.11 (VIII.40.9) *pūrvíṣ te*, VII.3.4 *prásitiṣ te*, VII. 18.18 *rāradhúṣ te*, VIII.14.3 *dhenúṣ te*, VIII.17.6 *svādúṣ te*, VIII.44.23 *syúṣ te*, IX.104.4 *góbhiṣ te*, X.33.7 *pitúṣ te*, X.38.3 *asmābhiṣ te*, X.56.2 *tanúṣ te*, X.85.40 *agníṣ te*, X.112.1 *ukthébhiṣ te*. Counterexamples: I.80.8 *bāhvós te*, I.147.2 *vandārus te*, I.163.3 *āhús te*, III.55.22 *niṣṣídhvarīs te*, IV.12.1 *trís te*, IX.79.5 *āvis te*, IX.86.5 *prabhós te* [VII.99.7 *váṣaṭ te*]. In other words, retroflexion is the most common outcome of *te* after a word ending with a ruki-fiable *s*, though it is not without exception. Constituency does not seem to play a role, nor (though this is not clear from the examples just assembled) does metrical position: all of the non-rukified examples occur first in their pādas, but rukified examples occur in every sort of metrical position, including, regularly, initial in pāda. See also the data on retroflexion discussed just above ad VI.2.6.

In the 2nd hemistich *āṃhaḥ* is the most problematic form. In the syntagm *pāsi ... mártam āṃhaḥ* we should like an ablatival reading: “you protect the mortal *from* narrow straits.” There are several ways to achieve this reading or to configure the form in a syntactically different way. For general disc. of this problem see Old, ZDMG 55: 280–81, and Schindler, Root noun, pp. 10–11. Gr (fld. by Kuiper III 1: 49 [1957]) invents a root noun *āṃh-* for just this passage, beside the very well-attested *s*-stem *āṃhas-*, to which our form could be the abl. Although this solves the immediate problem, inventing a stem for a single occasion otherwise has little to recommend it, and we should in any case expect accent on the ending, **āṃháḥ*. Others take it as an abl. to the *s*-stem, truncated in some way and at some period. M. Hale (Fs. Melchert) sees it as an archaic zero-grade abl. to the *s*-stem, preserved from a pre-proto stage of IE -- though he otherwise sets forth quite cogently the arguments against positing the preservation of such archaisms. Wackernagel (AiG III.80) interprets it as a haplology from **āṃhasaḥ*, an ad hoc solution that again solves the problem, but rather crudely. Schindler, flg. an oral suggestion of Hoffmann’s (in turn fld by Scar 135, 300), takes it as the acc. it appears to be, governed by a participle to be supplied (he suggests $\tilde{a} \sqrt{r}$, on the basis of V.31.13): “den Sterblichen, den du, O

Gott, beschützt, wenn er durch Verlassenheit in Bedrängnis (gerät).” This again takes care of the form, but requires supplying material from nowhere.

I also am inclined to take it as an acc., but not via the same mechanism as Schindler (/Hoffmann), but by way of syntactic ambiguity plus metrical convenience. I start with the fact that 1) abl. *ámhasaḥ* is common with $\sqrt{pā}$, often final in a Jagatī cadence; in this cycle cf. VI.16.30, 31 (though these two are actually in dimeter cadences) ... *pāhy ámhasaḥ*#. 2) Another, semantically similar, expression involves *ámhas-* and (*vī*) \sqrt{muc} ‘release’, but this expression can have two different syntactic realizations: personal ACC. + ABL. of the danger, or ACC of danger + personal ABL. Cf., e.g., I.118.6 *ámuñcatam vārtikām ámhaso nīḥ* “you two released the quail from *ámhas-*” versus II.28.6 (etc.) *vatsād vī mumugdhy ámhah* “release *ámhas-* from the calf.” The same duality of construction is found with \sqrt{pr} ‘carry across, rescue’. Cf. in the next hymn VI.4.8 *pārṣy ámhah* “carry (us) across narrow straits” versus VII.16.10 *tān ámhasaḥ pipṛhi* “rescue them from narrow straits.” I suggest that here we have a blend of these constructions extended to semantically similar $\sqrt{pā}$. The person remains in the ACC., but the danger is put into the ACC. as well. The similarity of the expression here ... *pāsi ... ámhah*# and, in the next hymn, VI.4.8 *pārṣi ámhah*# may have contributed. And I don’t think we should discount metrical convenience: the expected abl. *ámhasaḥ* is fine for a Jagatī cadence but doesn’t fit a Triṣṭubh cadence like this one, whereas *ámhah* is quite common in Triṣṭubh cadences. So if the poet can find a syntactically principled way to use acc. *ámhah* here, he will — and, in my opinion, he did. Note also *ámho mártam* in the next vs. (2d), the same words in opposite order to our *mártam ámhah*, as well as *ámhah* in the previous hymn, VI.2.4.

A less pressing problem is how to construe the instr. *tyájasā*. In the Hoffmann/Schindler interpr., it is simply construed with the invented participle: “wenn er durch Verlassenheit in Bedrängnis (gerät).” Both Ge and Re take it as the cause leading to *ámhah*, e.g., Ge “... vor Not infolge einer Unterlassungssünde,” but Ge suggests in a n. (1) that it could be an instr. of accompaniment with *ámhah* (“vor Not und Sünde”). That is the tack I adopt here, but I consider *tyájas-* as something that might befall the hapless mortal rather than something he might commit (like Sünde) and bring about his bad fortune. On the semantics of *tyájas-* here and elsewhere in the RV, see Old, ZDMG 55.280–82.

VI.3.2: As Ge points out, *pāda a* recalls VI.1.9a with *īje śasámé* as here; the addition of *rdhát-* in *pāda b* also recalls VI.2.4a *ṛdhāt ... śasámate*. In fact, the diction of the first hymns in this Agni cycle is very similar; cf. e.g., the repetition of *ámhas-* (VI.2.3, 11; 3.1.2, 4.8), the use of the verb \sqrt{nas} (*ānaṭ* VI.1.9, *aśyām* VI.1.13, *naśat* 2.5, *naśate* 3.1, 2, *aśyāma* 4x 5.7), etc. Other echoes have been treated elsewhere in the comm. The two forms of *naśate* in these first two vss. express mirror images: the first (1b) has the virtuous mortal as subject, suitably rewarded by attaining the light; the 2nd (2d) has the same mortal as object, with the verb negated, to express the evils that will not reach the mortal.

On *rdhád-vāra-* see comm. ad VIII.46.23

VI.3.3: This vs., esp. its 2nd half, bristles with difficulties and has been interpr. in an exhausting variety of ways (not only the usual tr., but also, e.g., Old at length in ZDMG

55.283–84=KISch 742–43; Thieme Unters.; Lüders, AcOr 13 [=Phil.Ind.]; Scar 146–47; Gonda, Ved.Lit. 219). I will not treat these other interpr. in detail, but merely lay out my own, which is in closest agreement with Lüders (“Ved. heṣant-...,” Philol. Ind.: 781ff.) through the first half of c. The general point of the vs. seems to be, as often, to contrast the fearsome and militant aspects of Agni with his benign ones.

It might also be pointed out that pāda a, which is the most straightforward part of the vs., has a bad cadence that is not easily fixable; in fact it presents an unusual sequence of 5 light syllables: (*sūro ná yá*)*sya dṛśatīr a(repā)*. I do not see any way to make *-tīr* heavy.

The first question, in the relatively transparent 1st hemistich, is what *bhīmā* modifies. Though Ge and Re take it with *dṛśatīḥ* -- that is, Agni’s appearance is both spotless (*arepā*) and fearsome -- the pāda boundary weakly suggests that *bhīmā* should be construed with the other fem., namely *dhīḥ*. On the assumption that this *dhī-* is Agni’s, *bhīmā* identifies the *dhī-* with the violent side of Agni.

In c, with Ge and Lü inter alia, I assume that a new clause begins with *nāyām* and, also with Lü, that *heṣasvant-* means ‘possessing arms, armed’. The opening of this pāda *heṣasvataḥ śurūdhaḥ* then is a nominal clause, with the gen. *heṣasvataḥ* expressing possession. Cf. III.38.5 *imā asya śurūdhaḥ santi pūrvīḥ* “here are his many proliferating riches”; sim. IV.23.8 *ṛtasya hí śurūdhaḥ santi pūrvīḥ* “Of truth there exist many riches.” The rich spoils that fall to Agni are presumably the various materials he burns.

The published tr. importantly omits *aktóḥ*. It should be corrected to “(But) on his own, by night, this one here ...” This temporal adverb implicit contrasts with *sūro ná* of pāda a. That is, the appearance of the militant Agni is compared to the sun, the light of day, whereas the benign Agni described in the second half of c + d is a phenomenon of night.

On the famous crux *nāyām* see comm. ad VIII.2.28 and my 2013 Fs. Hock article. Pace Thieme (1949: 51–52) and Lub, who classifies this passage separately, I believe that *nāyām* here belongs with the other occurrences of this syntagm.

The adj. *raṇvá-* recurs here from VI.2.7. On its indirect association with ‘home, dwelling’ in that passage and its direct associations elsewhere, see comm. ad loc., also I.66.3 and X.33.6. Here it might be better to render the phrase *raṇvó vasatīḥ* as “delightful dwelling” rather than “cozy nest” to bring out the echoes with the passage in the previous hymn.

I take *kútrā cid* as temporal rather than spatial.

VI.3.4: This vs. continues with the description of violent Agni.

Pāda d has caesura after 3; there are two other exx. of this metrical irregularity in the hymn, 6b and 8b, both of which have bad cadences as well. Here the early caesura might be calling attention to the extreme alliteration of the pāda: *dravír ná drāvayati dāru dhákṣat*. The same is not true of the others.

The 3rd sg. *bhásat* is most likely a subj. to a root aor.; see Gotō 82.

The hapax *yamasānā-*, an apparent participle to a supposed “Doppelstamm” to *√yam*, does not fit the pattern of most of the other *-asānā-* stems, on which see comm. ad IV.3.6 -- in that it neither falls into the semantic sphere of violent activity nor has an associated *s*-stem. Note here, however, that *rabhasānā-*, which meets both criteria, is found in the last vs. of this hymn (8d) and could have provided a model for this

formation. I also wonder if *yamasāná-* is not a pseudo-cmpd. of *yāma-* ‘bridle’ (e.g., V.61.2) and *√sā* ‘bind’, as if with a middle part. of the root aor. *asāt*, etc. (*viṣāṇa-* in V.44.1, identified as a part. by Gr., is better taken as an *-ana-* nom. to the same root [*<sā-ana-*]; cf. AiG II.2.193). Hence, ‘being bound to the bridle’. Needless to say, this would not be well formed by standard Vedic compounding rules, but is not completely out of the question as a nonce inspired by *rabhasāná-*, itself a nonce. Note also the phonological figure (*yam*)*asāná āsā*.

The simile in c, *vijéhamānaḥ paraśúr ná jihvām*, has been variously interpr. I take the frame to be (*agníḥ*) ... *jihvām* -- that is, the tongue is Agni’s, as usual, and refers to his flame(s). As for the comparandum, the ax -- I assume that *its* tongue is its blade, extending from the handle as a tongue does from a mouth. The blade might be found in the next vs. in *dhārā* (5b). See VI.2.7–8, where I argue that a word missing from vs. 7 is found or gestured toward in the following vs.

The hapax *dravīḥ* in the next pāda is universally taken as a nom. sg. masc. to an *i*-stem *draví-* meaning ‘smelter’ (so Gr, etc., and cf. AiG II.2.297) or ‘cutter’ (so Hoffmann, Aufs. 420, to *√drū* ‘cut’, rather than *√dru* ‘run’). But agent nouns in simple *-í-*, though they do exist (see AiG II.2.296–97), are not exactly thick upon the ground. I suggest instead that it is a neut. *-ís*-stem like *havís-* ‘oblation’, *sarpís-* ‘melted butter’ (on this type, including those built to aniṭ roots, see AiG II.2.364–67). It would then be a cognate object to *drāvayati* in the simile and, on the one hand, be a more likely substance to be caused to run than wood (*dāru*) and, on the other, refer to the parts of wood that really do ‘run’, like sap. It might be worth noting that the much later cvi formation *dravī-bhū* (etc.) means ‘become liquid, liquefy’. (This of course has nothing to do with the *-í-* in *dravīḥ*, but does show that ‘run’ is used of liquids, a reasonably widespread semantic extension -- e.g., in English.)

The standard tr. take *dāru* as the obj. of *dhákṣat* ‘burning’, rather than of *drāvayati*. This is, of course, the safer course. But cf. V.41.10 *ní riṇāti vānā* “he liquefies the trees” (also of Agni), V.58.6 *riṇaté vānāni* “the trees dissolve,” both with the root *√ri* ‘flow’.

VI.3.5: This vs. is comparatively straightforward, esp. the first hemistich.

I take *téjaḥ* in its literal etymological value: ‘sharpness’ → ‘point’, given *tigmá-* ‘sharp’ in 4a.

In c note the phonetic play of (*citrádh*)*rajatir aratír*.

Despite the pāda boundary, I take *vér ná* as the simile with both c and d, unlike most, who limit it to d. The root *√dhraj* ‘swoop, soar’ (found in the b.v. *citrá-dhrajati-*) is generally limited to birds (cf. I.165.2, IV.40.3) and the wind, and so comparison to a bird here would be apt. Note also that a form of *√dhraj* and an uncompounded form of *pátman-* are found together in 7c.

Though most interpr. take *aktóḥ* as a gen. either with *aratíḥ*, imposing a forced reading on the latter (Ge “der Lenker der Nacht,” Lü [Philol.Ind. 783] “als Herr der Nacht”), or with a gapped “Agni” (Th [Unters.] “der (Agni) des Nachts”), I think it likely that it is adverbial, as it is two vss. earlier (3c) in the same metrical position. So also Re.

Our *druṣádvan-*, a hapax, exists beside 2 occurrences of the simple root noun cmpd. *druṣád-* -- one of which is in an exactly parallel context: IX.72.5 #*vér ná druṣád* (like our #*vér ná druṣádvā*). I assume that the extension by the derivational suffix *-van-*

simply serves metrical convenience, since the forms seem identical semantically. Several other *-sád-* cmpds have the same extension: *nṛśádvān-* (1x), *pariśádvān-* (1x), and *admasádvān-*, found once in the very next hymn (VI.4.4), and *-van-* extensions are not rare in root noun cmpds, esp. to roots ending in *-ā*, such as *vājadāvan-* ‘giving prizes’, *sahasradāvan-* ‘giving thousands’, etc.

The final word of the vs., the b.v. *raghu-pátma-jamhāḥ*, is unusual for the RV in having three full members, as Re notes. He discusses the cmpd at some length and considers it a “conglomérat” of a tatpuruṣa **raghu-pátman-* (entirely parallel to *raghu-pátvan-*) and the attested bahuvrīhi *kṛṣṇá-jamhas-*, tr. “(dieu) au vol rapide, au plumage (noir)” (I.141.7). I see no reason to involve the latter cmpd., detach the (compounded) first member *raghu-pátman-* from the second, *jámhas-*, and insert a ‘black’ not found in the text to qualify the second member. The English designation “flight feathers” would have the same structure (save for the bahuvrīhi) as *raghupátma-jamhas-*, that is, “feathers suitable/specialized for flight.” Note that in this bahuvrīhi with a cmpd first member, “first member accent” actually falls on the second member of the first cmpd., matching that of the original tatpuruṣa (cf. just cited *raghu-pátvan-*) -- in other words, when the bahuvrīhi is formed, the internal structure of its first member is no longer visible to the process.

VI.3.6: The noun *rebhá-* is generally tr. ‘singer’ and the root *√ribh* from which it is derived, ‘sing’. However, as I discussed in “On Translating the Ríg Veda” (2000, Proceedings of UCLA IE conf.) and again in the Intro. to the publ. tr. (p. 78), the limited number of attestations of the verbal root and the variety of contexts in which it is found suggest that its meaning is more specific than ‘sing’. That the sound of *√ribh* can be compared to that made by birds of prey (IX.97.57) or by ungreated wood on a wagon (TS VII.1.1.3) suggests something on the lines of ‘squawk, squeak, rasp’ -- a hoarse or husky voice quality that would perhaps not be surprising in a middle-aged man in antiquity, esp. one who spent a lot of time huddled over fires. (See also X.87.13 where these performers produce “harshness of speech.”) The verb with which *rebháḥ* is construed in this passage, *rārapīti*, is likewise usually rendered in very general fashion, as ‘speak, praise’ or the like. But again it seems to have a more specific sense: ‘mutter, murmur’ vel sim. (see EWA and, e.g., Schaefer, Intens., both s.v. *rap*). So the anodyne tr. of Ge “Wie ein Bard ruft er ... laut” and Re “comme un barde ... il parle-puissamment” (both ascribing real intensive sense to *rārapīti* rather than the more likely frequentative) can be replaced with something both more pointed and more appropriate to Agni, who is the referent here: “like a hoarse-voiced (singer) he keeps muttering (=crackling) with his flame.”

The phrase *práti vasta usrāḥ* should be read with accented *vásta*, an old correction, endorsed by Oldenberg inter alia. Cf. pāda-final *vásta usrāḥ* at IV.25.2, VII.69.5, VIII.46.26. The erasure of accent here may be redactional, based on the verb *vaste* in the next hymn, VI.4.3b. It should be noted, however, that Re interpr. *vasta* as a finite verb form to *√vas* ‘wear’ (“Comme un barde, il se revêt des aurores”), and he is followed by Lub. That the exact phrase, but with accent, occurs 3x elsewhere makes this interpr. unlikely. There remains, however, the question of what the underlying form is. The Pp analyzes it as *vaste*, but Old prefers *-o* (both here and for the other occurrences of the phrase), a loc. to *vástu-*. On *-o* (from *-au*) as *u*-stem loc., see AiG III.153–54, and now TY, who argues for its continuing a PIE endlingsless loc., which would be preserved

unaltered in a cadential formula. Cf. also *sāno ávye* “on the ovine back,” also with putative endless loc. **-au* to *sānu-*. See disc. ad IX.86.3.

As for *usrāḥ*, in this phrase it appears to be an anomalous gen. sg. to the notional stem *usr-*, whose gen. sg. also appears as *usráḥ* (III.58.4, possibly also VI.12.4, but see comm. there). See AiG III.213. The long-vowel *-āḥ* ending seems to be the result of “feminizing” the form; cf. loc. sg. *usrām* in X.6.5 (on the pattern of *devy-ās*, *devy-ām*). Since in all four instances of *vāsta usrāḥ*, *usrāḥ* is at the end of the pāda, the length could be redactional for **usráḥ*, as the forms would be metrically equivalent. However, gen. sg. *usrāḥ* is found in other contexts, e.g., in II.23.2. We should also bring into the mix II.39.3 ... *prāti vāsta usrā*, with an unaccented dual voc. *usrā* referring to the Aśvins, and perhaps IV.45.5 *usrā jarante prāti vāstor aśvínā*, where the *usrā* may be again be a dual modifying the Aśvins (so Ge, implicitly Pp.) or a masc. nom. pl. (*usrāḥ* out of sandhi) modifying the fires that ended the preceding pāda – or another gen. sg. *usrāḥ* to be construed with *prāti vāstoḥ*.

Although *prāti* is not found in the other 3 exx. of the phrase, *prāti vāstor* is attested in II.39.3, IV.45.5, X.189.3, so it is likely to form part of the phrase here. Given its position, it would be difficult to take it as a preverb with *rārapīti*, esp. since *√rap* isn’t otherwise construed with *prāti*; see comm. ad V.61.9.

As noted previously, pāda b is metrically bad, with caesura after 3 and a bad cadence *mitrāmahaḥ*, where we should have a heavy penult.

The *īm* in Wackernagel’s position in pāda a is, in my opinion, a long-distance anticipation of the *īm* in c, and both are placeholders for *nṛ̥n* at the end of c and d. This might be clearer if the publ. tr. read “he keeps muttering to them.”

The second hemistich consists of a pair of parallel relative clauses with no overt verb. It also, quite unusually, shows verbatim repetition after the caesura: x x x x / *aruṣó yó divā nṛ̥n*. Such tag repetitions are far more characteristic of short echo pādas in meters like Atyaṣṭi, and even in those meters there tends to be some patterned variation. I don’t know what function this repetition serves here. I would attribute it to the poet’s flagging imagination, except that the rest of the hymn bursts with imagination.

There have been various solutions to the lack of verb in these relative clauses. Old, fld. by Re, supplies ‘protects’ (*√pā*). There’s nothing wrong with this -- it provides a verb to govern acc. pl. *nṛ̥n*, and “protect men” is a relatively common predicate, as Old points out. But there’s nothing in the context that imposes this addition; the closest we can come is *pāsi* in 1d. Ge takes these as nominal clauses -- “der bei Nacht, der am Tage das rötliche (Ross) der Männer ist” -- which saves him from supplying an unmotivated verb, but requires *nṛ̥n* to be a gen. pl., which I think we should avoid if at all possible. The simplest solution, at least as far as I can see, is simply to continue the verb of the first hemistich, *rārapīti*. The *īm* of 6a, echoed by *īm* in c, may suggest that the clauses follow the same template, and as noted above, *īm* in 6a is easiest to explain if it anticipates *nṛ̥n* in the relative clauses. Needless to say, when a verb needs to be supplied in the RV, a silent iteration of a verb in a previous nearby pāda or verse is often the best choice. And in this case the intensive (=frequentative) form of *rārapīti* in b may be reflected iconically in the implied repetition of Agni’s muttering in the rest of the verb. The next two vss. provide some further support for this suggestion. In 7ab an intensive in the relative clause of pāda is matched by an intensive to the same root in pāda b, and in 8a supplying an intensive in

the rel. cl. to match the one in the main clause of b also makes sense. Although I still think the 2nd half of this vs. is clumsy, it may be clumsy apurpose.

VI.3.7: More or less with Ge (fld. also by Re), I supply a word for sound or noise as the subj. of pāda a; see Ge's parallels cited in his n. 7a. They opt for 'voice', while I favor something generated from the two verbs in this hemistich, both derived from \sqrt{nu} 'roar', e.g., *nāvā-* 'roar(ing)'.

The two verbs themselves require comment, *nāvīnot* and *nūnot*, both pāda-final. First, note that the accent on the first but not the second requires that pāda b must be the main clause to pāda a. The stems of the two verbs are similar but not identical; both have heavy or intensive redupl. and appear to mean pretty much the same thing. *nāvīnot* is clearly an intensive to \sqrt{nu} (or $\sqrt{nū}$? see EWA s.v.); the stem is attested once elsewhere in the RV (VII.87.2), though the better-attested intens. stem is *ānonolu-*. The other verb *nūnot*, which is also attested once elsewhere (V.45.7), is less clear morphologically. Wh classifies it as a redupl. aor., and Schaeffer (Intens. p. 147) also attempts to argue for this identification. There are two problems with taking it as a redupl. aor. First, there is no causative attested to this root — *nāvayati* is only found in the Skt. lexica, not independently in text, at least acdg. to Whitney (Rts) — but a redupl. aor. of this shape should be secondarily generated to a causative. Second, a redupl. aor. should have transitive/causative value, but neither occurrence of *nūnot* has this sense, and in our passage it is difficult to see how to construct such a contrastive value for *nūnot* in opposition to *nāvīnot*. They seem to be used in identical fashion. Schaeffer in fact does try to claim that *nūnot* has factitive-transitive value, translating *nāvīnot* as "brüllt" and *nūnot* as "Gebrüll erregt." But "Gebrüll erregt" is a translational sleight of hand -- simply a phrasal paraphrase of "brüllt," enabled by German (similarly in English "shouted" / "raised a shout"). There is no acc. obj. in the Skt.; the noun "Gebrüll" is a dummy noun. I therefore think we should take them both as intensives with the same meaning. I do not understand the reduplication vowel of *nūnot*; metrically **nonot* would have been equivalent and could belong to the better attested intensive stem cited above -- though it should be noted that the attested 3rd sg. to that stem is a (pseudo?) seṭ *nónavīti*, so the secondary form might be expected to be **nonavīt*. All of this is made more complicated by the metrical irregularity of pāda b, which has only 10 syllables. However, (*oṣa*)*dhīṣu nūnot* provides a fine cadence to this line, while repeating *navīnot* from pāda a would yield enough syllables but a bad cadence, (*oṣadhī*)*ṣu navīnot*, and the hypothetical **nonavīt* would also produce a bad cadence.

rukṣá- is a hapax. It is generally taken as a nom. sg. -as out of sandhi with a meaning 'shining', derived from \sqrt{ruc} . So Gr, Ge, EWA s.v., etc. This is perfectly possible, harmless, and not very interesting. I favor the more daring hypothesis: that it is a loc. in -e out of sandhi and belongs to a **rukṣá-* 'tree', found also in the widespread MIA *rukḥa-* 'tree' (Pāli, Pkts.), which is probably a metathesis of *vrkṣá-* 'id.' (see EWA s.v. *vrkṣá-*). So also Re. In this context it could be indirectly alluding to its source by its position after *vṛṣā*, which is phonologically close to *vrkṣá-*.

The second hemistich presents its own difficulties. A crucial problem is the apparent lack of a verb. Ge and Re supply 'fill' (e.g., "Himmel und Erde mit Gut (erfüllt)"). I follow Old's suggestion (ZDMG 55.290=KISch 749; not very enthusiastically alluded to in the Noten) that we should emend *dām* in d to *tán* (root aor.

injunctive to *ā √tan* ‘stretch’). As he points out, this lexeme with *ródasī* (vel sim.) as object/goal, often Agni as subject, and an instr. is quite common, esp. in this set of hymns (VI.1.11, 4.6, 6.6 [recall how tight the phraseology is in this Agni cycle]); cf., e.g., *ā yás tatántha ródasī ví bhāsā*. Although I strenuously resist emendation ordinarily, the echo of IV.19.7 *dám̐supatnīḥ* might have led to the change here. (On that form see comm. ad loc.) In any case, *pace* the Pp. (see also Lubotsky s.v. *dām-*), I think it unlikely that the sequence contains the accented monosyllable *dām̐* followed by an accented *supát̐nīḥ*. Inter alia, the root noun *dām-* outside of the cmpd *dāmpati-* and esp. the archaic gen. *dán* in the phrase *pátir dan* are confined to Maṇḍalas I and X. If the emendation of *dām̐* to **tán* seems too radical (and I’m inclined now to think it is), I would read **dám̐supatnīḥ* with one accent, supply a verb, and tr. “... (fills) with goods the two worlds, who (thus) have (in him) a wondrous husband.”

In c I take the participle *yán* with both the simile and the frame.

Note the return of *√dhraj* (*dhrájasā*) and *pátman* (*pátmanā*) from 5cd.

VI.3.8: The vs. is structured as two *vā* alternatives; the reason for this is unclear. See Klein II.203–4.

The rel. cl. of pāda a has no verb, and the verb of b, *dauidyot*, must belong to a main clause because of its lack of accent. Ge, Re, and Klein (II.203–4) supply “become strengthened”; this certainly makes sense, but there is nothing in context or parallel passages that encourages this invention. Kü (206) goes for a more restrained “versehen ist,” a nominal clause with predicative instrumentals, I suppose. But given the twin rel. cl./main cl. intensives in 7ab (*návīnot ... nūnot*) and the intens. *dauidyot* in 8b, I wonder if the same pattern holds here, and we should supply an intens. form of *√dyut* in a.

The *arká-* of pāda a are most likely both chants and rays.

Pāda b is once again metrically irregular: it has a caesura after 3 and its cadence consists of 4 heavy syllables (*s^u*)*vebhīḥ śúsmaiḥ*.

VI.4 Agni

VI.4.1: As Re also points out, the *yáthā ... evá* framework of this vs. and the *adyá* and the *-si-impv. yakṣi* in the *evá* clause lead us to expect a preterite in the *yáthā* clause: “as you *have sacrificed (in the past) ..., so sacrifice today.” Encountering the pres. subj. *yájāsi* instead is surprising. Re operates with his usual parentheses to introduce the preterite: “S’il est vrai que (tu as sacrifié et) sacrifieras ...” I have inserted the totalizing qualifier “always” (“regularly” vel sim. would also work) to enable the future sense that I generally see in the subjunctive. Taking the subjunctive in a more modal fashion (“should sacrifice”) or, à la Tichy, as expectative (“Just as [I expect] you to sacrifice ...”) would be less troublesome in this passage, but I am reluctant to allow context to dictate function to that extent. I should note that Tichy does not treat this passage in her subjunctive monograph. IH suggests that the subjunctive here may show generalizing value, as in Greek, spread from indefinite contexts (“whoever [will] do X ...,” as in VI.5.4-5 ... *yáḥ ... dádāsat / sá ...* “whoever will ritually serve, he ...”).

VI.4.2: Ge takes both *vibhāvā* and *caḥṣāṇiḥ* as transitive: “Er ist unser Erleuchter wie der Erhellter am Morgen.” But well-attested *vibhāvan-* does not elsewhere take an object or

an objective gen. (on X.8.4 see comm. ad loc.). By contrast, *cakṣāṇi-* is a hapax and so its value is more up-in-the-air. AiG II.2.207 takes it as an agent noun ‘Erheller’ and explains it (p. 208) as a nominalization of an infinitive in *-āni*; in our passage *cakṣāṇir ná* “als Anzeiger” is said to rest on **cakṣāṇi ná* “wie um anzuzeigen.” But this is not how RVic similes work, and further a class of *-āni* infinitives is marginal at best (see most recently Keydana, *Infinitive im Ṛgveda* pp. 190–96). I take it as an intrans. ‘sighting, vision’ -- AiG II.2.207 lists action nouns as one of the two standard values for *-ani*-nominals -- to harmonize in sense with *vibhāvā*, though other interpr. are not excluded. Old suggests ‘Beschauer’, sim. Re.

The tr. of *védya-* is in accord with my usual interpr. of this stem as ‘to be acquired’ (see comm. ad II.2.3) and my understanding of the original meaning of the epithet *jātāvedas-* (in d here) as ‘having (all) beings as possessions’. However, ‘to be known’, found in the standard tr., would certainly be possible here.

Note that the phrasal verb *cāno √dhā* ‘take delight’ takes an acc. obj. *vandāru*, as is standard.

In the 2nd hemistich it is uncertain (but not terribly important) which of the nominatives is the predicate with *bhūt*. It is more difficult to attribute the usual change of state sense ‘become/became’ to *bhūt*; Hoffmann’s interpretation (p. 136) as a general statement about Agni seems reasonable. Indeed, I might be tempted to emend my ‘has been’ to ‘is’, to match the presential injunctive *cāno dhāt* in the preceding hemistich. The presence of this unnecessary *bhūt* may well be accounted for by the figure in which it participates: *uṣarbhūd bhūd*, which pleasingly has near rhyme forms from two different roots.

The collocation *uṣarbhūd- ātithi-* recurs in VI.15.1.

VI.4.3: The first hemistich treats the billowing smoke and bright flames of physical fire. The kernel of the first pāda, ... *yāsya panáyanti ábhvam*, is almost identical to II.4.5 *ā yán me ábhvaṃ vanádaḥ pánanta* “The formless mass [=smoke] of the woodeater which they (first) marvelled at.” Cf. comm. ad loc. In that verse also the next step for Agni is to become bright. In our vs. I supply ‘mortals’ from 2c as subj. of *panáyanta*, but undefined ‘they’ is also possible.

The problem in pāda a is *dyāvo ná*. We might like this to be genitive sg., allowing it to be parallel to *yāsya* and depend on *ábhvam*: “whose formless mass they marvel at like that *of heaven.” But there is no way that *dyāvaḥ* can be a genitive, and in any case it is also not at all clear that heaven is shaped like a formless mass. Old (ZDMG 55.291 = KISch 750) attempts to rescue this interpr. by assuming anacoluthon and mixture between the two constructions “Agni has *ábhvam* like the heavens” and “they admire A’s *ábhvam*,” but besides being overtricky, in both instances ‘heaven’ should be genitive, since Skt. lacks a ‘have’ verb and uses GEN X for such values. (He does not push this interpr. in the Noten.) Taking *dyāvaḥ* as the nom. pl. it must be, Ge and Re assume that *dyāvaḥ ná* belongs with the second pāda, as a simile with the verb *vaste* -- so Ge “Er ... kleidet sich wie die Himmel in Glanz.” Although this makes sense, it is syntactically impossible, at least as far as I can see: it requires fronting the simile around the entire relative clause, a major violation of standard RVic syntax. My own interpr. takes both the morphology and the syntax seriously: given the structure of the pāda, nom. pl. *dyāvaḥ* should be being compared to the subject of *panáyanti*. In fact, this is possible

semantically as well: the heavens can marvel at Agni's smoke that is billowing all the way up there. As often, assuming what the meaning of a RVic passage should be has led interpreters to distort the grammar to get to that meaning and has prevented them from reflecting on what the poet meant in producing a non-hackneyed image.

The 2nd hemistich presents its own problems, primarily because of missing or unspecified arguments to the verb. In *c ví ... inóti* lacks an overt object. Ge supplies "Schätze" and interprets the phrase in positive fashion. He reasonably cites as parallels, both from the immediately following hymn, VI.5.3 ... *inoṣi ... vāsūni* and VI.5.1 ... *ínvati dráviṇāni* with 'goods' and 'chattels, treasures' as obj. respectively. But these passages lack the preverb: although Gr lists VI.5.3 with *ví* as preverb, and Ge apparently follows him, *ví* in that passage should be construed otherwise, not as a preverb with *inoṣi*; see comm. ad loc. In my opinion a more telling parallel is found in VI.10.7, also in this Agni cycle, with the *ví*: *ví dvéṣāṃsīnuhí* "dispel hatreds." Re also considers the expression to be negative, on the basis of the same parallel, and tr. "lui qui chasse au loin (les ennemis)." The preverb *ví* is not found elsewhere with this verb. IH now makes the attractive sugg. that the obj. is actually the 'smoke' implied in the first hemistich. I consider this an alternative possibility.

In d the verb *śísñathat* is construed with an acc. *pūrvyāṇi*, but the referent of this generic adj. 'primordial' is not clear. Other occurrences of both of these words (*√śñath* and *pūrvyā-*) don't give clear formulaic guidance for what to supply as the real obj. This pāda is identical to II.20.5, an Indra hymn, and it does seem imported from an Indraic context here. (Bloomfield does not comment in RVReps.) Ge supplies Burgen (with ?) here, but Werke in II.20.5. Although the former works fine semantically, *pūr-* 'fortress' is fem. and so is excluded. Re supplies "performances"; he does not indicate what Sanskrit word he had in mind or why he thought it was apposite. Though it is the case that both *kr̥tāni* and *kārmāṇi* appear with *pūrvyā(ṇi)*, I do not see how one can 'pierce' them. I supply 'domains' (*dhāmāni*), on the basis of IV.55.2 *dhāmāni pūrvyāṇi*, VIII.41.10 *dhāma pūrvyām*, although not with a great deal of confidence.

Ge and Re take *ásna-* as a PN, but I see no reason not to take it, with Gr, as a straightforward derivative of *√as* 'eat'. Mayr splits the difference in his PN book, listing it as a PN but noting its likely original identity with the adj. *ásna-* 'hungry'.

VI.4.4: The rare word *vadmán-* is found only here and in VI.13.6, also belonging to this cycle. It presumably presupposes a neut. **vādman-* 'speech', from which *vadmán-* was derived by accent shift, like neut. *bráhman-* → adj. *brahmán-*. *vadmā* here participates in a phonetic figure with pāda-final *admasádvā*, where both the 1st cmpd member *adma* and the 2nd *sádvā* match the basic phonological structure of *vadmā*.

The immediate context in VI.13.6 is similar, *vadmā sūno sahaso no víhāyā*, but it contains the full voc. phrase *sūno sahasaḥ* "o son of strength," rather than the truncated *sūno* here (the only place in which the bare voc. *sūno* is found in the RV). The phrase "son of strength" is hypercharacteristic of this Agni cycle: besides VI.13.6 the full voc. is found in the 1st vs. of this hymn (1b), as well as nearby VI.1.10, 5.5, 11.6, 13.4–6, and 15.3, and the acc. *sūnúṃ sáhasaḥ* in VI.5.1, 6.1, the nom. in VI.12.1. This density of occurrence alone would strongly suggest that gen. *sahasah* has been gapped here, but I wonder if a factor contributing to the omission of *sahasah* is the two occurrences of *ūrj-* 'strengthening nourishment' in pāda c, given the similar, common voc. phrase *ūrjo napāt*

“o descendent of nourishment” (e.g., in this cycle VI.16.25). The *ūrj-* forms would, as it were, substitute for *sáhas-* in this stereotyped “son/descendent of X” expression.

It is difficult to contrive a causal sense for *hí* here, and the particle is therefore not rendered in the publ. tr.

The meter of pāda c is problematic. HvN make the obvious distraction *tu váṁ*, which produces an orthodox opening of 4, but a bad cadence. Old (both ZDMG 55.291 and Noten) suggests not distracting *tvám*, which produces an opening *sá tvám na ūrja-*, with caesura in the middle of the cmpd *ūrja-sane*, and reading *ūrjam* trisyllabic (with a medial rest: *ūrj am*). Although I usually pay heed to Old’s metrical observations, this requires two highly unusual features: the caesura splitting the type of cmpd that is seldom split and a reading of *ūrjam* that is unprecedented in the occurrences of this stem, while failing to distract *tvám*, which is more often disyllabic than not. In this instance Old’s usual good sense seems to have deserted him, and the HvN reading seems preferable. Part of the bad cadence may be attributable to following a phrasal template: pāda-final *ūrjam dhā(h)* has the same structure as pāda-final *cáno dhāt* in 2b. However, the light final preceding it (*ūrjasana ūrjam dhā(h)*) is harder to explain; of course the *-a* represents voc. *-e* in sandhi and perhaps we can unusually restore it.

VI.4.5: The first half of this vs. is fairly straightforward; the second bristles with nearly insoluble difficulties.

The adverbial *nítikti* ‘sharply’ presumably refers to haste -- as in Engl. “look sharp!” meaning “hurry!” Alternatively it could refer to the shape of flames, with their apparent sharp edges.

In b *rāṣṭrī* is quite surprising, whether it is applied to *vāyúh* ‘wind’ (so Ge) or to Agni (publ. tr.), since it is fem. and both of those are masc. (*pace* Debrunner, who suggests, implausibly, in AiG II.2.407 that *vāyú-* might in this passage be “ausnahmsweise Fem.”). Gr simply lists this occurrence as a separate stem *rāṣṭrī* masc., next to the same stem identified as fem. (Curiously, Tichy [-*tar*-stems] takes no notice of the form; she recognizes only the two fem. occurrences of *rāṣṭrī-*.) It unfortunately cannot be the masc. nom. sg. of an *-ín*-stem ‘possessing a kingdom (*rāṣṭrá-*)’ because it should then be accented **rāṣṭrī́*. This *-ī*-stem occurs twice elsewhere referring to Vāc and therefore is clearly fem., as we would expect. In our passage I think it has been employed as an imperfect pun with (unexpressed) *rātrī-* ‘night’ to evoke that stem in this passage concerning Agni’s dominance of the nights (*aktún*), here expressed by a distinct stem *aktú-*.

The image is that of a triumphant king marching across territory. Cf. the similar sentiment in VI.9.1, again part of this Agni cycle, ... *ná rājā / ávātiraj jyótiṣāgnís tāmāṁsi* “(Agni) like a king suppressed the dark shades with his light” and IV.4.1 (also of Agni) *yāhí rājeva ánavāṁ íbhena* “Drive like an aggressive king with his entourage.” The relevance of the wind is unclear to me, except perhaps to indicate the speed of Agni’s progress.

As noted above, the 2nd hemistich is a mess. So Old (ZDMG 55.291–92) “Der dritte Pāda ist schwierig und ein s i c h e r e s Resultat wohl unerreichbar.” Interpr. therefore differ significantly, and I cannot treat the details of all. As already noted by Old, some help is given by semi-parallel passages containing *√tṛ + árātīḥ*: IX.96.15 *átyo ná vājī́ táratī́d árātīḥ* “(he,) like a prize-winning steed, outstrips hostilities” (also with a

horse in the simile, as here); III.24.1 *duṣṭāras tārann ārātīḥ* “hard to overcome, but overcoming hostilities”; and, in this Agni cycle, VI.16.27 *tāranto aryó ārātīḥ* “overcoming the hostilities of the stranger.” Similar to this last passage is VIII.60.12 *tāranto aryá ādīśaḥ* “overcoming the aims of the stranger.” These parallels suggest that the frame of the passage is *ārātīḥ* √*tṛ*. The superimposability of the last two passages further suggests that *ārātīḥ* and *ādīśām* in our passage should be equated, since acc. plurals of both serve as obj. of *tārantaḥ* in the same formula, and that *ādīś-* here has negative connotations, unlike some other occurrences of this stem. Of course, the difference in case between them here (acc. pl. *ārātīḥ* versus gen. pl. *ādīśām*) makes the equation tricky, but I think that, in juxtaposing these two negatively viewed objects, the poet has demoted one (*ādīś-*) to a dependent genitive. (That is, rather than having “may we outstrip hostilities (and) (ill-)intentions,” we have “may we outstrip the hostilities of (ill-)intentions.”)

The remaining problem in pāda c — and it is a major one — is what to do with the truncated relative clause introduced by *yás te*. Old (ZDMG 55.292, reprised in Noten) considers numerous possibilities, none of which he seems particularly enamoured of, and Ge, Re, Gonda (VedLit. 236), Hoffmann (Fs. Thieme [1980] = Aufs. III.753–54), Scar (708), etc., add more. A number of interpr. take the rel. construction as embedded between the verb *tūryāma* and its object *ārātīḥ*, sometimes by introducing an otherwise unidentified new actor, sometimes by emending *yás* to **yās* to allow it to refer to one of the fem. pl. *ādīśām* or *ārātīḥ*. I would of course prefer to avoid such embedding on principle, and in fact each attempt to produce such an interpr. runs into further difficulties, which require emendation (of the rel. pronoun or of gen. *ādīśām*), highly unusual case usage, or supplying significant amounts of material — or a combination of the three. So embedding does not produce an otherwise clean syntactic or semantic result. I will not rehearse the details of all these ultimately unsatisfactory proposals, but simply present my own (also ultimately unsatisfactory, I’m afraid). I take *tūryāma yāḥ* to be an improper relative construction “... we who ...”, with disharmony in number between the 1st pl. verb and the sg. rel. prn.; the sg. *yāḥ* would have been imported from/enforced by the numerous rel. cl. in this Agni cycle beginning *yás te* and referring to the pious mortal and his ritual service to Agni. Similar 2nd position rel. are VI.2.4 *ṛdhād yás te ...*, 2.5 *samídhā yás te ...*, and there are also a number of pāda-initial exx. of *yás te*: VI.1.9, 5.5, 13.4, 15.11. Thus, although the overall structure of the sentence in cd is couched as (1st) plural, the template of the “pious mortal” defining relative clause would impose a singular in that construction. (Note that the *person* is unspecified, since the rel. cl. lacks a verb.) In the publ. tr. I supply a verb “serve,” but I would now omit the verb, with the rel. cl. only nominal *yás te* “who is/are yours” or “who is/are for you.” The main-clause verb *tūryāma* would have been fronted around this minimal clause.

We come finally to the simile of pāda d, which again has inspired numerous interpr., which again I will leave undiscussed. The particular issues are 1) the precise sense and reference of (*pari*)*hrút-*, 2) the grammatical identity of *hrútaḥ* and *pátataḥ*, which could both be either gen.-abl. sg. or acc. pl., 3) whether those last two should be construed separately or together, 4) whether √*pat* can mean ‘fall’ at this period. I answer 4) with a negative, though Ge’s and Scar’s interpr. depend on that sense. I also follow Hoffmann in seeing the simile as depicting a race and racecourse, though I think *-hrút-* refers to the curves of the racetrack and the curving course of the racehorse. I take both

hrútaḥ and *pátataḥ* as acc. pl., but in separate syntagms: *pátataḥ* is the obj. of *tūryāma* in the simile and refers to the competing horses “flying” around the course -- thus corresponding to *árātīḥ* in the frame -- while *hrútaḥ* is construed with *parihṛút* as an etymological figure and has no direct correspondent in the frame. For the other occurrence of the root noun *hrút-*, where it likewise refers to real life curves, see comm. ad IX.61.27.

VI.4.6: *ā ... bhānumádbhir arkaīḥ ... tatántha* is an elaboration of VI.6.6 (next hymn) *ā bhānúnā ... tatantha*. In our passage *tatántha* is accented because it follows pāda-initial, extra-sentential voc. *ágne*.

In c *nayat* ‘leads’ would seem to need an obj.; with Re I supply “us.” Ge leaves it object-less.

There is no agreement about where to construe the instr. *śocīṣā*. Re takes it with *aktáḥ* (“oint de flamme(s)”), while Ge’s interpr. isn’t clear (at least to me). I assume it goes with the VP: Agni’s bright flame illuminates the passage around the darkness(es).

I am rather baffled by the simile in d. The vṛddhi form *auśijá-* is usually used as the patronymic of Kakṣivānt, one of the great poets of maṇḍala I (e.g., I.119.9, 122.4, 5), but morphologically it could also simply be a derivative of *uśij-* ‘(type of) priest’. It also occurs once (I.112.11) with the rare word *vanij-* ‘merchant’; that passage also contains Kakṣivānt (though not in the same syntagm). Ge claims that our passage is part of “die Sage vom fliegenden Kaufmann,” but the two other passages he cites (one of them I.112.11) certainly do not add up to a saga, and *dīyan* ‘flying, soaring’ does not have to belong to the simile as he (and Re) take it. I am inclined to think that the referent of *auśijáḥ* is, as usual, Kakṣivānt. His (other) patronymic, according to the Anukramaṇī, is *dairghatamasa* ‘descendent of Dīrghatamas’, another celebrated poet of Maṇḍala I, whose name means ‘having long darkness’ (=blindness, quite possibly). I suggest that we have here a reference to Kakṣivānt via the vṛddhi deriv. *auśija-*, and this reference to Kakṣivānt then obliquely evokes his relationship to Dīrghatamas. So, somewhat ironically, a poet connected to “long darkness” leads us around (/helps us avoid) darkness. I would further suggest that *pátman ... dīyan* “soaring in flight” might refer to soma exhilaration (as in X.119 the Labasūkta). Cf. I.119.9 *māde sómasyauśijó huvanyati* “in the exhilaration of soma, (Kakṣivānt), the son of Uśij, cries out (to you),” where Kakṣivānt, identified as *auśijáḥ*, cries out “in the exhilaration of soma.”

If this nomenclatural intertextuality seems too far-fetched, we can take *auśija-* simply as descended from / connected to (fire-)priests and assume that Agni is being compared to his priest (for, to me, unspecified reasons).

VI.4.7: This vs. has a number of metrical problems or peculiarities. In pāda a the caesura unusually splits the splv. suffix from its base: *mandrá-tamam*; pāda b has an unusual opening (on which see below). Pāda c is, at least by the Pp. analysis, not only a syllable short (hence HvN’s rest at 5), but has a bad cadence for a Triṣṭubh; for possible solutions, see disc. below. Pāda d also has a bad cadence, but a different one and not easy to fix.

Instr. *arkaśokaīḥ* unites the instrumentals *arkaīḥ* of 6a and the *śocīṣā* of 6d. I take it as a pun, with *arka-* representing both ‘ray’ and ‘chant’, both of which meanings are found for this stem in nearby passages: in the immediately preceding vs. 6a it means ‘ray’ and refers to the similarity of Agni’s rays to those of the sun; in the next hymn VI.5.5 it

appears in a sequence of ritual items, adjacent to *uktaīh*, and must refer to priestly chants. In our passage “ray-flames” are attributed to Agni, “chant-flames” to “us.”

In b, as noted above, the first word *vavṛmāhe* is metrically bad: a heavy 2nd syllable would be preferable, as it would in the other 4 occurrences of this 1st pl. pf., as well as in 2nd sg. *vavṛṣé*. Kü (459) plausibly suggests that the original reading of this form was **vuvūrmāhe*, as we would expect for this *seṭ* root, which was redactionally changed, as *anīṭ* forms crept into this root. Note the echo *-māhe māhi*.

The accent on *śróṣi* is somewhat troubling, as it is very unlikely to begin a clause. One could construct such a meaning: “Since we have chosen you ... as a great thing for us, listen, o Agni!” But the most natural way to construe the sequence is ... *naḥ śróṣi* “listen to us” (cf., e.g., I.133.6, VI.26.1 (...) *śrudhī naḥ*, etc.), as Old (ZDMG 55.292) also points out -- which in turn requires that immediately preceding *māhi* be part of that clause to host the enclitic *naḥ*. Old (ZDMG 55.292–93 and Noten) suggests rather that *śróṣi* is still under the domain of *hī*, but this seems unlikely, since it would involve an asyndetic conjoining of a preterital perfect and a *si*-impv. (/subjunctive). I suggest that the accent was supplied redactionally on the basis of *pārṣi* in the next vs. (8b) and, especially, *ghóṣi* in the next hymn (VI.5.6d), both in the same metrical position and receiving their accents honestly.

śróṣi is also the only attestation of this *si*-imperative, an isolated formation beside the very well-attested root aorist. In particular, there are no *s*-aor. subjunctive forms of the type that regularly support the *si*-impv. I do not entirely understand how or why it was formed, but, given the tight formulaic relationships between the hymns in this Agni cycle, I suggest it may have been based on semantically identical and rhyming *ghóṣi* in VI.5.6; as was discussed above, it is possible that the accent of *śróṣi* is owing to the same source. However, MLW reminds me that “*s*-forms of *k’leu* are very wide spread in Indo-European (Lith. *klausyti*, TB. *klyaus* and there might even be an exact match for *śróṣi* in Messapic *klaohi*. Cf. also *srausāt*. Nonetheless, I still favor an internal Skt. explanation.

As already noted, pāda c is both metrically deficient and afflicted with a bad cadence. Old (both ZDMG 55.293 and Noten) suggests restoring *devātātā*, as in 1a, also pāda final. Though this would fix both metrical problems and would also make contextual sense, I do not understand how such a corruption could have arisen. I prefer, and have adopted, Ge’s suggestion (n. 7cd) to read *vāyúm* beginning pāda d as *vā āyúm*, with *vā* going with the previous pāda. *devātā* appears several times in a Triṣṭubh cadence followed by a monosyllable (IV.44.2, 58.10, VII.85.3) -- so ... *devātā vā#* would be a fine pāda-end -- and the *vā* can easily conjoin the two instr. *śávasā devātā*. The reanalysis of *vā āyúm* to *vāyúm* can have been based on pāda-initial *vāyúr* in 5b. Agni is called *Āyu* on a number of occasions (see, e.g., I.31.11, X.20.7, and Gr s.v. *āyú*- def. 2). Although Ge’s idea seems eminently sensible to me, it is passed over in silence by Re. An asterisk should be inserted before “*Āyu*” in the publ. tr.

I do not see any way to improve the cadence in d. The splv. *nṛtama-* is not suitable for the cadence of any Rigvedic meter, though it also appears there in VI.33.3.

VI.5 Agni

VI.5.1: I supply ‘our’ with ‘thoughts’ (*matíbhīh*) in pāda b, though the subject of the overt verb *huvé* is only 1st singular. I assume that the *vah* ‘for you’ is addressed to the

poet's fellow celebrants and therefore there is an implicit 1st pl. It would, however, also be possible to tr. "with my thoughts."

invati is obviously a thematized Vth Class pres. (see Gotō, 1st class, p. 76). What is rather surprising is that the athematic stem is found two vss. later, as *inoṣi* in 3c, as well as in the previous hymn (*inóti* VI.4.3; cf. also the impv. *inuhí* in nearby VI.10.7). It is true that *invati* provides a more favorable heavy syllable in 2nd position, but I do not otherwise see the motive for using both stems in this hymn.

Note the etymological connections *yúvānam* ... *yáviṣṭham*, *ádrogha(-vācam)* ... *adhruk*, and (*viśvá-*)*vārāṇi* (*puru*)*vārah*.

VI.5.2: In almost all occurrences in which it is possible to determine, animate forms of *yajñīya-* refer to gods. They may be the referents here as well: the gods may send goods to Agni to be redistributed to his mortal worshipers.

The syntax of cd is somewhat problematic, since there is incongruity between the simile and the frame. Ge evades this by taking the simile that begins c (*kṣāmeva víśvā bhúvanāni*) with ab: "In dir ... bringen die opferwürdigen (Götter) ... Schätze zum Vorschein wie die Erde alle Geschöpfe," and beginning a new clause with *yásmín*. This is not impossible, but it is unnecessary and, given the hemistich break, undesirable if another interpr. can work. Various ones have been tried (see Old, ZDMG 55.293 and Noten), but, flg. Old, I think it is yet another example of case disharmony in similes, utilizing two possible alternative interpr. of the verb (*sám* ...) *dadhiré*. In the frame this medial verb has a passive sense 'be held, encompassed', with *saúbhagāni* as subj. For this construction cf. VI.38.3 *bráhmā ca gíro dadhiré sám asmín* "the sacred formulations and the songs together have been placed (/are encompassed) in him." But the same verb form can also be transitive, with the object expressing what is encompassed or placed. This is the construction of the simile, with nom. *kṣāma* (or *kṣāmā*? see Old) and acc. *víśvā bhúvanāni*. For such a transitive construction, cf. III.19.4 *bhūrīṇi hí tvé dadhiré ánikā* ... *yágyavo jánāsaḥ* "the peoples eager to sacrifice have established in you [=the fire] your many faces." In our passage the *object* of the simile thus corresponds to the *subject* of the frame; that both are neut. pl. makes their correspondence easier to process, despite their different grammatical functions.

VI.5.3: As noted above ad vs. 1, we have both thematized *ínva-* and athem. *inó-* in this hymn, with very similar objects: *drávināni* 'movable goods' (1c), *vásūni* 'goods' (3d). As was also noted above, ad VI.4.3, Ge (and others: cf. Gr and Re) construes the *ví* opening pāda d with *inoṣi* in c and uses this supposed lexeme to argue that *ví* ... *inóti* in VI.4.3 has positive value. As I argued there, *ví* ... *inóti* is more likely to mean 'dispel' and to take a negatively viewed object. In our passage here I do not think that *ví* belongs with *inoṣi*. Instead I think *ví* forms a phrase with immediately following *ānuṣák*; cf. the same pāda-initial expression I.58.3, 72.7, IV.12.3, as well as #*ví* ... *ānuṣák*# V.16.2. I assume that the expression arose from passages like I.72.7 *vy ānuṣak* ... *dhāḥ* "distribute in due order" with *ví* *√dhā* (reinforced here by *vidhaté*), and then *ví* and *ānuṣák* became phrasally fused.

VI.5.4–5: These two vss. are contrastively paired: each has a generalizing rel. clause describing the activities of a mortal -- harmful in 4ab, beneficial in 5ab -- while the 2nd

hemistichs of each set out the results of such actions. The pairing is further emphasized by the phonological similarities of the oppositional verbs *abhidāsat* ‘will assail’ (4a) and *dādāśat* (5b) ‘will ritually serve’.

VI.5.4: Note the extreme etymological figure that occupies the whole of pāda d: *tāpā tapiṣṭha tāpasā tāpasvān*. For the last two words, see the parallel structure in 6b.

VI.5.5: I now would be inclined to take *samīdhā* as an abstract “with kindling,” rather than as the concrete material “with kindling wood” as in the publ. tr. See disc. ad VI.1.9, 2.5.

VI.5.6: The pāda-final *sāhasā sāhasvān* is morphologically entirely parallel to 4d *tāpasā tāpasvān*.

In d *tād* may not be a temporal adverb as in the publ. tr., but a neut. acc. obj. of *juṣasva*, with which ‘speech’ vel sim. should be supplied. So Ge and Re -- e.g., Ge “so freue dich an diesem (Gedicht) des Sängers.” However, since $\sqrt{juṣ}$ can take a gen. complement (though more rarely than the acc.), *jaritūḥ* may be construed directly with the verb, as in the publ. tr.

On *ghōṣi*, which I take as an anomalous -*si* imperative, see comm. ad IV.4.8, which contains the other occurrence of this form. On the possible relationship between *ghōṣi* and *śróṣi* in VI.4.7, see comm. ad loc.

VI.5.7: This vs. is characterized by etymological figures: b *rayīm rayivaḥ*, c *vājam ... vājāyantaḥ*, d *ajarājāram* -- a stylistic tick found also in vss. 1, 4, and 6 -- see comm. ad locc.

VI.6 Agni

VI.6.1: The subject of this vs. is not overtly expressed, but it cannot be Agni, who is the acc. goal. Re cleverly suggests that the subject is indicated by the participle *grṇánt-* ‘singing, singer’ in the last pāda of this hymn. If so, this is an oblique form of ring composition.

Contrary to my usual principles, rather than construing *návyasā* with *yajñéna* in the next pāda (so Ge, Re), I supply a form of ‘speech’. I do so on the grounds that *návyas-*, particularly in the instr., is specialized to the realm of speech. Cf. *návyasā vácasā* (VI.62.5) as well as the famous pāda-final disharmonious formula *návyasā vácaḥ* (II.31.5, VI.48.11, VIII.39.2), along with fem. forms of the comparative with different ‘speech, thought’ words (e.g., nearby VI.8.1 *matír návyasī*).

The hapax *vṛścád-vana-* ‘hewing wood’ shows the poet’s penchant for the type of compd. that provides his name, *Bharád-vāja*. Cf. also *ṛdhád-vāra-* in VI.3.2.

VI.6.2: The first hemistich mixes the visual and the audible in a species of synaesthesia, esp. clear in the description of Agni as “brightening thunder,” but note also his “ever-roaring” flames.

The standard tr. construe *purūṇi prthūni* with *bhárvan*; e.g., Ge “die vielen, breiten (Flächen) fressend.” But nearby VI.12.5 *anuyāti prthvīm* favors taking the acc. as an acc. of extent with the verb *anuyāti*, as in the publ. tr.

Note the phonetic figure in *pāvakāḥ purutāmaḥ purūṇi, prthūni*, esp. the last three words, of which the first two also etymologically related.

VI.6.3: Alliteration continues, with *ví ... víṣvak* (a), *śuce śúcayaḥ* (b), *nāvagvā vānā vananti* (cd). The first two are etymological figures; in the third, intricately structured one, *vānā vananti* is not, but mimics one.

Flg. Ge (fld. by Re), I assume that the Navagvas are in an unmarked simile: the flames break and overcome the woods as the Navagvas broke Vala. The gapping of the simile marker *ná* would not be surprising in the *-na*-rich environment of the figure noted above: *nāvagvā vānā vananti*: we might have expected *divyā *ná nāvagvā*, and haplology would not be surprising.

The identity of the root found in *tuvi-mrakṣá-* is disputed; see EWA s.v. *MARC*, with \sqrt{mrc} ‘harm’, \sqrt{mrj} ‘wipe’, and $\sqrt{mrś}$ ‘touch’ all possibly in play. \sqrt{mrc} ‘harm’ seems the most likely to me. The Schwebeablaut outcome *-mrakṣ-* is standard when *-kṣ-* ending the root syllable would yield a super-heavy cluster **-rkṣ*. Cf. *drakṣyati* (not **darkṣyati*) to $\sqrt{drś}$ (see AiG I.212–13). Any of the roots just listed would follow this pattern.

VI.6.4: In my view (flg. Re), the rel. cl. of the first hemistich hangs off the previous vs. 3 and supplies the subject (*śúcayaḥ* ‘flames’) of *vananti* in 3d. However, Ge takes the rel. prn. *yé* as a stand-in for ‘wenn’, providing a subordinate clause to cd, with its resumptive *ádha*. The conspicuous alliteration of vs. 3, continued here (4a) — *śukrāsaḥ śúcayaḥ śuciṣmah*, also a triple etymological figure — might be a weak arg. in favor of a connection with vs. 3, esp. 3b *śuce śúcayaḥ*.

In b *kṣām* must be read disyllabically.

In the publ. tr. “like” should be enclosed in parens, as there is no overt simile marker in b. The question is why the flames are likened to “unharnessed horses” (*vīṣitāso áśvāḥ*). Ge and Re think they are grazing, and this interpr. might fit well with *vāpanti* ‘shear, shave’ -- a slightly different image of what happens to vegetation when fire moves across the earth: grazing “shears” the grasses like shaving does. However, I tend to think that *vīṣita-* adds a different semantic dimension: horses out of harness racing about wildly without control.

In d the standard view (e.g., Ge, Re, Macd [*Hymns*, p. 74], Klein [DGRV II.106], Mau [p. 24]), fld. also in the publ. tr., is that the gen. *pṛśneḥ*, lit. ‘speckled, dappled’, refers to the earth. And this seems perfectly reasonable. However, it should be noted that *pṛśni-* is nowhere else unambiguously used of the earth in the RV, except in the metaphorical *dhenúm ... pṛśnim* “dappled cow” in I.160.3. Though Re (comm. ad loc.) suggests that there is such a ref. in IV.5.7, 10, those are desperately obscure passages and nothing can be built upon them. Generally *pṛśni-* names the mother of the Maruts, who seems to have been a dappled cow, and “dappled (cow)” → “earth” is not a difficult step in RVic discourse. Still it should be kept in mind that it’s a step that hasn’t been taken elsewhere.

VI.6.5: The rendering of *goṣu-yúdh-* as ‘cattle-raider’ loses the specificity of the loc. pl. 1st member, but ‘of the one battling for cattle’ seemed excessively heavy.

The hapax *kṣāṭi-* is built to $\sqrt{kṣā}$ ‘burn’. I have borrowed the felicitous bilingual pun ‘ardor’ from Maurer.

On Gotō’s posited \sqrt{di} ‘destroy’ supposedly found in *dayate* here, see comm. ad III.34.1. There is no need for a separate root, as ‘divides’ → ‘fragments’ is a plausible semantic pathway.

VI.6.6: This vs. has a number of connections with phraseology elsewhere in this Agni cycle: *ā ... bhānumádbhīḥ ... tatántha* (VI.4.6): *ā bhānúnā ... tatantha* (6a); *dhṛṣatā* (3d, 6b); *spṛdho bādhasva* (VI.5.6): *bādhasva ... spṛdhaḥ* (6cd, though with the two forms belonging to separate clauses, not a VP as in 5.6); *vanuṣyāt* (VI.5.4): *vanuṣyán vanúsaḥ* (6d).

The referent of the gen. phrase *mahás todásya* ‘great goad’ is not entirely clear -- some take it as some feature of Agni (e.g., Ge), others as the sun (e.g., Mau). Most construe it with *bhānúnā* (as I do), though Re takes it with *pārthivāni jráyāṃsi*. If, as is likely, it goes with *bhānúnā*, this provides a good clue to its identity. The bahuvrīhi *svār-bhānu-* ‘having the radiance of the sun’ is obviously based on a genitival tatpuruṣa **svar-bhānú-* ‘radiance of the sun’, and GEN. *bhānú-* would simply be the analytic version of this cmpd., with the phrase *mahás todásya* substituted for putative gen. **sūraḥ* or **sūryasya*. VI.4.6 *ā sūryo ná bhānumádbhīr arkaiḥ* “like the sun with its radiant rays” provides further support for this interpr. Although it is true that in nearby VI.12.1, 3 the ‘goad’ (*todá-*) appears to be Agni, the qualifier ‘great’ in “*great goad*” here might point to the cosmic body, the sun, of which the earthly fire is a less powerful earthly counterpart.

VI.6.7: The insistent etymological alliteration in this vs. seems to me inartful overkill, though it certainly provides an explosive climax. The forms of \sqrt{cit} in the first hemistich — *citra citráṃ citáyantam ... citrakṣatra citrátamam* — give way to \sqrt{cand} in a slightly more restrained array, *candrám ... cándra candrābhiḥ*. Since both roots belong to the same semantic sphere and begin with *c*, the difference in effect between the hemistichs is minimal.

It is not clear what should be supplied with the fem. instr. pl. *candrābhiḥ*. The standard tr. use ‘flames’, and I’ve followed suit, but *súci-*, which figured in vss. 3-4, is unfortunately masc. when used as a noun. Re suggests alternatively *stutībhiḥ* ‘praises’ (fld. by Mau), pointing to the adjacent *gr̥naté* ‘singer’, but it is more natural to take the instr. *candrābhiḥ* with Agni syntactically, rather than construing it with the dat. participle, and further, *candrá-* seems never to be used with verbal products.

VI.7 Agni Vaiśvānara

As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn is heavily seeded with forms of \sqrt{jan} ‘beget, be born’. The epithet *vaiśvānará-* is also found in every vs. (1b, 2c, 3c, 4d, 5a, 6a, 7a), in all cases initial in its pāda.

VI.7.1–2: These two vss. are paired, both ending with *janayanta devāḥ* and sharing an opening pāda with the structure ACC SG + GEN ACC SG + GEN; this NP structure is also

found at the end of 1c and 2c (one iteration each), but is upended by GEN + ACC SG *yajñāsya ketúm* in 2d. It is perhaps a measure of the sensitivity of the RV to subtle patterns that this syntactic metathesis feels strikingly disruptive. It may well be that the poet generated this disruptive order in order to call attention to this very phrase; see the importance of the word *ketú-* in vss. 5 and 6, with the comm. there. There is an important difference, however: here the “beacon of the sacrifice” must be Agni, whereas in vss. 5–6 it is the sun.

There are only three finite verbs in this two-vs. sequence, all injunctives: 1d *janayanta*, 2b *abhí sám navanta*, 2d *janayanta*. The temporal reference is therefore unspecified. I tr. them as preterites (as do Ge and Re) on the assumption that Agni’s begetting by the gods happened only once in the mythological past. It would be different if priests were the subject.

VI.7.1: Since Agni is often called the mouth of the gods, Ge (and others) assume that the loc. *āsán* in d refers to Agni, and the gods have produced a drinking cup (*pātram*) to put in his mouth. But this requires Ge to treat the three-pāda accusative phrase that opens the hymn and refers to Agni as grammatically untethered, as an anacoluthon with the referent picked up in the loc. in pāda d (see his n. 1d). But, with Re, I see no reason why Agni cannot be conceptualized here as the cup that the gods drink from. Re considers *āsán* simply an attribute limiting the *pātra-*, a “réciptent pour la bouche, réciptent à boire,” while I take it as referring to the gods’ (collective) mouth.

Note the phonologically matching words *aratím* and *átithim* stationed in the same metrical position in pādas a and c.

VI.7.2: On *mahām* as acc. sg. masc. see AiG III.251, EWA s.v. *mahānt*, p. 338.

The paradox of calling fire “a great watering trough” (*āhāvā-*) simply sharpens the slightly discordant image in 1c of Agni as ‘cup’. Although *āhāvā-* is clearly derived from *ā √hu*, a standard lexeme for the oblations that Agni would be receiving, this particular noun is associated with a well in X.101.5 and is therefore associated with more mundane acts of pouring water (which of course should extinguish fire). Agni is a trough because the gods get their “water” there.

VI.7.3–5: The middle of the hymn is characterized by initial (or modified initial) forms of the 2nd sg. prn.: 3a *tvát*, 3b *tvát*, 3c VOC *tvám*, 4a *tvām*, 4c *táva*, 5a VOC *táva*.

VI.7.4: *abhí sám navante* reprises *abhí sám navanta* of 2b and perhaps confirms the preterital interpr. of that injunctive, since the verb in this vs. is marked as pres., though the gods are also subject here. However, how to interpret the tense values in the 2nd hemistich is unclear. Pāda c has an unambiguous impf. *āyan*, which, with its goal of immortality (*amṛtatvám*), would seem to refer to the remote mythological past (though see below). The verb is the last pāda, *ádīdeḥ*, can be either a plupf. (to the older stative pf. *dīdāya*) or an impf. to the new redupl. pres. remodeled from the pf. stem (Kü opts for the impf.; see 228). But whatever its morphological identity, it seems to refer to an event in the immediate past or the immediate neighborhood -- assuming that *pitróḥ* refers to the two kindling sticks -- namely, the regularly repeated kindling of the fire. This interpr. would be supported by 5c with pres. part.: *jāyamānaḥ pitrór upásthe* “being born in the

lap of your two parents.” In the publ. tr. I assumed that the first hemistich refers to the regular kindling of the fire and the gods’ response, while the 2nd one refers to the Ur-kindling in mythological time. However, I now wonder if we should interpret the abstract *amṛtatvām* in c in light of the voc. *amṛta* in pāda a. In the first hemistich Agni is addressed as “immortal one” when he is being born and the gods cry out to him; indeed the voc. “o immortal one” might be the content of their cry, expressed in the verb *abhī sām navante*. In the second hemistich the gods went to immortality (*amṛtatvām*), that is, to the abstract quality possessed by the one addressed as *amṛta*, and they did so “according to your [=Agni’s] intentions” (*táva krátubhiḥ*), again when he was born. The gods’ journey to *amṛtatvām* may therefore not be one of the distant mythic past (or not only of the distant past), but one they undertake whenever he is kindled. The abstract principle of immortality may also be found in the gen. *amṛtasya* in the last pāda of the hymn (7d), where Agni is identified as its protector.

Note that the phrase *vísve ... devāḥ*, parcelled out over two pādas, may teasingly invite us to connect the first term, *vísve*, with the dominant epithet in this hymn, *vaiśvānará-*.

VI.7.5: The disjunction between pf. *dadharṣa* in the main clause of b and impf. *ávinдах* in the subord. cl. of d is likewise a bit disturbing. Flg. Kü (266), the publ. tr. renders the perfect presentially as “ventures against,” but I might be tempted to change that now to “has ventured against” (cf. Ge’s “... hat noch keiner angetastet”). The question is what is the relationship between the two clauses. I think that Agni’s *vratás* are those that he established after he discovered (*ávinдах*) the phenomenon in d.

This in turn raises the question of what that phenomenon is and, more precisely, to which noun (*ketúm* or *vayúneṣu*) the gen. *áhnām* belongs. Most (Ge, Re, Old) take it with *vayúneṣu*; cf., e.g., Re “quand ... tu eus découvert le signal-lumineux pour les jalonnements des jours.” Old, who should know better, even cites word order as support of this interpr. And certainly *áhnām* does (once) occur with *vayúna-*: II.19.3 *aktúnāhnāṇ vayúnāni sādhat* “He perfected the patterns of the days through the night.” But far more often *áhnām* limits *ketú-*, several times in a Vaiśvānara context: VII.5.5 *vaiśvānarām uśásām ketúm áhnām* “V., the beacon of the dawns and of the days”; X.88.12 *vaiśvānarām ketúm áhnām akṛnvan* “they made V. the beacon of the days.” Cf. also III.34.4 *ketúm áhnām*, X.85.19 *áhnām ketúr uśásām*, and VI.39.3 *imám ketúm adadhur nū cid áhnām*, this last with separation between the noun and its gen. as in our passage. In my interpr. of this pāda the *vayúna-* are the ritual patterns, the regularly repeated sequence of events in the ritual, including the kindling of the fire. The “beacon of the days” is the sun, which rises at that kindling (clarified in the next vs.), in contrast to the “beacon of the sacrifice” in 2d, which is Agni. Note that Agni, addressed as Vaiśvānara, is here distinct from the sun, which he finds. (See further ad vs. 6.). Finding the beacon of the days in the (ritual) patterns means recognizing and replicating the regular rising of the sun that coincides with the kindling of the ritual fire. As usual in Rigvedic discourse the correct performance of ritual governs the rhythms of the natural world.

To return to the question of the relationship between the two hemistichs, I suggest that the “great *vratás*” of Agni that no one has/does venture(d) against are the ritual patterns, esp. the dawn kindling, which in turn control the repeated return of the “beacon of the days.”

VI.7.6: This vs. continues, and clarifies, the theme of the 2nd hemistich of vs. 5. Although Agni as Vaiśvānara is often identified with the sun and although several of the passages cited immediately above, ad 5d, identify Vaiśvānara with the “beacon of the days,” here Agni Vaiśvānara is separate from the sun (as indeed he was in 5cd), which is his eye (*vaiśvānarāsya ... cākṣasā*) and which is further characterized as “the beacon of the immortal one” (*amṛtasya ketúnā*), taking up the *ketú-* of 5d, which Agni found. The sun “measures out the backs of heaven” by crossing the sky on his daily passage.

In c the referent of *tāsya* in the phrase *tāsya ... mūrdhāni* “on his head / on the head of this one” is not specified and could either be the sun, as expressed by the instr. of ab, or Agni Vaiśvānara. It is surely the latter, however: *mūrdhāni* echoes the first word of the hymn, *mūrdhānam*, which refers to Agni himself as the “head of heaven.” And the *vīśvā bhūvanāni* “all creatures” who take their place on this head are a twist on Agni’s epithet *vaiśvānarā-* ‘belonging to all men’, which dominates this hymn.

On the formation of *visrūh-*, which occurs only here and in V.44.3, see comm. ad V.44.3, where I connect it (as a number of others do) to *√ru(d)h* ‘grow’. In our passage this etymological connection is actualized in the figure *ruruhuḥ ... visrūhaḥ*, and the vegetative image is further anchored by the simile *vayā iva* “like twigs.” With Re (and Kellens, *Noms rac.*, 82–83), I think the ‘outgrowths’ are Agni’s flames, but unlike those two I would not *translate visrūhaḥ* as ‘flames’: it’s a metaphor.

VI.7.7: In this vs. the subject of the cosmogonic *vī √mā* ‘measure out’ is Agni Vaiśvānara, not the sun, as in the immediately preceding vs., and the more usual identification of Agni Vaiśvānara with the sun seems to have reasserted itself. See VI.8.2.

In pāda a *sukrátuḥ* reprises *krátubhiḥ* in 4c, and it might have been better to render the *krātu-* in the same way -- either as “by your resolutions” ... “the very resolute one” or “by your intentions” ... “he of good intention.”

VI.8 Agni Vaiśvānara

This hymn, like the last, is dedicated to Agni Vaiśvānara and has a form of this epithet in every vs. but 5, always pāda-initial as in VI.7. However, the hymn is somewhat different from VI.7. In that hymn Agni Vaiśvānara was distinct from and dominated the sun (see esp. VI.7.5–6) until the last vs., while in this hymn the usual identification of Agni Vaiśvānara and the sun is in evidence. See esp. vs. 2.

As noted in the publ. intro., the hymn is also heavy with initial *v*’s, esp. in the earlier parts of the hymn, which index the epithet. Note esp. the three hemistichs that begin with the preverb *vī* (2c, 3a, 3c), as well as 1ab ... *vṛṣṇaḥ ... vocaṃ vidáthā ...*, 2ab ... *vyòmani, vratāni ... vratapā ...*, 3cd ... *avartayad, vaiśvānaró vīśvam ... vṛṣṇyam*.

VI.8.1: On *prkṣá-* see comm. ad II.34.3.

VI.8.2: Here Agni Vaiśvānara is “being born in highest distant heaven” (*jāyamanah paramé vyòmani*), presumably in the form of the sun, in contrast to VI.7.5 with the same participle but a different location: *jāyamānaḥ pitrór upásthe* “being born in the lap of your parents,” usually a kenning for the ritual kindling sticks, so that VI.7.5 refers to the kindling of the ritual fire. In that vs. Agni found the sun (“beacon of the days”), which

was therefore distinct from him, and in the next vs. (VI.7.6) the backs of heaven were measured out by the sun as an organ -- the eye -- of Agni Vaiśvānara (*vaiśvānarasya vímitāni cákṣasā, sānūni diváh*). Only in the last vs. of that hymn, VI.7.7, did Agni Vaiśvānara himself measure out the cosmos and take on his usual solar aspect. The two pādas VI.7.7a (*ví yó rájāṃsy ámimīta sukrātuḥ*) and our VI.8.2c (*vy āntarīkṣam amimīta sukrātuḥ*) are almost identical, but the former represents the resolution of the disjunction between Agni Vaiśvānara and the sun, while no such disjunction is found in our hymn.

VI.8.3: The cosmogonic activities of Agni Vaiśvānara continue here, but I would argue that they are instances of the *daily* creation of the cosmos by the light of the sun. The propping apart of the two world halves refers to the visual separation of earth and sky at the horizon at first light, and the rolling out of the two skins is a similar image, of the full extent of earth and sky revealed to sight at that time.

It is not entirely clear why Agni Vaiśvānara is called an “unerring ally” (*mitró ádbhutaḥ*; see the identical phrase in I.94.13 and similar I.77.3 *mitró ná bhūd ádbhutasya rathīḥ*). Agni is of course regularly identified as an ally (*mitrá-*) and is compared to Mitra because of his role as go-between between gods and men; in this particular case the sun’s role as the most visible of the gods and the heavenly being most clearly engaged with human life may have elicited this description. The covert presence of Mitra here may also play off the covert presence of Varuṇa in 2b, in the phrase *vrātāni ... vratapā arakṣata* “as protector of *vratas*, he guarded the *vratas*: *vrātās* are Varuṇa’s special province, although curiously Varuṇa is never called *vratapā-* in the RV.

The interpr. of pāda b is disputed because of disagreement about the sense and formation of *antarvāvat* (also found in I.40.7). Ge tr. the pāda as “er zerteilte die dazwischenliegende Finsternis durch das Licht” (almost identically also Oberlies Relig. I.191), presumably with the ‘between’ sense of *antár* nominalized with the complex suffix *-vā-vant-*. Re denies that the formation has a complex (or duplicate) suffix but rather considers it an imitation of *arvāvát* ‘nearby’, despite the difference in accent, and renders the word (in his note) as “un domaine intérieur (= invisible).” His tr. of the pāda is “il a fait que les ténèbres (devinssent) par la lumière un domaine-cachée.” So, he takes *antár* in the meaning ‘within’, but the further morphological analysis is unclear. Old (ad I.40.7) also sees the ‘within’ sense of *antár* here, but with a more plausible interpr. of the suffixal material — with the whole meaning ‘inhaltsvoll’ (that is, ‘having [something] within’). He also considers it is entirely or roughly synonymous with *antárvant-*. (Both of these views are also found in AIG II.2.893, and the whole is laid out with admirable clarity by Schmidt [B+I 102]. Both AiG and Schmidt explain *-vā-vant-* as pleonastic.) The second observation seems to me the most important clue: *antárvant-* is in fact only attested in the fem. *antárvatī-* (III.55.5, X.91.6) in the meaning ‘pregnant’. In both I.40.7 and our passage here the ‘pregnant’ sense is used metaphorically of non-females (*kṣáya-* ‘dwelling place’ in the former, *támas-* ‘darkness’ in the latter). (So also Schmidt; AiG doesn’t go quite this far.) One could speculate that the pleonastic suffix is used because a non-fem. *antárvant-* would seem distinctly odd, and the addition of a second suffix attenuated this oddness. In our case, the *antarvāvat* can directly modify neut. *támaḥ*; in I.40.7, since *kṣáya-* is masc., the connection is less direct. See comm. ad loc. In our passage this interpr. produces a striking image, of the darkness of night swelling with light as day breaks.

VI.8.4: I have no idea what the buffaloes (*mahiṣāḥ*) are doing here or why they do what they do in the lap of the waters. Ge (n. 4a) suggests that the buffaloes are the gods or the old singers, but this does not actually explain anything (including why they would be called buffaloes). Ge notes the very similar passage X.45.3 *ṛtīye tvā rājasi tashivāṃsam, apām upāsthe mahiṣā avaradhan* “The buffalos strengthened you, who were standing in the third realm, in the lap of the waters.” That passage occurs in a hymn concerned with Agni’s triple birth, one of which is in the waters, but the identity of the buffaloes remains unclear. In X.8.1 it is Agni himself who as buffalo grows strong in the same place: *apām upāsthe mahiṣo vavardha* “the buffalo has grown strong in the lap of the waters.”

The second pāda shows the connection between Agni Vaiśvānara and royal power and the second hemistich the connection between that thematic complex and Vivasvant, as Proferes convincingly argues (*Sovereignty*, pp. 28–29 and *passim*). The passage cited just above, X.45.3, may also concern Agni Vaiśvānara.

Note the phonological intertwining of #*vīśo* ... / ... *vivāsvato* # *vaiśvānaró* ...

Note also the juxtaposition of nom. *dūtāḥ* and acc. *agnīm* – remarkable because Agni is the prototype *dūtā*-.

VI.8.5: In the first hemistich the distribution of the accusatives is at issue: *vidathyām* ... *rayīm yaśāsam* ... *návyasīm*. The first, *vidathyām*, must be either masc. or neut.; *yaśāsam* is ambiguous between masc. and fem. (though far more often masc. than fem.); *návyasīm* is clearly fem. The sole noun, *rayīm*, is generally held to be normally masc., but occasionally fem. Although I think this statement is true, I also think that the number of supposedly fem. occurrences can be considerably reduced, to the point that apparently fem. examples should be viewed as aberrancies, not as normal if rare usages. In this particular case Old (ZDMG 55.296 [=KlSch 755], not restated in *Noten*) and Ge decide that *rayīm* must be fem. here, as evidenced by *návyasīm*, so that another noun must be supplied for *vidathyām* to modify. Old supplies *agnīm* and takes that phrase as an obj. to the part. *grṇādbhyaḥ* (without transl.), while Ge supplies *vīrām* (which does indeed occur with *vidathyām* in I.91.20 and VII.36.8) as an obj. parallel to *rayīm*: “... einen in Weisheit tüchtigen (Mann) ... und Ansehen bringenden neuen Reichtum.” Re allows everything to modify *rayīm*: “une richesse (émanant) des participations-rituelles, (richesse) honorable, plus nouvelle,” with his n. on the gender mixture seemingly meant to cast obscurity rather than illumination. In my opinion, *rayīm* is masc. here, modified by *vidathyām* and *yaśāsam* (so also Thieme, *Unters.* 48, who simply elides *návyasīm*), and *návyasīm* belong to a separate NP, for which I supply *matí*- ‘thought’, which appears in the phrase *matír návyasī* in the first vs. of the hymn, 1c. Note that vs. 1 also contains a form of *vidátha*- ‘ceremony, rite of distribution’, to which our *vidathyā*- must belong (*pace* Ge, who seems to derive it from *√vid* ‘know’). In vs. 1 the poet proclaims the *vidáthā* of Agni and announces that a “newer thought” is being prepared for him. In this vs. he asks Agni to keep providing both wealth for the *vidátha*- and a “newer (thought).” Although Agni does not himself compose the poem, it is a commonplace of RVic discourse that the gods provide the inspiration for the poets’ compositions.

In the 2nd hemistich Ge and Re take *téjasā* with the simile (“mit dem Schärfe (der Axt)” and “avec l’aigu (de la hache)” respectively), while I attribute the sharpness only to Agni in the frame. Certainly their interpr. fits the word order well (*vanínam ná téjasā*),

though it doesn't necessarily require *téjasā* to be part of the simile. On the other hand, it does require *pavyéva* at the beginning of the hemistich to be dissociated from the later simile or at least considerably sidelined. In the end, I would go for a compromise position, that *téjasā* should be read with both simile and frame: "as if with a metal wheel rim, hew down the curser with your sharpness like a tree with the sharpness (of an axe vel sim.)."

I have not separately rendered *nīcā* in the phrase *nīcā ní vṛśca*, which seems simply to reinforce the *ní*.

VI.8.6: Both Ge and Re take *ajāram* with *suṁvīryam* (e.g., "die unbeugsame Herrschaft, das nicht verwelkende Heldentum"), while I take it with *kṣátram*. The Ge/Re interpr. is perfectly possible, and there are no grammatical or syntactic features to allow a clear decision. My interpr. is based on the rhetorical arg. that the two privative adjectives (*ánāmi* and *ajāram*) belong together, but I can also see that rhetoric might also favor parallel phrases: PRIV-ADJ. X, PRIV-ADJ. Y. My other, quite faint, consideration was that the adj. *ajāra-* was used of the king (=Agni) in the previous vs. (*rājan ... ajara*) and would transfer easily from the king to his dominion (*kṣatrá-*).

VI.8.7: On Ge's proposed emendation of *iṣṭe* to *iṣṭébhiḥ* see comm. ad I.143.8, which has the same form in a lexically and rhetorically similar passage (containing, inter alia, *pāhi* and *ádabdhebhiḥ*). Old (ZDMG 55.296 = KISch. 755) is adamantly opposed to Ge's suggestion, and there seems no good reason to emend the passage and no obvious trigger for such a corruption.

It is difficult not to interpr. the *-iṣ-*aor. injunc. *prá ... tāriḥ* as an impv., given its overt coordination with *rákṣā* in pāda c.

VI.9 Agni Vaiśvānara

On the structure of this complex hymn and for a verse-by-verse synopsis, see publ. intro. It has been much translated and discussed -- in addition to the usual treatments, see, e.g., Thieme, *Gedichte*; Renou, *Hymnes spéculatifs*; Wendy Doniger, *Rig Veda*. Oldenberg (ZDMG 55.296–97) gives a detailed (for him) account of the contents and pronounces it an *ākhyāna*, an opinion repeated in the *Noten*, though he doesn't spell out who the speakers might be verse by verse. Gonda (*Vedic Literature*, 99) calls it "a profound glorification of Agni as the great immortal conceived as the inner light and placed among the mortals to guide them in the mysteries and intricacies of the ritual." As discussed in the publ. intro., the hymn concerns the development of the poet's craft and resembles IV.5, in which the poet also receives his poetic inspiration from Agni Vaiśvānara. I do not see the poetic contest (*brahmodya*) that others (starting with Geldner [*Ved. Stud.* II.181–82], fld by Re, Doniger, George Thompson ["*Brahmodya*"]) take as the *mise en scène* of the hymn. See Old's explicit rejection of the *brahmodya* interpr. (ZDMG 55.297), with which I concur. The *brahmodya* interpr. primarily rests on a brief phrase in vs. 2, on which see below.

VI.9.1: The first hemistich has two nom./acc. dual expressions (*áhaś ca kṛṣṇám áhar árjunam ca* and *rájasī*) and a dual verb *ví vartete*. The question is which of the two dual expressions is the subject of this verb, or is the subject both or neither? The standard

interpr. (Old, Ge, Re, Doniger) is that both expressions serve as subject and that *rājasī*, usually an expression referring to space, here qualifies the two day(-halves), light and dark. However, flg. Thieme, I instead take *rājasī* as an accusative expressing extent of space, preferring to keep the temporal and spatial concepts separate. I do have to admit that an image of rolling out the dual spaces finds support in the preceding hymn, VI.8.3c *vī cārmaṇīva dhiśāṇe avartayat* “He rolled out the two Holy Places [=world-halves] like skins,” and even more so in VII.80.1 *vivartāyantīm rājasī sāmante* “(Dawn,) unrolling the two adjoining realms.” The object of the transitive *vī vartāya-* in those passages should be the subject of the intrans. simplex verb. Nonetheless, see nearby VI.7.7 *vī yó rājāmsi ámimīta* “who measured out the dusky realms,” with *rājas-* as object, and the frequent use of *vī* to refer to movement through space. As I see it, the image here is of the day and night proceeding through the cosmos, spreading first light and then darkness. Since *vī* can also be used for alternating movement, that notion is also probably present: “The black day and the silvery day roll out *alternately* through the two dusky realms,” referring to the regular alternation of night and day.

Re points out two minor anomalies in word placement: *ca* in pāda a, *ná* in pāda c. The first is not immediately second in its constituent (expect **áhaś cārjunam*, like the first constituent *áhāś ca kṛṣṇám*, not *áhar árjunam ca*). Klein (DGRV I.133) suggests that the construction is a conflation of the expected sequence (given as starred just above) and one with only an adjective in the second constituent (*kṛṣṇám cāhar árjunam ca*, as he constructs it). This is possible but seems somewhat over-complex. It’s worth noting that a properly placed *ca* would be damaging to the meter, whether it was read undistracted (*cārjunam*), the more common option for *ca* + V, or distracted (*ca árjunam*). I had thought that another argument for the unusual placement might be that *ca* + V is generally avoided, but a quick glance at Lubotsky turns up about 70 instances of *ca* + V (out of 1094 total instances of *ca*). I doubt that this represents a statistically significant underrepresentation, although I ran no tests.

As for *ná*, it ordinarily is also positioned after the first element in the simile, but it is highly unlikely (that is, quite impossible) that Agni is being compared to a king *being born*, with the simile comprising *jāyamāno ná rājā*, but rather Agni, even as he is being kindled, is compared to the victorious (adult) king, with the simile just *ná rājā*. Such “wrong” positioning is not unprecedented — other examples have been noted in the comm. — and, as Re points out, it is “masked to the eyes” by *jāyamānaḥ*, which matches *rājā* in number, gender, and case.

VI.9.1–2: Note the echo of the last word of vs. 1, *tāmāmsi*, in the last word of the 1st hemistich of b, *’tamānāḥ*. The latter form is the pres. part. to the 1st class pres. of *√at* ‘wander’, with aphoresis of the initial vowel after *samaré*. This abhinihita sandhi, relatively rare in the RV, is metrically guaranteed, and it may have been applied in order to bring the participle more into phonological line with *tāmāmsi*.

VI.9.2: The 1st person speaker, the poet in training, takes over here, with a statement of his ignorance about his own metier. He expresses this ignorance in the metaphor of weaving, a well-known trope for poetic composition that reaches back into Indo-European antiquity.

The main support for the brahmodya interpr. is the loc. *samaré*, which is almost universally construed with (*á*)*tamānāḥ* in the sense “entering the contest” (vel sim.: Ge: “wenn sie in den Wettstreit eintreten,” Re: “quand ils marchent dans l’arène”). But this bends the sense of both words. The other occurrence of the medial participle *átamāna-* (II.38.3) does not signal the type of purposeful motion implied by those translations; there are no other middle forms in the RV, only a single active (I.30.4), whose goal-oriented motion can be accounted for by both the voice and the presence of a preverb. Assuming that *√at* is continued by younger *√aṭ* (see EWA, s.v. *AT*), the usual gloss of the root, ‘wander’, is probably accurate. As for *samará-*, it is obviously formed of the same elements (*sám* *√ṛ* lit. ‘come/move together’) as *samāraṇa-*, which does usually mean ‘collision, conflict’ (cf. also the hapax denom. *samaryāti*), and it has a derivative *samaryá-* that generally refers to the same. But *samará-* itself is found only twice elsewhere, both times in the meaning ‘gathering, confluence’ with a genitive expressing goods or spoils (VI.47.6 *samaré vásūnām*, X.139.3 *samaré dhānānām*), a benign assemblage rather than a hostile clashing together. Thus, “entering the contest” is at best a weakly supported interpr. of *samaré ’tamānāḥ*; we are free to interpret that phrase differently and, with the supposed rival poet-competitors removed from the passage, to concentrate on the real competition -- that between the poet and his father, as set out in the second hemistich of this vs.

However, let us first consider the rest of the first half-verse. The poet expresses his ignorance of three things: *tántum ... ótum ... yāṃ váyanti*. Most tr. try to make *tántum* and *ótum* grammatically parallel, either by making them both nouns (e.g., Re “Je ne connais point la lisse ni la trame ...”) or both infinitives (e.g., Thieme “Nicht verstehe ich [die Fäden des Aufzugs] zu spannen, nicht [die Fäden des Einschlags] zu weben.”). This is understandable, since the two terms are identically formed, with full-grade accented root and *-tu-* suffix. However, this morphological identity conceals a difference in usage. *tántu-* behaves like a straight noun: it has nominative forms; it occurs in the plural; it has adjectives modifying it (e.g., IX.83.2 *sócantaḥ ... tántavaḥ*, as well as *tatá-* ‘stretched’ several times) and genitives dependent on it (e.g., IX.73.9 *ṛtāsya tántuḥ*). By contrast, outside of this hymn *ótu-* is found only in the clear dative infinitives *ótave* (X.130.2) and *ótavaí* (I.164.5, where in fact acc. pl. *tántūn* is construed with it). I therefore think that *tántum* and *ótum* in this passage are non-parallel, just as the third source of ignorance, expressed in a rel. cl., is not parallel to either of the others. In my view, having three non-parallel objects to the verb *ví jānāmi* makes the bewilderment stronger: it’s not just three different things the poet doesn’t understand, but three categories of things -- which categories of things are expressed by different grammatical categories: a noun, an infinitive, a relative clause (without antecedent). “I do not understand the thread (noun), nor (how) “to weave” (infinitive), nor “what they weave” (rel. cl.). Although *-tum* infinitives are quite rare in the RV (5 stems, acdg. to Macdonell VG §586b, Re GLV §371), I suggest that *ótum* was formed and used here, rather than the already existing dat. inf., to provide this grammatical contrast with apparently identical *tántum*.

Since, contra the standard tr., I do not believe that the subject of the verb *váyanti* refers to rival poets, I must propose a different subject. Here the alternative possibilities for *átamāna-* and *samará-*, as discussed above, provide the clues, along with a rudimentary understanding (which is all I have) of the weaving process. With the warp threads (*tántu-*) stretched lengthwise on the loom, “wandering” is a pleasingly apt

description of the way the weft threads go alternately under and over the warp threads proceeding horizontally, and this mingling of warp and weft could easily be characterized as “a meeting/gathering.” My only uncertainty is the precise identity of the subjects who do the weaving (*váyanti*). Are they the weft threads themselves as they wander over and under? Are they the human weavers, or their fingers, manipulating the weft threads? Or some technological substitute like shuttles. As MLW reminds me, that Vedic India knew such technology is clear from X.130, a cosmogonic hymn whose operative metaphor is weaving and that contains a word plausibly taken to be ‘shuttle’ (*tásara-* in vs. 2).

Of course, since the weaving in this verse is metaphorical for poetic composition, ultimately the subjects of *váyanti* must underlyingly be poets — those who do know how and what to “weave.” But my point here is that the imagery of weaving is carried further than the standard brahmodya interpretation allows: the wandering and the coming together refer to the weaving process, not to a putative poetic competition. Moreover, with the contest interpr. banished, the underlying poets need not be guys physically present in the next room, as it were, polishing their verses; they can be any poets in the tradition. Which brings us to the father.

The second hemistich contains two sets of polarized terms: *putrá-* / *pitár-* ‘son’ / ‘father’ and *pará-* / *ávāra-* ‘above’ / ‘below’. (That *pará-* and *ávāra-* make up a polarized pair is clear from numerous passages in which they are contrasted [e.g., I.164.17, X.88.17].) The case assignment in the text, nominative for the first of each pair, instrumental for the second, makes it clear that it is the son who is above, the father below, although this is the counterintuitive pairing. As noted in the publ. intro., despite his professed ignorance of poetic craft, the young poet feels that he must not only equal but surpass his father, to further the poetic lineage. That *pará-* can mean not only ‘higher’ but also ‘further’, while *ávāra-* means both ‘below’ and ‘nearer’, allows the sense of “furthering” the line also to be read in the passage. The father is close by, both to the poet and the present moment, but the poet himself must go farther, in the future, beyond the model of his father, to speak “what is to be said” (*váktvāni*); it is perhaps ironic that the only other occurrence of *váktva-* in the RV outside this hymn is as a genitive pl. dependent on ‘father’: III.26.9 *pitāraṃ váktvānām* “the father of what is to be said,” referring to Agni. It is a nice touch in our vs. that because ‘father’ is in the instr., it better fits the phonological template of ‘son’ than the direct cases would: *putrá ... pitrā*.

VI.9.3: This vs. is responsive to vs. 2, repeating *pāda* almost verbatim, while transposing it into the 3rd ps. from the 1st and into the positive from the negative. The 2nd *pāda* abbreviates the 2nd hemistich of vs. 2, pulling out the all-important object and verb (*váktvāni ... vadāti*) that had been scattered across two *pādas* in vs. 2. The 2nd hemistich introduces new material — identifying the person who does know what the poet says he doesn’t yet — while replacing the *pará-* / *ávāra-* pair with the almost identical *pāra-* / *avāḥ* ‘below’ [adv.].

The first half-verse with its near identical repetition is straightforward, but, with its repetition of “just he ... he ... he” (*sá id ... sá ... sá*) as the subj. of ‘knows’ and ‘will speak’, it promises both a resolution to the poet’s anxiety of ignorance in 2ab and an answer to the question “whose son?” (*kásya putráḥ*) in 2cd.

But though the identity of the “he” of 3ab is surely revealed by the relative cl. in the 2nd hemistich, beginning “who ...” (*yáḥ*, 3c), the referent is far from clear. There are

both an apparent and apparently obvious answer and, in my opinion anyway, a covert but enlightening answer that depends on tricky manipulation of the words as given -- which is, after all, the point of the hymn, to learn the ins and outs of verbal weaving. The standard tr. take Agni as the subject of the whole vs.; he is the one who know the thread and the weaving and can say the things to be said. There is a good, obvious piece of evidence that this interpr. is correct: the subject of the relative clause in c appears to be identified as *amṛtasya gopāḥ* “the herdsman of the immortal.” This epithet was used of Agni only two hymns previously (VI.7.7); it *seems* to clinch the identification. But note what precedes it: *yá īm cīketat* “who will perceive him/it.” Ge (fld. by Doniger) takes *īm* as referring to the thread, while Re simply ignores it. But Thieme takes *amṛtasya gopāḥ* as the content of the act of perception, as a quotation: “der ihn (Gott Feuer) erkennt: ‘[Er ist] der Hüter des Lebens,’” with *īm* the obj. of *cīketat* anticipating the revelation of Agni’s role and power in the quote. I find Thieme’s interpr. very persuasive. The one who knows all this is not Agni, but the poet who rightly perceives Agni, who possesses the esoteric knowledge acquired by contemplating the ritual fire and receiving its vision.

Thieme then takes pāda d as referring to the poet-subject of c, but I think we can go one better: d is both a description of the poet, as Thieme takes it, *and* a continuation of the right perception of Agni that the poet received, the second part of the quoted revelation “he is the herdsman of the immortal.” In this latter interpr., Agni “moves about below” (*avás cáran*) as the ritual fire of mortals, but “sees above the other one” (*paró anyéna páśyan*), because he (in the form of smoke) goes to heaven bringing the oblations to the gods. By my rules of placement for *anyá-* (1997, Fs. Beekes), it should be definite here (“the other,” not “another,” as in most interpr.). Here “the other” is quite possibly the sun, which is Agni’s allo-form but also presumably somewhat lower in heaven than the smoke carrying the oblations. In the alternative application of this pāda, to the poet, I differ in some crucial ways from Thieme (whose interpr. I will not present further here). The poet also “moves about below” not only as a mortal on the earth, but also as a son, who in one sense is “below” his father in the lineage. But he “sees above the other,” who is the father whose skills he is trying to best. Though in this pāda both *aváh* and *pára-* refer to the son, whereas in 2cd *pára-* referred to the son and *ávāra-* to the father, here the ultimate superiority of the son is triumphantly announced, whereas in 2cd this outcome was in question. The cleverness and intricacy of this 2nd hemistich, esp. immediately following the near verbatim repetition found in the first, is a clear demonstration that the young poet has come into his skills and his poetic heritage.

VI.9.4: As argued in the publ. intro., this vs. is the omphalos of a well-structured omphalos hymn, and it contains the “message” of the hymn: the revelatory vision of Agni immediately before the eyes of the poet. This immediacy is conveyed by the near-deictic pronoun that begins the first three pādas — *ayám* (a), *idám* (b), *ayám* (c) — and also ends the first pāda (*imám*). The immediacy is also conveyed by the abrupt command “look at him” (*páśyatemám*) at the end of the 1st pāda; since the impv. is in the 2nd plural, it cannot be addressed to the poet alone. Instead I suggest that it is the poet speaking, urging his priestly colleagues to behold the revelation that has just come to him. As noted also in the publ. intro., the name Agni does not occur in this verse. In fact, in the whole hymn *agní-* is found only in the first and last vss. (1d and 7b), another reinforcement of the omphalos structure. But every phrase in this vs. is an unmistakable description of Agni,

and each could be matched by many similar phrases in Agni hymns. Unlike many omphalos vss., this one is not enigmatic and riddling (save for the omission of the name), but straightforward and obvious, one might say *blazingly* transparent. In this way it captures the poet's sudden burst of enlightenment, in which he truly *sees* for the first time what is (and has always been) in front of him. As such it can be characterized as an epiphany in the technical sense: although the ritual fire has been there all along, it is only now that the poet sees that the fire is really the god. This divine revelation is underscored by the two occurrences of "immortal" (*jyótir amṛtam* b, *ámartyaḥ* d), taking up the poet's initial true perception in 3c, where he saw that Agni was "the herdsman of the immortal" (*amṛtasya gopāḥ*).

dhruvá in *dhruvá ā* is ambiguous. The Pp. takes it as nom. *dhruváḥ*, but modern interpr. differ: Old (ZDMG 55.297 and Noten, with Gr [transl.], Hillebrandt, Pischel) and Thieme opt rather for the loc. *dhruvé*, while Gr (Wö), Ge, and Re follow the Pp. — as do I: *dhruvám* modifying Agni as light (*jyótiḥ*) in the next vs. (5a) seems decisive. The constructions are quite parallel: the "steadfast light" of 5a was also "set down" (*nīhitam*), just as "steadfast (Agni)" was "set down" (*nīṣattaḥ*) in 4c. A loc. interpr. is not out of the question, however.

VI.9.5–7: The last three vss. of this hymn are dominated by play on the syllable *ví*, which is also evident, though recessive, in the first part of the hymn. Starting with 5c every hemistich begins with *ví*: 5c *vísve*, 6a *ví*, 6c *ví*, 7a *vísve*; note also *ví* in the middle of 5d and 6a and beginning 6b. This sequence culminates in 7c *vaiśvānaraḥ*, whose first syllable is phonologically a vṛddhi form of *vi* and whose first member *vaiśva-* is morphologically a vṛddhi derivative of *vísva-*. That the two forms of *vísve* in 5c and 7a are in the syntagm *vísve devāḥ* "all the gods" and the 2nd member of *vaiśvānarā-* is contrastively *-nara-* 'man' makes the pattern all the more pleasing. And of course it is Agni *Vaiśvānara* who is the source of the poet's revelation and therefore the focus of the hymn. The stationing of *vaiśvānarāḥ* at the beginning of the last hemistich of the hymn also forms a ring with the same form at the beginning of the second hemistich of the 1st vs. and reinforces the omphalos structure.

VI.9.5–6: The transference of the properties and powers of Agni to our poet is explicit in these two vss. In 5a Agni is light set down or deposited (*jyótir nīhitam*); in 5b he is "swiftest mind" (*māno jáviṣṭham*). In 6b the poet comments on "this light that has been deposited in (my) heart" (*idám jyótir hṛdaya āhitam yát*; note the near-deictic *idám* again), and in 6c "my mind goes widely" (*ví me mānaś carati*).

The two vss. are also contrastive. In 5 *all* the gods sharing the *same* mind and the *same* perception (*sámanasaḥ sáketāḥ*) converge on Agni as the *single* focus of their intention or resolve (*ékaṃ krátum abhí ví yanti sādhu*), whereas in 6 the poet vividly describes the dis-integration of his senses, emphasized by the repetition of *ví* 'widely, apart). But rather than expressing a worrisome loss of physical and mental control, the vs. seems rather to dramatize the exciting expansion of his sensory horizons, the limitless potentials for thought and speech that he now experiences. His ears flying apart (*ví me kárnā patayataḥ*), his mind moving widely (*ví me mānaḥ carati*) are anticipated by Agni's mind "swiftest among those flying" (*jáviṣṭham patáyatsu*), and the insistent *ví* in

this vs. is given a positive spin by the pattern of *vi*-s leading to *vaiśvānarā*-, as discussed above.

In the omphalos structure this vs. is twinned with vs. 2, where the poet worried about his lack of knowledge and skill; here his mind and body can literally not contain the possibilities. One index to the change in his mental attitude may be shown by the difference in mood between the tentative subjunctive *vadāti* in 2d and the purposeful future *vakṣyāmi* in 6d. Both are in questions, but the first wonders “whose son *will (be able) to speak ...?*” while the latter seems only to question which of the many possibilities he should begin with: “what *shall I say?*” There are only two finite forms of the future to *√vac* in the RV (plus one participial form), so the choice of this form must be marked here. The other is *pravakṣyāmaḥ* in I.162.1, announcing the recital of the heroic deeds (*vīryāṇi*) of the horse to be sacrificed and therefore functioning exactly like the more common, likewise annunciatory *prá vocam* (e.g., in the famous opening of the Indra-Vṛtra hymn I.32.1 *índrasya nú vīryāṇi prá vocam*). The correspondent of this future is found rather often in Old Avestan, where 1st sg. (*fra*) *vaxšiiā* regularly performs the same function of proclamation, as in Y 30.1, 45.1 — perhaps indicating a common IIR. employment of this future as an introducer of formal praise. The use of this form here suggests that our speaker is foreseeing his role as official encomiast and poet of record, not simply casting about for something to say. It is possible that *svid* (*kíṃ svid vakṣyāmi*) contributes to this sense, but I don’t have a good sense of the function of this particle in the RV.

In 5d Re (*Language* 29 [1953] 235, but not in EVP) suggests that *ékaṃ krátum* is a “pré-bahuvrīhi” **ekakratum* (for which he gives no accent), but this seems to me to detract from the vividness of the expression.

VI.9.7: The final vs. of the hymn forms the outer frame of the omphalos structure with vs. 1. We have already noted the resposion of hemistich-initial *vaiśvānarāḥ* in 1c and 7c and the only two occurrences of the stem *agní*- in 1d and 7b. Another important verbal repetition is *támas*-, the last word of vs. 1, found in 7b in the phrase *támasi tasthivāṃsam* “(Agni,) standing in darkness.” The sentence in which this is found seems an odd way to end a hymn: “all the gods, in fear (*bhiyānāḥ*), offered homage (*anamasyan*) to you, while you were standing in darkness.” (Note that [*a*]namas[*yan*] anticipates *támas[i]* in the next pāda.) Why are the gods afraid and what time period does the augmented imperfect refer to? And why is this somewhat downbeat statement the real end of the hymn (the last hemistich being a generic request for aid)? I don’t have certain answers to these questions, but I think the omphalos structure gives us some guidance. This final vs. seems not simply to circle round to the 1st vs., but in fact to take us to a time (right) before the events depicted in the first vs. In vs. 1 Agni overcame the darkness with his light (1d); here he is still in darkness, before he has become equipped with light, before he has been kindled, in fact. The gods are afraid because they fear he won’t light up -- and, reading between the lines, he will only light up if the human ritualists kindle him. Even the gods are dependent on our dawn sacrifice, and, reading further between those lines, our newly minted poet will have a crucial role in making that sacrifice succeed.

The last hemistich has a curious etymological figure, repeated for emphasis: *avatūtáye* (i.e., *avatu útáye*) “let him help for help.”

VI.10 Agni

VI.10.1: In the lexeme *puró √dhā*, *puráh* serves as a pseudo-preverb; the phrase shows extreme distraction (pseudo-tmesis) here, with *puráh* initial in the 1st hemistich and *dadhidhvam* final in that hemistich. The phrase is then revitalized with *puráh* opening pāda c, thus directly adjacent to its verb though across a hemistich boundary. That the opening words of pāda c, *purá ukthébhiḥ* belong to the clause in the first hemistich is further shown by the abrupt clause boundary and change of subject in the middle of c, clearly signalled by a typical clause-initial sequence of PRN + Wackernagel-position particles, *sá hí nah*.

Pāda b has two extra syllables. The meter could be easily fixed by deleting *agním* with no ill effects to sense or metrical structure. This is an old idea (see Old's reff., ZDMG 55.298), but though harmless, it may be better to accept the text as given (see Old, Noten ad loc.).

On *suṛktí-* as a secondary bahuvrīhi, meaning 'possessing/receiving (hymns) that possess a good twist', see comm. ad II.4.1. This interpr. as a masc. adj. is imposed by the otherwise unbroken string of acc. sg. masculines: *mandráṃ divyám suṛktím ... agním*. In the comm. ad II.4.1 I suggest that it can also have the primary bahuvrīhi meaning 'having a good twist', referring to Agni's curls of smoke and flame. This would also be possible as an alternative or secondary reading here.

I take *adhvaré* as part of the loc. absol. *prayatí yajñé*, contra Ge. (Re seems to ignore the second loc.) Nothing much rides on either choice.

VI.10.2: As was discussed in the publ. intro., this hymn traffics in disappointed expectations and truncated syntax, and this vs. displays both in extreme form. The vs. begins *tám u* "him/it [acc. sg.] PARTICLE." Given that the dedicand of the hymn is Agni and vs. 1 contained a long acc. phrase referring to Agni (though that vs. ended with Agni as nom. subj.), we might expect that *tám* = Agni, and our expectations would be supported by a little formula found in various places in the RV (see Klein, *Particle u*, 67–68):

VIII.95.6	<i>tám u ṣṭavāma yáḥ</i>	"let us praise him who ..."
VIII.96.6	<i>tám u ṣṭuhi yáḥ</i>	"praise him who ..."
V.42.1	<i>tám u ṣṭuhi yáḥ</i>	(ditto)
I.173.5	<i>tám u ṣṭuhi ... yáḥ</i>	(ditto)

as well as variations on it. In our vs., immediately following *u* there is a long interruption, consisting mostly of vocatives addressed to Agni (*dyumaḥ purvaṇīka hotar, ágne*), leaving the *tám* in syntactic suspension. But when we finally reach the end of the hemistich, we encounter a nominative participle *idhānāḥ* 'being kindled', which can only refer to Agni. This leaves the initial *tám* doubly unmoored: it can't refer to Agni, as we'd thought, and it can't be construed with *idhānāḥ*, which is intransitive and doesn't take accusatives.

The resolution of one of these problems comes at the beginning of the second hemistich, which opens with the acc. *stómam*, which must be the referent of *tám*. This is a pleasing twist on the formula just noted: the root *√stu* is preserved, but as a coreferential nominal, not as the verb governing the *tám*. There is also an element of "vertical mantra,"

since the elements of the NP *tām stómam* are positioned “vertically” in identical metrical slots.

There is no resolution of the other problem, however: what governs this acc. phrase. *stómam* is immediately followed by the rel. prn. *yám* introducing a dependent clause (and reminding us of the *yáh* in the quoted formula). There is no overt governing verb in the main clause; all we know is that it should have Agni as subject, given the nom. part. *idhānāḥ*. Ge, flg. Sāy. and fld. by Re (in his tr., which reflects neither of his suggestions in the n.), supplies the impv. “hear.” This is of course nothing wrong with the sense of this (“[hear] this praise which ...”), but there is also nothing in context to support it. I have supplied “take to yourself,” assuming a medial form of $\sqrt{dhā}$. There are two pieces of supporting evidence for this. It could be generated (somewhat trickily) from *dadhidhvam*, the impv. in the previous verse. And — rather stronger evidence — a similar expression is found overtly in vs. 6: “you [=Agni] have taken to yourself the well-twisted (hymn)” (*dadhiṣe suvrktīm*), with a medial form of $\sqrt{dhā}$ with Agni as subject and a praise as object. Old’s “nimm ... an” (both ZDMG 55.299 and Noten) coincides with my interpr., but he does not, as far as I can see, provide a motivation for it.

What to do with the rest of the first hemistich, namely *agnībhir mānuṣaḥ*, is another problem. With Ge I take *mānuṣaḥ* as dependent on *hotar*, despite the distance between them and the fact that *mānuṣaḥ* is accented in a voc. phrase (easily accounted for by the distance). The phrase *mānuṣo hōtar-* is common in the RV (e.g., I.180.9, II.18.2, IV.6.11, V.5.7). The instr. *agnībhiḥ* must be construed with the part. *idhānāḥ*, as witnessed by the identical expression in the next two hymns (VI.11.6b, 12.6b), but whether it is an instr. of accompaniment as I take it (“along with the [other] fires”), as apparently also Ge, or a true instrument (e.g., Re “allumé par les feux...”) isn’t certain — though I’m not sure what Re’s “being kindled by the fires” would mean.

The relative cl. of pāda c is in no better shape than the main clause of ab. It too lacks a verb. Though there *is* a finite verb in pāda d, *pavante*, it not only lacks an accent and therefore can’t be part of the rel. cl., but it is also intrans. and cannot take *yám* as object. Moreover, both *asmai* and *mamáteva* present difficulties of their own. Let us begin with *asmai*. It surely refers to the recipient of the praise, which just as surely must be Agni. But Agni is addressed in the extensive vocative phrase in ab, and so he must be present both as 2nd ps. addressee and 3rd ps. recipient in the same sentence. Switch of person even within a syntactic construction is of course not unusual. I have no particular answer to this example of it beyond suggesting that 1) the poet may have lost a bit of track of his referents in this syntactically truncated construction, and 2) *asmai* may also be serving as a near deictic, pointing to “this (Agni) here.” It is barely possible, but I think highly unlikely, that *asmai* refers to another ritual participant, despite Ludwig’s interpr. (see Ge n. 2c) “für diesen Opferer.”

mamáteva is presumably to be analyzed, with the Pp., as *mamātā iva*; the resulting *mamātā* is a hapax. It is generally taken as a PN (“like Mamatā”), an interpr. whose strongest support is the vṛddhi deriv. *māmāteyā-*, usually a metonymic of Dīrghatamas (I.147.3, 152.6, 158.6, particularly clear in the last passage), which presupposes an underlying PN of this shape. Both the *-eyā-* suffix of *māmāteyā-* and the name Mamatā itself suggest that the person may be female. However, there is some direct evidence that a masc. **mamāta-* is found in the Bharadvāja lineage. Cf. VI.50.15 *evā nāpāto māmā tāsya dhībhīr / bharadvājā abhī arcanti arkaḥ* “In just this way the

Bharadvājas, the descendants of me, this Mamata, chant with their insightful thoughts, with their chants,” where *māma tāsya* is probably a play on the PN. For disc. see Old, ZDMG 42.211–12 = KISch 580–81, though I do not think the text needs emending. However, our *mamātā* is also most probably a pun, on a *-tā-* abstract built to the gen. sg. of the 1st ps. pronoun; such a stem is attested Epic+ in the sense ‘Selbstsucht, Eigennutz’. In this reading it could be an instr. sg. of the *-tā-* stem, ‘with/in my me-ness,’ in addition to being a nom. ‘like Mamatā’. On these questions see now Mayr, PN 2.1.393. Old (ZDMG 55.298–99) explored the possibility of taking *mamātā* (or *-ta*) as the missing verb of the rel. cl., as did I, but both of us came up short.

It is therefore likely that another verb has to be supplied. Contextually, ‘sing, speak, chant’ vel sim., is likely, and both Ge and Re go in that direction, as do I. Specifically I supply a form of \sqrt{rc} ‘chant’, which takes *śūśām* as obj. on a number of occasions (I.9.10, X.96.2, 133.1); see also VI.50.15 cited just above with the locution *abhī arcanti arkaīḥ*. All three of us assume that the verb is 1st sg, although there is less support for that assumption, since there are no other 1st persons, sg. or pl., in the hymn. The pun “in my me-ness” that I see in *mamāteva* would provide some support for my “I,” but neither Ge nor Re so interprets *mamāteva*.

VI.10.3: This vs. also appears to be deliberately misleading, though less so than vs. 2. It begins *pīpāya sá* “he becomes swollen.” Although $\sqrt{pī}$ ‘swell’ is not a particularly Agnaic verb, it still could be applicable to the ritual fire, and the audience might expect an unidentified subject to be the deity of the hymn. But the second pāda, with dat. *agnāye* and nom. *vīprah*, contravenes our expectations: it is the poet who becomes swollen, as a result of his successful service to Agni.

I would emend the tr. of pāda a: *śrávasā* should be rendered ‘with fame’, not ‘with praise’.

VI.10.5: The usual truncation of instr. pl. *ūtíbhīḥ* (appropriate to final position in Jagatī and in dimeter meters) to sg. *ūtī* in final position of a Triṣṭubh pāda. Cf., e.g., *nṛtamābhir ūtīḥ* in VI.19.10 versus, e.g., V.40.3 (etc.) *citrābhir ūtíbhīḥ*. Our own hymn contains an ex. of the full instr. pl. phrase in 3c *#citrābhiḥ ... ūtíbhīḥ ...#*. I consider such truncations to be synchronically generated, providing no evidence for any deep historical practice.

The bahuvrīhi *puruvāja-* is a hapax and may be a play on the poetic lineage *bharadvāja-*, which name appears in 6c.

VI.10.6: Another slightly off expression: with monotonous regularity throughout the RV Agni is described as ‘sitting’ or ‘sitting down’ or “made to sit (down)”. Although ‘sit’ in these locutions is always expressed by the root \sqrt{sad} , it still seems odd to characterize the human ritualist as ‘sitting’ (*āsānāḥ*, using the regularized participle to $\sqrt{ās}$, not *āsīmá-*), in a context where we might expect the referent to be Agni.

The expression *dadhiṣe suvrktīm* “repairs” both vs. 1 and vs. 2. In 1a we had the adj. *suvrktīm*, which had to be a masc. referring to Agni and therefore a secondary bahuvrīhi. Here *suvrktí-* has its usual meaning of ‘well-twisted (hymn)’ and is presumably fem. As for *dadhiṣe*, recall that I suggest supplying a medial form of $\sqrt{dhā}$ to govern *stómam* in 2. Here we have the full VP.

VI.10.7: The accent on *inuhí* can easily be explained as contrastive to the immediately following verb *vardháya*.

VI.11 Agni

VI.11.1: Although the vs. seems superficially straightforward, it presents a number of small difficulties. We might start with the meter of pāda c: in order to reach 11 syllables, something has to be distracted. HvN suggest *nāsatiyā*, but this produces a bad cadence: – ∼ ∼ ×. Oldenberg (ZDMG 55.300 and Noten) instead suggests distracting the initial preverb *ā*, which produces an even worse cadence (–*nā nāsatiyā* – – – ×). And the third possibility, *nāasatyā*, produces a third type of bad cadence (∼ ∼ – ×). Only if we could read the first vowel of *nāsatiyā* as distracted – ∼ can we fix the cadence, but there is no real license for this.

The first morphological problem is *bādhah* in pāda b. Gr takes it as the acc. pl. of a root noun ‘Treiber, Förderer’, but it is hard to fit this into the passage semantically. Schindler (Rt. nouns) finds the passage unclear and does not commit to a root noun interpr., much less a case form. Scar (346–47) takes it as a root noun, but in the abl. sg. (“aus dem Drängen heraus”), in which he calls a “hoffnungslos obskur” passage -- a characterization that, given the super-abundance of hopelessly obscure parts of the RV, seems rather overdramatic for this minor conundrum. With Old (ZDMG 55.300), Ge, and Re -- and *pace* Scar (346–47) -- I take *bādhah* as an adverbially used neut. *s*-stem, like (and perhaps truncated from) *sabādhah*, also an adverbially nom.-acc. *s*-stem, which, however, Scar also thinks is an old abl. sg. of the root noun. However, even if Scar should be right, the interpr. of *bādhah* as abl. sg. of a root noun could be adapted to the adverbial interpr. with one further step (as he recognizes): ‘out of urgency’ → ‘urgently’.

The next question is the application of the simile *marútām ná práyukti* and the morphological identity of the last word. To start with the latter, with most interpr. I take it as an instr. **-tī* shortened in pause (or, with a more modern descrip., with loss of its final laryngeal in pause [and here before a vowel beginning the next hemistich]). But what does the hitching up of the Maruts have to do with Agni’s sacrificial performance? My assumption is that the simile is limited to qualifying the adverbial *bādhah* ‘pressingly, urgently’. Since everything the Maruts do is precipitous, no doubt the yoking up of their horses is performed with the same urgency, to get on the road as soon as possible. Both Ge and Re push *prá √yuj* further than I think it should go -- to ‘impulsion, instigation’ (“wie auf Betreiben der Marut” and “à l’instigation des Marut” respectively), a sense that seems distant from the ‘yoke, hitch up’ sense of *√yuj*. I also don’t see that the Maruts would be the ones to set Agni’s sacrificing in motion; they are not even associated with the dawn sacrifice and don’t have much to do with Agni. My “at the hitching up” reads as if it were a locative. Though that tr. was made for English parsing reasons, I might slightly alter it to “with the hitching up.”

In pāda d both Ge and Re (flg. Gr’s interpr.) take *hotrāya* as simply referring to the sacrifice (e.g., “zu unserm Opfer”), but *hotrá-* is elsewhere not the sacrifice, but the office of Hotar or the performance of the Hotar’s duties. My tr. (“turn [various gods] to the Hotar-work”) makes it seem that those gods will perform that office, but, since Agni is the Hotar par excellence (see, e.g., pāda a, also 2a, 6a), it must rather be that Agni is

urged to cause the gods to turn towards his own performance of his duties. It might be clearer if the tr. read “toward my Hotar-work.”

VI.11.2: The disposition of the elements in pāda b is not entirely clear. In the publ. tr. I construe *antār* with *mārtyeṣu* “(god) among men/mortals” and consider *vidáthā* an acc. of extent of time/opportunity “through the rites.” Ge agrees with the first, but supplies a verb to govern *vidáthā*: *sādhān* “der ... die Opfer (zustande bringt),” on the basis of two passages containing this phrase (III.1.18, IV.16.3 *vidáthāni sādhan*). I did not believe then that these two passages constituted sufficient formulaic support for supplying a form of $\sqrt{sādh}$, but now I’m more sympathetic to Ge’s view. But there are also other possibilities. In Agni passages *antār* is often in a lexeme with \sqrt{i} or \sqrt{car} : ‘go between’ -- usually between heaven and earth or men and gods. Flg. Old and Re, such a lexeme, with the verb of motion supplied, could be construed with *vidáthā*: e.g., Re “(te mouvant) entre les participations-culturelles.” And, if we take *vidátha-* in its occasional meaning of ‘(cosmic) divisions’, we can follow Thieme (Unters. 43) in his interpr. “zwischen den Verteilungen (Himmel, Luftraum, Erde) ist er, der Himmlische unter den Sterblichen.” Any of these is, in my opinion, possible, but I will stick with the publ. tr., as involving the least amount of extra manipulation.

Since *vāhnir āsā* is a fairly common locution (see passages assembled by Ge ad I.76.4), instr. *āsā* ‘with the mouth’ is not parallel to instr. *juhvā* ‘with the tongue’, despite grammatical and semantic similarity.

VI.11.3: There are several metrical problems in this vs. Pāda c has the caesura after 3; there seems no way to remedy this, and the rest of the meter is fine. Pāda a is rather more interesting: the Saṃhitā text as given yields 10 syllables; there are two possible distractions: *dhān(i)yā* (HvN’s choice) and *t(u)vé*, but both produce the same bad cadence ($\sim - - \times$). As Old points out (ZDMG 55.300 and Noten), if we distract neither of these choices, the vs. reads fine until the last word, with an opening of five and *dhiṣāṇā* taking post-caesura position. (It is worth noting that *dhiṣāṇā-* is almost always immediately post-caesura, whether after an opening of 4 or of 5.) All that’s wanting to make a fine Triṣṭubh line is a single light syllable preceding *váṣṭi*. Although I would not presume to supply such a syllable (nor does Old), it does seem preferable to allow for a rest here with syncopation, rather than to choose one of the two possible distractions that yield a bad cadence.

The syntax and exact sense of the first hemistich are somewhat unclear. Ge and Re take the pādas together, with *dhiṣāṇā* as subj. both of *váṣṭi* and of the infin. *yájadhyai* (approx. “the Holy Place wishes to sacrifice in you ...”). I have two objections to this interpr.: 1) as Old (ZDMG 55.300) points out (sim. Re; see below), it is Agni who should be doing the sacrificing (though I.109.4, where *dhiṣāṇā* presses soma willingly [*uśatī*], renders this objection less forceful); 2) the *prá* beginning pāda b suggests that there’s an intermediate verb form between *váṣṭi* and the infinitive or at least that there’s a subclausal break at the pāda boundary. Re also notices the 2nd problem indirectly, suggesting in his n. an alternative tr. “elle veut (ceci): qu’(Agni) sacrifie en avant” (with the *prá* presumably represented by “en avant”). My publ. tr. reflects such an intermediate verb form, from a supplied form of $\sqrt{dhā}$, with a form of ‘you’ also to be supplied — with the sense “to (put) (you) forward to sacrifice ...” For $\sqrt{dhā}$ + *yájadhyai* see nearby VI.15.15

ní tvā dadhīta ródasī yájadhyai “One should set you [=Agni] down, to sacrifice to the two world-halves.” The locution *dhiṣāṇā √dhā* is also quite common, aided by real or pseudo-etymological association; cf. III.31.13 ... *dhiṣāṇā* ... *dhāt*; III.56.6 *dhiṣaṇe* ... *dhāḥ*, IV.34.1 ... *dhiṣāṇā* ... *ádhāt*; VI.19.2 ... *dhiṣāṇā* ... *dhāt*; VII.90.3 ... *dhiṣāṇā dhāti*. However, I am now no longer sure that my objections to the standard tr. are strong enough to merit the additional complexity of my publ. interpr., and I am also disturbed by having to interpr. loc. *tvé* as “in regard to you.” The next hymn contains a passage that strongly encourages construing *tvé* here with *yájadhyai* “to sacrifice in you”: VI.12.2 *ā yásmīn tvé* ... *yákṣat*. I would now alter the tr. here to “For even the wealthy Holy Place longs to sacrifice in you to the gods, to their races, for the singer” -- though I am still bothered by the *prá*.

Another problem in this syntagm is *devāñ jánma*. Old (explicitly, ZDMG 55.300) and Ge (in tr.) take *devāñ* as a gen. pl., a form that could either represent the survival of a very archaic PIE gen. in *-ōm or the truncation of the standard form *devānām*. I do not think this nec., subscribing to Re’s assertion (in n.) “*devāñ jánma* ne comporte pas de désinence abrégée ou archaïque, mais signifie «la génération (, à savoir) les dieux»,” with *devāñ* and *jánma* as parallel acc. However, I now realize I cannot entirely gainsay the other instances of *devāñ jánman-*, which also favor a gen. pl. and now suggest an alt. tr. “... sacrifice to the races of the gods.”

In the second hemistich the referent of the subj., *vépiṣṭho āṅgirasām* ... *vípraḥ* is in question. Ge, flg. Sāy., suggests the current poet, and the presence of the singer in b (*grṇaté*) might support this view. However, his superlative status among the *Āṅgirasas* makes it more likely that it is Agni. Cf. the similar expression in I.127.1 *jyēṣṭham āṅgirasām vipra* “(We call upon you), o inspired poet, as the oldest/most important of the *Āṅgirasas*,” as well as the fairly frequent use of *āṅgirastama-* ‘first/best of the *Āṅgirasas*’ for Agni (I.31.2, 75.2; VIII.23.10, 43.18, 44.8). If Agni is the referent, there has been a switch from 2nd ps. reference (*tvé* in pāda a) to 3rd ps. reference here, but this is hardly novel. See the next vs. (5).

As disc. ad VI.3.6, I interpr. *rebhā-* not as ‘singer’, but as ‘hoarse/husky-voiced (singer)’, sometimes used of Agni, whose crackling is likened to singing. He is so identified nearby in VI.3.6, and the use of this adj. here is another piece of evidence that Agni is the referent of the subject in this hemistich.

In d *chandāḥ* is taken by Gr as the sole example of suffix-accented thematic *chandá-* (not only in the RV but, acdg. to Whit, Rts., anywhere), beside *chānda-*. Gr glosses our form ‘singend, preisend’ and *chānda-* as ‘glänzend, strahlend’; Ge, by contrast, takes it as an *s*-stem and dismisses the accent: “*chandāḥ* doch wohl für *chāndaḥ*.” Pointing to the suggestive juxtaposition *mádhu chandāḥ* here, a near exact match for the PN *madhuchandāḥ*, to whom the first ten hymns in the RV are ascribed (though the name doesn’t appear in the RV text), he tr. “seine süsse Weise.” Re follows suit (“le doux chant”), with the somewhat cryptic note “*chandāḥ* «qui charme», comme *chāndaḥ*.” (Curiously, Old doesn’t comment.) Although I would like to be able to follow their interpr., with *chandāḥ* an anomalously accented neut. *s*-stem, rather than an *-á*-stem with Gr, I do not see any way to get the suffix accent redactionally or grammatically. My interpr. in the publ. tr. introduces complications, in order to avoid positing arbitrary accent shifts. I suggested that the form *is* an *s*-stem, derivationally related to neut. *chāndas-* ‘rhythm, meter,’ showing the usual rightward accent shift of adjectival

possessive derivatives to neut. *s*-stems -- hence ‘having rhythm’. I would have preferred that the form in the text were *chandās* (*chandā* in sandhi), describing Agni the poet, but it is not. I therefore suggested that it is either a neut. used adverbially (“rhythmically” as in the publ. tr.) or that it qualifies *mádhu* “rhythmic honey,” of the song. But as discussed ad V.52.12, VIII.7.36, and I.92.6 I am now disturbed by the late distribution of the neut. *s*-stem *chándas-*, which might call into question the existence of forms based on it deeply embedded in the core RV. I don’t quite know what to do and leave my unsatisfactory solution in place, at least for now.

VI.11.4: On *svápāka-* see comm. ad IV.3.2.

Note the switch from 3rd ps. reference (pāda a) to 2nd ps. (b). The 2nd ps. reference continues by default through the rest of the vs., though the publ. tr. appears to switch back to 3rd ps.: (“(anoint) him ...”) for Engl. convenience.

VI.11.5: Old (ZDMG 55.301), fld. by Ge and Re, interprets *vr̥ñjé* as a *t*-less 3rd sg. passive, rather than as the 1st sg. it appears to be. I do not see the necessity for this. The same VP is found in I.116.1 (... *bárhīr iva prá vr̥ñje*), where the 1st ps. interpr. is reinforced by the flg. pāda containing the 1st sg. act. *iyarmi*. Further, in the almost identical pāda VII.2.4 *prá vr̥ñjate námasā barhīr agnaú*, the med. 3rd pl. *vr̥ñjate* must be transitive with sg. *bárhīḥ* as obj. The best support (see Old) for a pass. interpr. is that then all 4 pādas in this vs. would begin with a passive (b: *áyāmi*, c *ámyakṣi*, d *áśrāyī*), but in that case we might expect a form *more* parallel to the other three. Although *√vrj* has no passive aorist attested, there are no morphological or phonological barriers to building **ávarji* (cf. the very common *ásarji* to *√srj* ‘discharge’). I confess I do not understand the sequence of tense, with pres. *vr̥ñjé* in the *yád* clause, followed by 3 main clause augmented aorists, but taking *vr̥ñjé* as a passive does not solve this problem.

I do not understand the semantic difference between *sádman-* and *sádana-*, if there is one.

VI.11.6: As noted above, ad VI.10.2, the phrase *agníbhīr idhānāḥ* is found both there and in the next hymn, VI.12.6. It therefore seems unlikely that *devébhiḥ* should be construed in this collocation, despite its apparent parallelism, and, with Ge and Re, I take it as an instr. of accomp. with *daśasyā*.

My interpr. of the simile in the 2nd hemistich differs from the standard. Ge and Re assume that the comparandum for *vr̥jánam ná* is *ámhaḥ*. Given the adjacency of the two expressions, this is reasonable. Ge’s version, however, relies on a somewhat unlikely interpr. (insofar as we understand this root) of *áti √sras* as ‘abstreifen’ (strip off): “... möchten wir die Not wie einen Gürtel abstreifen,” and the notion of “stripping off” *ámhas-* seems odd. Re’s “puissions nous ... glisser hors du défile-étroit comme (hors de) l’encerclement (ennemi)” does better with the verb, but requires *vr̥jana-* to have a particular negative sense not elsewhere met with (*pace* his citation of X.27.5). In the publ. tr. I take the simile with *rāyāḥ* .. *vāvasānāḥ* “clothing ourselves in riches,” comparing the wealth we wear with a girthband. For a very similar expression, cf. I.173.6 *sám vivya índro vr̥jánam ná bhūmā* “Indra has enwrapped himself in earth, like a circlet,” with the same simile. Although the distance between *rāyāḥ* and the simile might speak against this interpr., it does work better semantically, and the parallel passage provides

strong support. It does give me pause, however, that MLW is not convinced and thinks *vrjānam ná* must be construed with *ámhaḥ*.

VI.12 Agni

VI.12.1: The ‘goad’ (*todá-*) found in VI.6.6 reappears here, as well as in vs. 3. Thus, 3 of the 5 occurrences of this word in the RV are found in this Agni cycle. In VI.6.6 I argue that the referent of the “great goad” is the sun (see comm. ad loc., sim. I.150.1). Old (ZDMG 55.301, also Noten) thinks the sun is the referent in our passage as well, and, further, he construes the gen. *tódasya* in pāda b with *śocīṣā tatāna* in pāda d, on the basis of VI.6.6 *bhānúnā ... todásya ... tatantha*. Although the parallel is suggestive, the distance between the genitive and its supposed governing instr. in our passage seems too far, esp. since the 2nd hemistich begins *ayám sá* “here is he” or “this one here,” a sequence that seems to open a new (though co-referential) clause. Moreover, in vs. 3 *todá-* seems to refer to or be compared to Agni himself, and so the internal evidence of the hymn favors a connection of the goad with Agni, not directly with the sun. I therefore follow Ge in taking *tódasya* as dependent on *rāt*, which also governs *barhīṣaḥ*. It may be that *rāt ... todásya* “ruler of the goad” is a phrase like *sūnúḥ sáhasaḥ* “son of strength” (see 1c), where “son of X” is tantamount to X. In the same way “ruler of the goad” may be the equivalent of “the goad” itself. Both the sun (“the great goad”) and Agni are goads because with their appearance at dawn they set the world in motion. Since Agni is often taken as an earthly form of the sun, sharing the same third party identity would not be surprising, with Agni being the lesser of the two by nature.

For Agni as “ruler of the ritual grass,” see VIII.13.4=15.5 ... *asyá barhīṣo ví rājasi*, though the subject there is Indra.

I take *yájadhyai* as a predicated infinitive (sim. Ge, Re, Keydana [Inf., 171]). The VP *ródasī √yaj* is found elsewhere in this cycle: 11.4 *yájasva ródasī*, VI.15.15 *ní tvā dadhīta ródasī yájadhyai*, with the same infinitive.

VI.12.2: On *svápāka-* ‘very clever’, also VI.11.4, see comm. ad IV.3.2. As noted there the Pp. analyses this sequence as *sú ápāka-*, though Ge and Re take it as a cmpd ‘having a lovely backside’. Kü (214), however, follows the Pp. analysis (also fld. by Gr), and tr. “von Ferne kommend” (as Gr does). I do not see how a derivation from *ápā(ñ)c-* ‘facing/turned backward’ could yield such a sense, esp. in a non-ablatival formation, and, furthermore, Agni, the most *present* of gods, should not be “coming from afar.” Keydana’s “der du entfernt bist” lacks the ablatival element but still runs afoul of the other problems just noted.

‘Heaven’ (*dyaúḥ*) is the performer of the sacrifice in Agni; the qualification *sarvátātā-iva* “as if in its entirety, in its entirety as it were” is explained, reasonably, by Ge as meaning the gods collectively, with *dyaúḥ* ‘heaven’ equivalent to “die Götterwelt.” Re follows this interpr., suggesting that *sarvátātā* is a variant of *devátātā*. For all the gods performing such sacrifice, see, e.g., X.88.7 adduced by Ge.

In tr. *yajatra* as ‘the means of sacrifice’ I am taking the *-tra-* instrument suffix seriously: Agni as the receptacle and recipient of the oblations is indeed the *means* to sacrifice.

In the publ. tr. the phrase introduced by the em-dash “— you the very clever ...” contains only vocatives, though for ease of English they do not read as vocc.

jāmhas- is found independently only here, but also appears in the *bahuvrīhis* *kr̥ṣṇá-jāmhas-* (I.141.7) and *raghupátma-jāmhas-* (in nearby VI.3.5). Though *jāmhas-* has no direct cognates and at best a root connection to IE *ǵhēngʰ ‘go’ (EWA s.v.), the cmpds occur in contexts that limit the semantic realm to birds (to which Agni is compared in both cases, as also here) and that point to a bird’s body part, *pace* Gr’s ‘Weg, Gang, Bahn’ -- wings, wing-feathers, or plumage. The question is what the point of comparison is between the bird’s *jāmhas-* and three-seated (*triṣadhástha-*) Agni, if in fact the simile is meant to further characterize that descriptor. Ge suggests that a bird alighting from flight appears to settle on his two wings and his tail-feathers (though MLW points out to me that, observationally, a bird appears to settle not on its two wings, but its two *legs*). MLW then suggests that “maybe *jāmhas-* means originally ‘stride’ and then the ‘striding parts/ locomoting parts’ and finally ‘the bottom parts’” which in a bird may be three. Re, by contrast, takes the simile separate from *triṣadhástha-* and also interprets *jāmhas-* as ‘enjambée’ (stride), though, as he explicitly admits, this involves “renouncing” the meaning ‘plumage’ that he ascribes to the same word in nearby VI.3.5, because “on obtient un sens plus facile” (a very dangerous principle to apply to RVic lexicography!).

With most, I take *yájadhyai* again as a predicated inf. “(you are) to sacrifice,” as in vs. 1. Kü (214) curiously interprets it as passive (“... sind die Opfertgaben ... zu opfern”), though, as Keydana (174 n. 171) points out, the nom. *triṣadhásthaḥ* is then left hanging.

VI.12.3: The rel. cl. that begins this vs. cannot span the hemistich, since the verb that ends b, *adyaut*, is unaccented. There is the further problem, long noted (see Old ZDMG 55.302), that the apparently easy application of the initial adj. *téjīṣṭhā* to the next noun *aratīḥ* is problematic, because *aratí-* is masc. (though both Thieme [Unters. 29] and Re are willing to allow a fem. here, and Old toys with this notion). In my view the rel. cl. consists only of the first two words, *téjīṣṭhā yásya*, with *yásya* of course referring to Agni. The rest of the hemistich is couched in the nominative, with descriptors most naturally applicable to Agni (like *aratí-*, which generally has Agni as its referent), and so a syntactic shift must happen between the *yásya* and the following nominatives.

Therefore, a noun must be supplied with *téjīṣṭhā* in the rel. cl., as Old already suggested (ZDMG 55.302 n. 1). His candidates are ‘Glut’ or (in pl.) ‘Flammen’; Ge follows the former suggestion, supplying *tapanī* as in II.23.14. In contrast I suggest ‘course’. As we’ve seen, the Agni cycle of VI is tightly knit, and in VI.3.4 (a hymn with another connection to this one, disc. ad vs. 2) we find *tigmám cid éma ... yásya* “whose course is sharp ...” Of course, *éman-* is a neut. and cannot be supplied with fem. *téjīṣṭhā*, but cf. I.53.8 *téjīṣṭhayā ... vartanī*; *vartaní-* generally means ‘course, track’, though in that particular passage I take it as ‘(wheel)edge’. In any case that fem. would fit here nicely and match the “sharp course” of VI.3.4.

Note that both (-)*rāt* and *todá-* return from vs. 1. As discussed ad vs. 1, *todá-* now seems to apply directly to Agni. I take this word as part of the simile (so also Ge, Re), despite the right displacement of the simile particle, *todó ádhvan ná*, which is not rare.

Hemistich-final *adyaut* echoes *dyaúḥ* at the end of 2b.

In c the first question is the meaning and root affiliation of the hapax *dravitā*. Older interpr. ascribe it to \sqrt{dru} ‘run’: Gr ‘Renner’, apparently (with some attenuation) Ge ‘Ausreisser’, while Re renders it as ‘fondeur’ (smelter), with, presumably, a developed sense of \sqrt{dru} . However, the set character of the agent noun makes this problematic, and Hoffmann (MSS 10 [1957] 70 = Aufs. 420) convincingly connects it with his set root $\sqrt{drū}$ ‘cut, reap’ -- an ascription that has been followed essentially by everyone since (e.g., EWA s.v. *DRAV*¹, Gotō 1st Kl., 138–39, Tichy Nom.Ag., 35, 285, Keydana Inf., 194 n. 18). The adj. characterizing this agent noun, *adroghā-*, is unexpected. It ordinarily means ‘undeceptive’ and qualifies speech (as in the bahuvrīhi *ádrogha-vāc-*), but “undeceptive reaper” is puzzling. I pushed the adjective further than it should probably go, to ‘undisguised’, which, in conjunction with *tmán* ‘in person’, may express that Agni’s role in cutting down plants is plainly evident to all. But the locution still seems awkward. Tichy’s ‘zuverlässig’ (trustworthy, reliable) mitigates some of this awkwardness and does not stray too far from the sense of the adj.; I would be inclined to emend my tr. to ‘trustworthy’.

In d *avartrā-* is likewise a hapax. It appears to be a bahuvrīhi built to *vártra-* (AV+) ‘dam, dike’; see Debr’s Nachtr. to AiG II.1 (p. 58).

VI.12.4: The first hemistich is partly assembled from material also found elsewhere: the quite straightforward 2nd pāda is identical to VII.12.2b. The post-caesura portion of the first pāda, *etārī ná śūṣaīḥ*, is also found at V.41.10, where the pre-caesura portion, *grṇūté agnīḥ* “Agni is sung”, is functionally identical to our 2nd pāda (esp. *agnī ṣṭave* “Agni is praised”). On *etārī* as a loc., see comm. ad V.41.10; note that this word is a partial anagram of 3a *vanerāt*.

In c note the insistent phonetic figure: *dr(ú)vanno vanván krát(u)vā ná árvā*.

The simile in c most likely consists only of *nārvā* (i.e. *ná árvā*), since *ná* is barred from pāda-final position. See my “Penultimate *ná* ‘like’ in the Rig Veda: A Syntactic Archaism” (ECIEC 2024).

The interpr. of pāda d is difficult because of the highly unusual form *jārayāyi*, which has been much discussed (see esp. Old ZDMG 55.302–3). Since the hemistich otherwise lacks a verb form, it is tempting to see a verb here. But the accent makes trouble because this is a main clause with no syntactic break evident before the word. Nonetheless, it is generally taken as a nonce aor. passive and quite possibly a punning one: as a denom. to *jārā-* ‘wooer, lover’ (hence ‘become a wooer’) and as a pass. built to the caus. *jārayati* (*l jārayati*) ‘awaken’. The pun is most clearly expressed in Ge’s tr. “wie der Vater des Uṣas zum Buhlen ward, so wurde er durch die Opfer erweckt”; he takes it as referring to the myth of incest of Heaven, also signalled by the phrase *usrāḥ pitéva* “like the father of Dawn.” Although I am always game (perhaps too game) to see puns everywhere in the RV, I am dubious about the one suggested here. For one thing the somewhat anomalous stem *uṣār-/usr-* is never used for personified Dawn, but only for the temporal dawn. (For supposed voc. *uṣar* in I.49.4 see comm. ad loc. and Lundquist 2014.) It seems unlikely that the stem typed for the goddess, *uṣās-*, would not be used in this myth where her identity is so very crucial. Moreover, I rather doubt that *usrāḥ* here is a gen. sg. with *pitéva*. Not only is the simile particle wrongly placed (though this is not rare), but *usrās* is almost always an acc. pl., which can express extent of time (e.g., VII.15.8). The solution I favor for *jārayāyi* is one also mentioned by Old, stemming from

Ludwig, and endorsed by Debrunner in the Nachtr. to AiG I [p. 163] -- that it belongs to a gerundive stem *jārayāy(i)ya-* ‘to be awakened’ and the expected nom. sg. **jārayāy(i)yaḥ* lost its final syllable by haplology before *yajñāiḥ*, not surprisingly in this *y(a)*-rich environment. This gerundive is predicated and serves in lieu of a finite verb. For a similarly formed predicated gerundive, see nearby *trayayāy(i)yaḥ* at VI.2.7.

VI.12.5: With *tákṣat* we can supply *vānā* on the basis of I.127.4, as noticed by the standard comm.

ṛṇá- is otherwise neut., meaning ‘debt’ (Gr’s supposed fem. *ṛṇā* in X.127.7 is actually a neut. pl.). I am inclined to assume that this masc. nom. sg. is a nonce application. But see the cmpd. *ṛṇa-cyút-* ‘shaking the debtor’ in VI.61.1, in which I also interpr. *ṛṇa-* as masc. and animate. I would now suggest that the masc. may have been extracted from the privative bahuvrīhi *anṛṇá-* ‘without debt’, which, though not found in the RV (perhaps because it belongs to the technical legal register), is reasonably well established in the AV.

The last word of the vs., *rāt*, seems to reprise the similarly pāda-final *rāt* in 1a and *vanerāt* in 3a, but because it is unaccented, it must be a verb form belonging to *√raj* ‘go straight’.

VI.12.6: In the first pāda as transmitted (metrically faulty), there is a hapax *nídāyā(h)* supposed built to a fem. *nídā-* ‘scorn’. There is no verb to govern this word, so “protect” vel sim. must be supplied. Ge adduces nearby VI.14.5 *nídāḥ ... uruṣyāti*, while Gr suggests II.34.15 *nídó muñcátha*. I am now somewhat more sympathetic to these makeshifts than I was when I produced the publ. tr., but the fact remains that protection from scorn would be rather intrusive in the passage, in a hymn that focuses almost exclusively on Agni’s travel and speed. In the publ. tr. I suggest a different analysis of the sequence, which I still favor: *arvann íd *āyāḥ*, resegmenting the Pp. analysis and taking *āyā(h)* to *ā √yā* ‘drive here’. This requires an alteration of the Saṃhitā text by accenting *āyāḥ*. The posited verb form could be an impf., injunc., or subj. to the root pres. to this root, or an indic. or injunc. to the *s*-aorist. Since no other such forms occur unambiguously in the RV, it could have been reanalyzed and lost accent. For a possibly similar form see *yā(h)* in V.33.2 and comm. ad loc. Although the particle *íd* would be slightly oddly positioned after a voc., it is fairly regular in pre-verbal position when the verb is final in its pāda (e.g., in this maṇḍala VI.19.13 *śátroḥ-śatror úttara út syāma*, 42.3 *dhṛṣāt tám-tam íd éṣate*, 45.7 *yó gṛṇatām íd āsitha*). Note also the phonetic figure closing a and b: *nídāyā(h)# ... idhānāḥ#*, which would be stronger if the first was *ídāyā(h)*.

VI.13 Agni

VI.13.1: The voc. *ágne* was omitted from the publ. tr.

Although *śruṣṭī* can represent nom. sg. *śruṣṭiḥ* and is so taken by Ge, Re (and seriously entertained by Old), I accept the traditional analysis as instr. sg. (allowed by Ge in n. 1c); elsewhere the instr. sg. form is almost always pāda-initial as here, whereas the rare nom. sg. never is. The point seems to be that Agni listens to us attentively and subsequently metes out rewards.

VI.13.2: As usual, the form *iṣé* is subject to multiple possible analyses, but most interpr. opt for a dat. of *iṣ-* ‘refreshment’, as do I. With most (but not Old), I split pāda a into two nominal clauses, based on the apparently clause-initial sequence *ā hí* after the caesura. The enclitic *naḥ* must of course belong properly to the 1st clause, though it can be understood with the 2nd as well.

In pāda b, the referent in the simile qualified as *párijmā* ‘encompassing’ has been variously identified: Ge (sim. Lü) Vāyu, Re the sun or Agni solaire, Gr Agni himself. By contrast, I supply ‘household’ (*gāya-*), on the basis of nearby VI.2.8, where Agni is said to be *párijmeva ... gāyaḥ* “encompassing like a household” (on which see comm. ad loc.). This simile would play on Agni’s well-known connection to the domestic sphere. The point of comparison is that the household is the unit that controls the wealth of its members. I supply “over treasure” on the basis of *rátanam* in pāda a; *kṣayasi* in b needs a gen. complement to parallel the simile in c: *mitró ná bṛhatá ṛtásya*.

VI.13.3: The anomalous root pres. *bharti* (otherwise found only at I.173.6) here immediately precedes *vājam* and therefore evokes the poet of this maṇḍala, Bharadvāja. As is remarked elsewhere in the comm. to VI (passim), there is much play with this name. Here it is possible that the nonce athematic form *bharti* was substituted for a thematic injunctive *bharad* because the latter produces a bad cadence. This does not account for *bhárti* in I.173.6, but see my disc. there. That hymn contains a number of distorted forms, and *bhárti* would fit that pattern. I am extremely wary of ascribing deep archaism to *bhárti* (as is often done; see, e.g., A. Willi, *Origins of the Greek Verb*, 177, 197).

VI.13.4: The sequence *vedyānaṭ* is emended by Old (ZDMG 55.304 and Noten) to *vēdyānaṭ* with two accents (that is, underlying *vēdyā* or *vēdī* ‘with the altar’ + *ānaṭ*). He convincingly adduces nearby VI.1.10 *vēdī sūno sahaso gīrbhir ukthaīḥ*, identical to our pāda a save for the first word. See comm. ad loc. The standard interpr. read *vedyā* (Ge, Re, Lub, etc.) with the Pp and render as ‘with wisdom’ vel sim. It’s worth noting that *vedyā-* is otherwise only plural, an argument about ascribing our sg. form to that stem.

With Ge I think *prāti vāram* should be construed together, even though the standard expression is *prāti váram* (II.11.21, etc.). Re suggests a haplology from **prāti vāram vāram*, but this seems unnecessarily complex. I consider *vāram* from **vāram* a minor metrical adjustment to fit a Triṣṭubh cadence. And see immed. below for another possible lengthening.

Ge takes *dhānyà-* as ‘grain’, a deriv. of *dhānā-* ‘id.’. Certainly the other occurrence of *dhānyà-* does have this meaning (V.53.13; cf. also *dhānyākṛt-* X.94.13), but here a deriv. of *dhána-* ‘wealth’ makes more sense (see Re’s ‘richesse’). Old suggests emending to *dhānyam*, which exists in this meaning, but I don’t see the need for this. Why not simply take it as a (nonce) -ya-suffixed vṛddhi deriv. of *dhána-* (on such formations see AiG II.2.834ff.), since vṛddhi derivatives are fairly prominent in this hymn (*saubhagāni* 1a, *sauśravasā* 5a)?

VI.13.5: Despite their distance from each other, the two datives *nṛbhyaḥ ... puṣyāse* seem to form a de facto infinitive phrase: “for men to thrive” -- although it is certainly possible

to construe them as separate datives with *dhāḥ* “establish (goods) for men, (goods) for thriving.”

I supply ‘goods’ with the neut. pl. adjectives *sauśravasā suvīrā*, on the basis of *vasavyaiḥ*, the last word of the preceding vs. (sim., Re “[choses]”). It would also be possible, with Ge, to take *sauśravasā* as a substantive: “Diese Ruhmesherrlichkeiten.” Cf. also Thieme (Fremdl., 47).

On first encounter the sentiment of *cd* is unsettling. What the text seems to say -- and what I think it does say -- is that Agni provides good things for the archetypal pair of inimical creatures, the wolf (*vīka-*) and the stranger (*arī-*). (For the pairing, see, e.g., nearby VI.15.3, where Agni is asked to keep us free of them.) It seems even worse that what Agni provides in our vs. is “an abundance of livestock” (*bhūri paśvāḥ*; cf. nearby VI.1.12) that becomes *vāyas-* (‘vigor, vital energy’) for those creatures: in other words he deprives human communities of their domestic livestock in order to feed hungry wild beasts and outlaws. There have been two basic responses to this apparent breach of the divine/human compact. Acdg. to Old (ZDMG 55.305), since Agni provides even for the wolf and so on, he should most definitely provide at least as much for us. Ge more or less follows this interpr. (see n. 5d), as do I. It is supported by a similar passage in an Ásvin hymn, VII.68.8 (also adduced by Ge) *vīkāya cid jāsamānāya śaktam* “Do as you are able, even on behalf of a wolf that is worn out.” Note the *cid*, which is unfortunately missing in our passage. (Cf. also VI.45.2 *avipré cid váyo dádhat* “placing vitality even in the uninspired,” with the VP *vāyaḥ √dhā* as here and a *cid*.) By contrast, Thieme (Fremdl., 47), fld. by Re, interprets the dat. phrase *vīkāyārāye jāsuraḥ* not as a dative of benefit, but of malefit, as it were: “...wenn du gross machst die Lebenskraft des Viehs durch deine Stärk für den (i.e. zur Verteidigung gegen den) Wolf, den Fremdling, der verschmachtet.” The slipperiness of glossing “for” as “for defense against” seems unacceptable to me, a clear instance of allowing our contextual expectations to trample the grammar. Th also severs the little formula *bhūri paśvāḥ* (found in nearby VI.1.12, as already noted, as well as III.54.15), taking the gen. *paśvāḥ* with *vāyaḥ* (“die Lebenskraft des Viehs”) and *bhūri* as part of a phrasal verb with *kṛṇóṣi* (“wenn du gross machst”). Re’s interpr. basically follows Th’s, with some curlicues of its own.

Although Th/Re may produce a more acceptable sense, they do so at the expense of the clarity of the grammar, which is supported by a number of parallel passages. I think we must accept that Agni is providing for these undesirables. It might be worthwhile to speculate about what the real-world analogue might be. Here I suggest (with no certainty at all) that this might be a forest fire. MBh I.217–19 depicts the horrific burning of the Khāṇḍava Forest, in which most of the animal denizens of the forest were killed in the conflagration and those that tried to escape were cut down by men stationed at the perimeter. Although in the MBh account there is no difference between prey animals and their prey -- they all perish -- it does suggest an analogue, that wolves and outlaw men might capitalize on the panic roused by a forest fire to capture easy pickings. An internet search turns up a passage in J. F. Bendell, “Effect of Fire on Birds and Mammals” (in *Fire and Ecosystems*, ed. T. T. Kozlowski, 1974), 75: “many birds and mammals are attracted by fires, probably to feed upon prey driven from their homes. Komarek (1969) mentioned species of birds in Australia, Africa, and North America that come to and hunt in front of fires.”

On the meter of *d* see Old ZDMG 55.305 and Noten.

VI.13.6: Both Ge and Re separate pādas a and b, and Ge's tr. seems at least potentially to take the subj. of a, *vadmā*, as non-coreferential with Agni ("Ein Redner ... (werde) uns ... zuteil"), but since *vadmān-* occurs only here and in nearby VI.4.4, where it definitely refers to Agni, I do not see the point.

A factor influencing the Ge/Re separation of the pādas may be the apparent presence of enclitic *naḥ* in both pādas: ... *no vīhāyā(h) # / ... no dāḥ #*. However, the second *naḥ* should almost certainly be read as the final syllable of the preceding *vājī*, thus **vājīnaḥ*, acc. pl. of *vājīn-*, a possibility floated by Ge in n. 6b. Note only does this reading eliminate the pleonastic enclitic, but it also eliminates the only supposed neut. nom./acc. sg. to *vājīn-*, which would be required to modify neut. *tókam* (e.g., Ge "siegestekrönten leiblichen Samen"). A change is only required in the Pp.; the Saṃhitā text is undisturbed. An asterisk should be inserted in the publ. tr. before "prize-winning."

The seemingly late position of *naḥ* in pāda a, before the final word *vīhāyāḥ*, is actually not so late after all: it can count as (modified) Wackernagel's position, after an accented initial word (*vadmā*) followed by the phrasal vocative *sūno sahasaḥ*.

VI.14 Agni

VI.14.1: This vs. is beset with small difficulties, which add up. To begin with, what should be done with *dúvaḥ* in the first pāda? Since the first hemistich has only a single expressed verb, *jujóṣa*, the question is whether both *dúvaḥ* 'friendship' and *dhíyam* 'insight' are objects of this verb. Re (flg. Gonda) takes the two nouns as appositional and both objects of *jujóṣa*: "Le mortel qui a-toujours goûté en Agni le privilège (de) la vision-poétique," but this depends on his particular interpr. of *dúvas-* and, even with that, doesn't make a lot of sense to me. Ge in his n. 1ab calls *jujóṣa* a Zeugma, which I think *ought* to mean that both nouns are its object, with slightly different senses of the verb -- but in fact he supplies a separate verb with *dúvaḥ*: "Welcher Sterblicher Agni die schuldige Achtung (erweist) und mit seinen Gedanken gern (seiner) gedenkt." Since he seems to take *dhíyam jujóṣa* as a phrasal verb "gern (seiner) gedenkt" [think well of him, vel sim.], he may be using Zeugma in a different sense (unless he's taking "erweist" as a different sense of *jujóṣa*). But I do not see submerging the distinct sense of *√jus* 'taste, enjoy' into an anodyne idiom with *dhī-*, 'think well of', and I don't see how he could get that out of the two words that go into it. In the publ. tr. my solution to the *dúvaḥ* problem was to supply a form of *√dhā* as in IV.8.6 (also adduced by Ge), I.4.5, VII.20.6, all with acc. *dúvas-* + LOC, as here. It would also be possible to supply a form of *√kṛ*, as in III.16.4, IV.2.9, VIII.31.9 with the same complements. However, the two hymns following this one each contain a form of *√van* 'win' with *dúvas-* as obj.: VI.15.6, 16.18, and I would therefore change my tr. to "(has won/wins) friendship in/by Agni."

In the second pāda we encounter two closely related stems: the root noun *dhī-* as object of *jujóṣa* and the instr. *dhītībhiḥ* to the *-tí-* stem to the same root, and some distinction must be meant. In my opinion, *dhītí-*, esp. in the plural, are generally the insightful thoughts of the human poet, whereas *dhī-* can be the insight that gods bestow on that very poet and that gives rise to his *dhītí-*, and those two values are found in our passage: the poet savors the *dhī-* that Agni provides him, which is manifested in the poet's *dhītí-*.

The second hemistich presents more problems, beginning with the first word: *bhāsan* is analyzed by the Pp. as *bhāsat*, hence as a finite verb form -- either an injunc. to a thematic stem *bhāsa-* (so Gr, Macd VGS, tentatively Whitney Rts) or the subjunctive to a root aor. (so Gotō, 1st Kl, 82; also EWA s.v. *BHAS*¹). This is not impossible, but I take the underlying form to be the same as the sandhi form, *bhāsan*, and, with Old (ZDMG 55.305–6; Noten), identify it as an act. part. nom. sg. masc. The question is to what stem. Although as just noted, the older authorities posit a them. pres. *bhāsa-*, in fact the other two forms to this putative stem, *bhāsat* VI.3.4 and *bhasáthas* VI.59.4, are more likely root aor. subjunctives (see Gotō ref. above and my comm. ad locc.) Of course, a root aor. participle should technically be **psán*, but one wonders how long that would last. In any case, taking it as a finite form would not appreciably change the meaning of the hemistich; in that case I would alter the tr. to “he will chew it now; he should ...”

The pāda-medial sequence *X nú śa prá* is somewhat puzzling, since both *śa* and *prá* seem out of place. Gr takes *prá* with *bhāsan*, but I think it goes more naturally with *vurīta*, though in either case the position of the preverb is odd. I’m also not sure what, if anything, the retroflexion of *śa* after *nú* is telling us. I have found no other examples of this sequence, though cf. VIII.27.18 with ... *páro nú sã* #, without retroflexion.

The next question is what *√bhas* ‘bite, chew’ is doing in this context. Ge tr. “der soll zuerst den Mund auf tun,” remarking in his n. 1c that it means something like ‘yawn, gape’ -- but he doesn’t explain what this means in context. Both Old and Re supply “enemies” as obj. (e.g., Old “... möge (seine Feinde) zermalmend”); this makes somewhat more sense, esp. given the hostile sentiments later in the hymn. But I think it can be better integrated into the context of the vs. in which it’s found. The vs. has a sequence of verbs *√jus* ‘taste, savor, enjoy’ -- *√bhas* ‘bite, chew’ -- *īṣam* *√vr* ‘choose (as) refreshment / nourishment’, all centering on eating. In my view they all take the same object, *dhīyam*, and all metaphorically refer to the mortal poet’s eating the insight that Agni has conferred on him -- that is, consuming it and turning it into his own substance. It is a striking image.

VI.14.3: As discussed ad IV.48.1 and VI.1.5, I take the phrase *rāyo aryāḥ* “the riches of the stranger” here and in IV.48.1 (cf. also VI.47.9; also *aryāḥ* ... *rayīḥ* in VI.20.1) and the phrase *rāya ubháyāso jánānām* “both the riches of the peoples” in VI.1.5 as referring metaphorically to people, as the most valuable resource of a society. In our passage there are three different parallel designations for these same people: “the clans of Manu” (*mānuṣo víśaḥ*) understood from the last pāda of the previous vs. (2d), “the riches of the Ārya” (pāda b), and “the Āyus” (*āyávaḥ* in c). To make matters more complex, these people are not only contending among themselves -- that is, divided and engaging in internal conflict -- but are also fighting united against common enemies, namely the Dasyu (*dāsyum*) and one without commandment (*avratām*), as was already seen by Ge (n. 3). This is the usual “fission and fusion” model of Rigvedic society, as discussed at length by Proferes (2007, esp. Chap. 2). The internal conflict is expressed in the first hemistich by the reciprocal verb *spárdhante* ‘they contend with each other’, while the second hemistich concerns their joint enterprises, expressed by the participles *tūrvantaḥ* ‘overcoming’ and *sīkṣantaḥ* ‘seeking to vanquish’.

VI.14.4: The hero whom Agni bestows here is the concrete realization of the help (*ávas-*) sought in vss. 1 and 3.

The standard interpr. (though not Gr) construe *sávasaḥ* with *bhiyā* “with fear of his vast power.” This is certainly possible, but a construction with *saṃcákṣi* seems equally possible and the adjacency of the two words (though across a *pāda* boundary) very weakly supports my interpr.

VI.14.5: By my interpr. *rayiḥ* here has the same metaphorical sense as *rāyaḥ* in 3, namely manpower, or perhaps more narrowly the hero given by Agni in 4. Both Ge and Re take *sahāvā* ‘victorious’ as an epithet of Agni, despite the hemistich boundary. This is presumably because the adj. is felt to be more appropriate for an animate being than for wealth -- but this problem disappears if we take wealth figuratively for manpower. (They may also unconsciously take the 2nd position of *yásya* in c as an indication that the rel. cl. begins there, though of course they otherwise regularly interpret 2nd position relatives correctly.) The repeated adj. *ávṛtaḥ* is also better applied to an animate being (4x of Indra, once [oddly] of barhis), and it must belong to the rel. cl.

Here, as in its other occurrences, the privative ppl. *ávṛta-* should be read with long initial **āvṛta-*, reflecting the likely initial laryngeal of this root. See Lub (“Vedic root *vṛ*,” 317).

VI.15 Agni

VI.15.1: On *ṛñjase* see comm. ad IV.8.1. A tr. “aim at/towards” would be more transparent here.

The problematic *pāda* here is c: *diváḥ*, *kác cid*, and *ā* are difficult to construe and interpret. Ge takes the first as referring to ‘day’ rather than ‘heaven’ and makes it dependent on *kác cid*: “zu jeglicher Zeit des Tages,” but *diváḥ* is far more often ‘heaven’ than ‘day’ (the latter sense usually confined to use with *trír ā* and a few temporal adverbs). Re takes *diváḥ* as an abl. of ‘heaven’ (“Il s’avance du ciel”), and he takes the *kác cid* adverbially with *jānuṣā* ... *súciḥ* (“pur de toute manière quant à la naissance,” where the indefinite sense of *kác cid* has been replaced by a totalizing one). In the publ. tr. I agree with Re in taking *diváḥ* as ablative of ‘heaven’, construing it with distant *ā*, and supply ‘food’ with *kác cid*. But I now don’t think this makes much sense. I will suggest an alternative that makes more sense, but that doesn’t solve all the difficulties and requires some special pleading.

First I’d observe that the word order in this *pāda* seems particularly contorted. I ascribe this to the position of *janúṣā*: this instr. occurs 20 times in the RV and it always occurs immediately after the caesura, whatever its function in the clause. In this particular case, it is generally agreed that *janúṣā* should be construed with *súciḥ* (see Ge’s n. 1c), despite the intervening material. I’d argue that the need to plunk down *janúṣā* smack in the middle of the *pāda* has disrupted the constituencies of the rest of the *pāda* as well. Therefore, we cannot use word order and adjacency as reliable guides here (even less so than in the rest of the RV).

Now, let’s start with the verb *véti*, which opens the *pāda*, and with the observation that the poet of this hymn is supposed to be *Vītahavya*, who is in fact mentioned in both the other vss. of the *ṛca* (2c, 3d). If we decompose this cmpd. name we can make a

putative *havyám* ‘oblation’ the object of *véti* (cf. I.74.4 *véṣi havyāni*; sim. III.53.1, VI.60.15, etc.; for similar gapping in this hymn, see 14b), which can be qualified by *kác cid*: “he pursues any (oblation) whatever.” I further suggest that *diváh* should be construed with *ā*, as in my publ. interpr., but that here *ā* means ‘all the way to X’, rather than ‘from X here’. Although in the ‘all the way to’ sense, *ā* normally precedes the ablative (see Gr, s.v. *ā*), as already noted, the word order in this pāda seems particularly scrambled, and, in any case, *ā* often follows an acc. in the ‘to’ sense. I would therefore now substitute the tr. “Just he, blazing from birth, pursues any oblation whatever all the way to heaven.” This would be a description of the flames rising up towards heaven as they carry the oblation up to the gods.

The next pāda is implicitly contrastive: although the flames of the ritual fire actively reach for heaven in pāda c, the fire itself, just kindled, starts by burning the kindling sticks, which are immovable as opposed to the oblation later poured into the fire.

The cadence of d is bad.

VI.15.2–3: In accord with the standard interpr., in the publ. tr. I take *vītá-havya-* in 2c and 3d as a PN, which the Anukr. also provides as the name of the poet of this hymn. But since in VII.19.3 the cmpd is an adj. modifying Sudās (‘whose oblation is pursued’), I now think it likely that the same adjectival value should be slotted in here as well: “well pleased in the one whose oblations is pursued” and “for the one whose oblation is pursued.” See also disc. of *vītí-hotra-* ad II.38.1. The Anukr. ascription was transparently plucked from these two vss.

VI.15.2: The first hemistich treats Agni in the accusative, so that no grammatical person needs to be expressed. It therefore appears to continue the 3rd ps. of vs. 1, but modulates to the 2nd ps. reference of cd.

VI.15.4: As noted in the publ. intro., this initial vs. of the 2nd ṛca is a variant on the 1st hemistich of the 1st ṛca: in their first pādas an opening of 5 ending in *vo* is followed by *átithim*; the end of the 2nd pāda of vs. 1, *ṛñjase girā*, is reprised by 4cd ... *suvṛktībhiḥ*, ... *ṛñjase*.

VI.15.5: In b both Ge and Re take *uṣásah* as a nom. pl. rather than a gen. sg. as I do (e.g., “comme les aurores avec leur rayon”). Either would work contextually. However, in IV.1.17 in the phrase *uṣáso bhānūḥ* (like our *uṣáso ná bhānúnā*), *uṣásah* has to be gen. sg. and Ge so interprets it there.

In c and d I take the crucial terms with double reference, in both simile and frame. In c this term is the pres. part. *tūrvan*: in the frame it refers to Agni and is construed with loc. *yāman* “going in triumph on his course”; in the simile it is construed with loc. *rāṇe* “like the victor in the battle.” The battle with (/lit., of) Etaśa is a reference to the conflict between Indra and the Sun involving the Sun’s horse Etaśa in some unfortunately puzzling way. To make this clear, “battle over Etaśa” would be a better rendering, as MLW points out to me. A further resonance of this phrase *tūrvan ná yāman* is the PN Tūrvayāṇa found several times in the RV, incl. nearby VI.18.13.

nū in c seems to have no function and is curiously positioned, though it might be noted that there's a minority position of *nū/nū*, penultimate in the pāda, and this is fairly common in VI.

As for d, the standard interpr. (Old ZDMG 55.313 + Noten, Ge, Re) take the part. *tatr̥ṣānāḥ* only with the simile; this requires supplying an elaborate verbal predicate ("goes to water") that is not found in the Sanskrit; cf., e.g., Old "er der herbei (eilt) wie im Sonnenbrand der Durstende (zum Wasser eilt)." I again think that the participle applies in both simile and frame: in the simile it refers to someone becoming thirsty in the (sun's) heat, whereas in the frame it refers to Agni "thirsting" for oblations. This participle is used unambiguously of Agni elsewhere (I.31.7, II.4.6) in describing his voracious appetite for fuel.

In a clever poetic trick the sun is referred to indirectly in both c (his horse Etaśa) and d (his heat: *ghṛṇā-*).

VI.15.6: The locative inf. *gr̥ṇīṣāṇi* occurs only here and in VIII.12.19. Curiously, in both passages it is construed with *āmreḍitas*: here *priyām-priyam ... ātithim* (matching *agnīm-agnim* in pāda a), in VIII.12.19 *devām-devam ... indram-indram*. I don't quite know what to do with this fact. Keydana (p. 178) takes it as a "Matrixinfinitiv" functionally equivalent to an imperative, pointing to impv. *duvasyata* in pāda a. However, it would also be possible to interpret it as I do, with *duvasyata* the main verb of both pādas and the infinitive an adverbial adjunct to both pādas. I would change the tr. of the *āmreḍitas*, however, to one more in harmony with that in VIII.12.19: "Time after time do friendly service to the fire with a kindling stick, time after time to your dear guest, in hymning (him)."

The morphology of *gr̥ṇīṣāṇi* is of course unusual, though it belongs with the small group of RV *-san-i* locative infinitives, some of which (cf. esp. *upastr̥ṇīṣāṇi*, which, however, I now consider to be based on *gr̥ṇīṣāṇi*; see comm. ad VI.44.6) are built to already derived verbal stems (see AiG II.2.924–25). In this passage it phonologically echoes *ghṛṇé* and *tatr̥ṣānāḥ* in the preceding vs. (5d), and in the next vs. (which also belongs to the next ṛca) pāda-final *gr̥ṇe*, which is also of course etymologically related.

VI.15.7: This vs. begins a new ṛca, but seems like a mishmash of the vss. that precede it. The 1st pāda, *sāmiddham agnīm samídhā girā gr̥ṇe*, telescopes vs. 6: *agnīm-agnim ... samídhā* (a), *gr̥ṇīṣāṇi* (b), *gīrbhiḥ* (c). It also contains two etymological figures (*sāmiddham ... samídhā* and *girā gr̥ṇe*). The next pāda, *śúcim pāvakām puró adhvaré dhruvám*, is more eclectic in its sources: *śúciḥ* (1c), *pāvakáyā* (5a), *svadhvarám* (4b); pāda-final *dhruvám* has no direct correspondent, but resonates with both *dúvaḥ* (pāda-final in 6e) and *adrúham*, which ends the next pāda (7c). The first two words of pāda c, *vípraṃ hótāram* have correspondents in 4c and b respectively. Only pāda d breaks significantly new ground.

VI.15.9: The publ. tr. failed to tr. *dūtó devānām*. The tr. should be emended to "... as messenger of the gods, you speed ..."

The lexeme *ví √bhūṣ* occurs only here and I.112.4 until Epic, and it is not entirely clear what it means here. "Seeking manifestation" of the publ. tr. depends on the usage of rare *ví √bhū*, which can mean 'become manifest'; an example is found (at least by my

lights) in vs. 14. But it might have the less marked meaning ‘becoming conspicuous, distinguished’ or ‘becoming extended/extensive’. In any case it picks up *vibhúm*, which opens the last pāda of the preceding vs. Note also the polarized preverbs *ví* and *sám* at opposite ends of the hemistich.

The Pp. takes *ubháyāṁ* as acc. pl. masc. *ubháyān* (so also Gr), but as Old suggests (ZDMG 55.313, Noten), it could be neut. pl. *ubháyā* with nasalization in hiatus, and a neut. pl. construed with *vrataṁ* is an attractive choice here. The phrase *ubháyā(ṁ) ánu vrataṁ* “following both (kinds of) commandments” would of course refer to those of gods and men, who were mentioned in 8c.

VI.15.10: This vs. is rhetorically pleasing, though unremarkable in content. It opens with three cmpds with *su-* as first member, all in the realm of appearance (at least as I interpret the sequence) *suprātīkaṁ sudṛśaṁ s(u)vāñcam*. The next pāda juxtaposes a negated form of the pf. part. of *√vid* with a comparative built to the same stem (though different allomorph), *ávidvāṁso vidúṣṭaram*, picked up by a third form to this participle, *vidvān*, at the end of the next pāda -- which itself participates in an alliterative sequence *vísuvā vayúnāni vidvān*.

svāñc- of course patterns and inflects with the *-añc-* stems, generally built to preverbs/adverbs in the meaning of ‘directed’ (e.g., *údañc-* ‘directed upward’), and in 2 of its 6 occurrences (IV.6.9, VII.56.16) the context favors the sense ‘well-directed’ (VI.58.4 is unclear). But here, as well as in similar adjectival sequences in VII.10.3 and in IX.73.7, it appears with words referring to seeing or appearance, and I suggest that this usage preserves a semantic relic of the ‘eye’ word (**h₃ekʰ*) that, according to most, is one contributor to the blend that produces the hybrid suffix *-añc-* (see, e.g., AiG III.230). I therefore render it in these contexts as ‘of lovely outlook’ (contra Ge’s ‘schön von ... Bewegung’). Re’s ‘de belle allure’ avoids the directional sense and may reflect an analysis similar to mine, but he does not comment. A zero grade of the ‘eye’ word is also buried in *prātīka-*, also found in our sequence (*suprātīka-*), and in *ánika*, which contributes *svanika-* in 16a (for both see EWA s.vv.).

Although pāda-final *vidvān* is generally used absolutely, here it must take an object, *vayúnāni*.

The clear *s*-aor. subj. *yakṣat* in c invites a subjunctive reading of *vocat* in the next pāda, though it is of course injunctive. Nonetheless, modal readings are quite common for this stem.

VI.15.11: This vs. is unusually conjunction-heavy, with *utá* in pāda a (conjoining clauses) and in d (conjoining nouns), and *vā* 3x in c. In fact there at first appear to be more *vā*’s than there are constituents to conjoin: *yajñásya vā nísitīm vā-úditīm vā*. However, Klein (DGRV II.195) plausibly explains the first *vā* as sentential (I would prefer the term ‘clausal’ in this case), connecting pāda b with its relative clause *yáḥ ... ānaṭ ...* with its continuation in pāda c. The other two *vā*’s are subclausal, conjoining the two *-ti*-stem action noun phrases, *nísitīm vā-úditīm vā*, both of which govern the gen. *yajñásya*, the constituency being interrupted by the clausal *vā* in Wackernagel’s position.

In c I assume that the verb is a gapped repetition of *ānaṭ*. Klein tr. the skeleton of bc as “who has attained ... or (has brought about) ...,” so I assume he thinks c has a

different underlying verb from b. But the full VP *nísitim ... ānaṭ* in nearby VI.13.4, as well as VI.2.5 *nísitim ... naśat* also in this Agni cycle, establish this as a ritual idiom.

Note the complementary preverbs *ní* ‘down’ and *úd* ‘up’ in the conjoined *nísitim ... úditim*. The latter word is not otherwise used as a ritual term; in all its other occurrences it is a loc. and refers to the rising of the sun. Here it seems to refer to the outcome or the progress of the sacrifice, though it could be more narrowly used for the “rising up” of the fire when it is kindled. This is probably the better interpr. because in 2 of the 4 occurrences of *nísiti-*, VI.2.5 and VIII.19.14, it is implicitly used of the fire.

VI.15.12: The problematic pāda here is c. The initial *sám* in both c and d and the fact that d otherwise contains only a phrase in the nominative invite us to assume that c and d have the same structure and that we should supply the verb *abhy ètu* from c for d, as well as, quite possibly, *tvā*. But though the NP in d, “thousandfold desirable wealth,” is something we would quite naturally invite to “come to you entirely,” the general assumption is that *dhvasmanvāt*, whether it modifies *pāṭhaḥ* ‘fold’ (Gr, Re) or not (Old, Ge), refers to something undesirable -- e.g., Old’s (ZDMG 55.313) tentative “was voll von Zerfall [decay] ist.” It is therefore uncomfortable to invite it to come anywhere near Agni or us. Certainly both occurrences of its base *dhvasmán-* (IV.6.6, VIII.66.15) are in fact in negative contexts. But the substance itself, smoke, is semantically neutral, and in this ritual context something ‘possessing smoke’ can be positive: the oblation as it is poured into the fire will be surrounded by smoke, and, by one model of the sacrifice, it will go to the gods in Agni’s smoke as that smoke rises to heaven. I therefore supply *havyám* here (found in this *tr̥ca* in 10d), and take *tvā* and *pāṭhaḥ* as two sequential accusatives of goal. Agni is the first destination of the smoke-wrapped oblation, which must be poured into the fire, but it then goes to “the fold (of the gods)” for their consumption -- *devānām* is a standard dependent gen. with *pāṭhaḥ* (esp. in Āprī hymns, II.3.9, III.8.9, etc.).

VI.15.13: Pāda b is nicely configured: *viśvā veda jānimā jātāvedāḥ*. The first two and the last two words alliterate. The final word, the epithet *jātāvedas-*, is immediately preceded by two independent words etymologically related to its two members (in reverse order): *veda* to *-vedāḥ*, *jānimā* to *jātā-*. (Of course, *-vedas-* may ultimately derive from *√vid* ‘find, possess’, but at least folk-etymologically it belongs with *√vid* ‘know’.) And *viśvā veda* evokes the cmpd *viśvá-vedas-*, a parallel formation to *jātā-vedas-*. Nothing profound here, but a pleasing way to deploy four words.

VI.15.14: The first pāda is a 13-syllable Triṣṭubh; as Old notes (ZDMG 55.313 and Noten), it would be possible to delete init. *ágne* without affecting sense, but on the other hand it is difficult to see why it would have been secondarily appended.

In pāda a it is unclear how to construe *viśáḥ*. Note first that by accent it must be abl./gen. sg., not acc. pl. (*viśaḥ*). Ge (see n. 14ab) takes it as a second gen. with following voc. *hotaḥ*, but in that case we would expect *viśáḥ* to lose its accent in the voc. phrase (as *adhvaryasya* has), and, further, *viśó hótar-* is not a standard title, as far as I can find. It might be possible to supply **pāti-* “(lord) of the clan,” matching *grhāpatiḥ* in the previous vs. (13a), next to *hótā*; cf. *viśpātiḥ* in 8d. However, I think the most likely solution is similar to the one also proposed for 1c -- to supply *havyám* as the object of *vēḥ*

in b (see *havyā* in d), with *viśāḥ* dependent on *havyām*. Recall that the poet's name is *Vītahavya*, and he seems to like concealed puns on his name. As a support for their connection, note that the two phonologically similar words *viśāḥ* and *vēṣ* take the same position in their respective pādas. Re's solution is somewhat similar to mine, with *viśāḥ* dependent on an object supplied for *vēḥ*, but his proposed object is "la fonction du messenger" and he makes *adhvarasya* a parallel gen. to *viśāḥ*, ignoring its lack of accent. His supplied obj. *dūtyāni* is certainly conceivable: he adduces IV.7.8 *vēr adhvarāsya dūtyāni* ... But to my mind the pun on the name of the poet weighs more heavily.

In pāda b there is close sandhi in the sequence *vēṣ t(u)vām*; the reason for this is unclear, esp. since by all standard interpr. (incl. mine) *t(u)vām* belongs to a new clause -- the parenthetical one marked by *hí* -- and so there is a particularly sharp syntactic boundary between them.

In c *mahinā* fits semantically much better in the subordinate *yád* clause than in the main clause (and is so taken by the standard interpr.), but it seems to be positioned too far to the left, with another element interposed before the subordinator: ... *mahinā ví yád bhūḥ*. I attribute this word order disturbance to the same factor that caused trouble in 1c: like *janúṣā*, *mahinā* only occurs immediately after the caesura in trimeter vs. Given this constraint, the only possible adjustment to produce the expected sequence would be an ordering *mahinā *yád ví*, which would put the subordinator in the correct 2nd position of its clause but produce a bad Triṣṭubh cadence (– – ~ ×). A somewhat similar situation is found in II.1.15c *prkṣó yád átra mahinā ví te bhúvat*, where *mahinā* causes some distortion in word order, though the placement of the subordinator is not affected.

With Lüders (438) I take *ṛtā* as neut. acc. pl. and supply 'hymns' (Lieder), rather than taking it as an instr. sg.; this interpr. is supported by VII.39.1 *ṛtām ... yajāti*, with the neut. sg. acc.

Note the phonetic interplay of *v*, *h*, and *y* in d *havyā vaha yaviṣṭha yā* ...

VI.15.15: As Old points out (see publ. intro.), this is no doubt the last vs. of this collection of ṛcas, with vss. 16–19 later additions. There is some faint sign of ring composition with the first ṛca: *súdhītāni* in pāda a reprises *súdhitam* in 2a, as *dadhīta* with Agni as object does *dadhūḥ* also in 2a. The last three pādas of this vs., esp. de, appear to be a refrain: pāda e is identical to VI.2.11e = 14.6e in this Agni cycle, and pāda d *ágne víśvāni duriṭā tarema* is a variant of VI.2.11d = 14.6d *dviṣó āṇhāmsi duriṭā tarema*, hence my supplied "narrow straits" here. These refrain pādas also signal that the hymn (or the ṛcas loosely collected into a hymn) once ended here.

On the anomalous position of *hí* here, see comm. ad III.31.12, where the idiosyncratic behavior of *√khyā* is discussed. Here the immediate preverbal position of *hí* is esp. anomalous because the preverb *abhí* has been fronted (as opposed to III.31.12 ... *ví hí kyán* #, where the preverb stays in the verb complex).

VI.15.16: The phrase "wooly womb" (*ūrṇāvantam yónim*) is striking as a designation of Agni's seat. Ge (n. 16b) thinks it refers to the barhis, but in fact the fire is not placed on that dry grass, which might produce a conflagration disruptive to the ritual. I think it must rather refer to twigs and foliage still present on the firewood.

In agreement with Ge (who is hesitant -- see n. 16c) and Re, I see a verse-internal enjambment: the two accusatives directly after the hemistich boundary, *kulāyīnam*

ghṛtāvantaṃ, qualify *yónim*, which ends pāda b; then there is a syntactic break in the middle of the pāda, with dat. *savitṛé* construed with d, not c. This is unusual, but it is difficult to find a function for *savitṛé* in the preceding clause.

VI.15.17: Ge and Re take *añkūyánt-* as a positive quality parallel to *ámūra-*; e.g., Re: “(dieu) faiseur de méandres, (dieu) exempt d’égarement.” I think rather that they are opposites and that the vs. concerns the flight of Agni and his recovery by the gods: note the imperfect *ānayan* (Pp. *ā ānayan*, though technically it could be *ā nayan* with an injunctive). Though Agni sought to elude the gods by taking a circuitous course, they found him and brought him straight back from the dark depths of the water. The “dark places” can of course also refer to the night, after which the ritual fire is kindled, but I think the primary reference is mythological.

VI.15.18: On *jāniṣvā* as belonging to the *-iṣ-*aorist, see Narten (Sig.-Aor, 68).

VI.15.19: The slangy *asthūrī* ‘not one-horse’ is appropriate to this later addition to the hymn. Its positive *sthūrī* ‘one-horse’ is found in the RV only once in the late X.131.3, also in a slangy context.

VI.16 Agni

VI.16.1: The tr. “for the human race” reads like a dative, but *mānuṣe jāne* is of course a locative. Unfortunately English lacks the “bei” / “chez” locution that would idiomatically tr. this loc.

VI.16.2–3: The first pādas of these vss. end respectively in *adhvaré #* and *ádhvanaḥ #*, which seems to signal an awareness of the deeper etym. relationship between the two stems.

VI.16.3: Klein (DGRV II.122) tr. b *pathás ca devāñjasā* as “and the paths going straight unto the heavenly ones,” apparently reading *devāñjasā* as a compd., contrary to the Pp. and all standard tr. (incl. mine), which separate *deva* as a voc. Although I think the voc. interpretation is correct, cf. X.73.7 *pathó devatrāñjaseva yānān* “... the paths as if going straight to the gods,” with the adv. *devatrā* immed. preceding and construed with *āñjasā*. On the basis of X.73.7 and similar phraseology, Insler (KZ 82 [1968] “Vedic *āñjasā*, *ñjasāná-*, and the Type *sahasāná-*,” p. 6) takes *devāñjasā* as a shortening of *devatrāñjasā* or “a type of haplological abbreviation of *devayānān āñjasā*” or possibly even directly as an “adverbial-type compound” *devāñjāsā*, and Klein must be flg. the Insler interpr. one way or the other. Although X.73.7 is suggestive, I do not think it is sufficient to allow the rather extreme type of haplology posited by Insler.

VI.16.4–6: As noted in the publ. intro., each vs. in this *ṛca* begins with a form of the 2nd sg. prn., although all three are slightly different: the acc. sg. *t(u)vām* in 4a shows distraction; both 5a and 6a contain the nom. sg., but the 1st is undistracted, the 2nd distracted.

VI.16.4: Klein (DGRV II.122) ascribes “logical conjunctive value ‘therefore’” to *ádha* here, connecting vss. 3 and 4. But since vs. 4 begins a new *ṛca*, it seems unlikely that vs. 4 is being conjoined to the *ṛca*-final vs. 3. Moreover, *ádha* here is displaced from its usual *pāda*-initial position to immediately precede *dvitā*, as it does several times elsewhere (I.132.3, VIII.1.28, 84.2, all *pāda*-final as here; also *pāda*-initial VIII.13.24 = IX.102.1, VIII.83.8). On the preceding page (DGRV II.121) Klein calls *ádha dvitā* a collocation and gives it “quasi-formulaic status.” The occurrence here must belong to this group.

In b *bharatō vājībhiḥ* “Bharata with his prize-winners” is an untranslatable pun on the poet’s name Bharad-vāja, whose name appears in the next vs. (5c).

The ritualistic verbs *īle* ‘reverently invoke’ (a) and *ījé* ‘sacrifice’ (c) are exact rhymes (save for accent). I take them here as 3rd sg., as do Ge and Re. Although the 3rd sg. to the former stem is usually *ītte* with *īle* the 1st sg., in this context a 3rd sg. reading is favored, and the lack of accent on *īle* allows it to be drawn into the morphological orbit of the pf. *ījé* (cf. 3rd sg. perfect-accented *īḍé* in IV.3.3). Kü (389), flg. Tichy, takes both verbs as 1st sg., which is equally possible, as long as Bharata is referring to himself by name: “You do I, Bharata, reverently invoke ...”

VI.16.5: A verb must be supplied in this vs., with ‘give’ being the obvious choice.

VI.16.6: The “divine race” (*daīvyam jānam*) here may resonate with the “human race, race stemming from Manu” (*mānuṣe jāne*) in 1c, though they belong to different *ṛcas*.

VI.16.7–9: This *ṛca* likewise has a form of the 2nd sg. prn. beginning each vs. (7 *t(u)vām*, 8 *táva*, 9 *t(u)vām*), again all different.

VI.16.8: (*prá*) *yakṣi* is morphologically ambiguous -- 2nd sg. act. -*si* impv. or 1st sg. middle *s*-aor. -- and opinion is divided: Old (ZDMG 55.314, Noten) dithers and doesn’t ultimately decide; Ge, Narten (Sig.Aor. 200–201), and Klein (DGRV I.385) opt for the 1st sg., Re for the 2nd but to the root *√yakṣ*. A strong factor in favor of a 2nd sg. to *√yaj* is the presence of an undoubted form of this same -*si* impv. in the following vs. (9c; cf. also 2c); in favor of a non-2nd-sg. interpr. is the difficulty of construing *pāda*-initial *táva* with such an impv. I consider the form the 2nd sg. act. to *√yaj*, on the basis not only of 9c but also vs. 13 in the previous hymn (VI.15), where Agni is the subj. of a (pres.) impv. to *prá √yaj*: VI.15.13d *yájiṣṭhaḥ sá prá yajatām ṛtāvā* “let him, the best sacrificer, the truthful one, set the sacrifice in motion.” What then to do with the rest of the first two *pādas*? I accept Ludwig’s suggestion (registered by Old) that *prá yakṣi* is a parenthesis -- or rather, I think that, because of the rigid parallel patterning in this *ṛca*, *táva*, which belongs with the clause beginning *saṁdṛśam*, has been fronted around the preemptory impv. *prá yakṣi*, and that it is dependent on the NP *saṁdṛśam utá krátum*: “your manifestation and resolve do they take pleasure in.” This is, strictly speaking, ungrammatical, but rhetoric occasionally trumps syntax.

VI.16.10: Both Ge and Re supply ‘gods’ as the underlying object of *vītáye*, and this is supported by *devávītaye* in vs. 7 (and 41). But as in the previous hymn (VI.15.1, 14), I think the default object of *√vī* here is *havyá-*, suggested by the name *Vīta-havya*, the poet

to whom VI.15 is ascribed. Here the *havyá-* can easily be extracted from the parallel purpose dative *havyá-dātaye* in b and its absence explained as gapping. However, the Ge/Re solution is certainly possible, and there are no major implications either way.

VI.16.13–15: Another *ṛca* with fronted ‘you’ beginning all three vss., though here the 2nd two occurrences actually involve the enclitic with preposed pronominal prop: 14–15 *tám u tvā*, as opposed to 13 *tvām*. This *ṛca* is also characterized by snippets of mythology, contrasting with the otherwise monotonous focus on the standard ritual tropes. Unfortunately the snippets are just that -- they remain undeveloped.

This *ṛca* is recited in śrauta ritual during the churning of the fire; see Krick (Feuergründung, 297)

VI.16.13: On the ritual use of the lotus and the relevance of this vs., see Krick (Feuergründung, 155–59), where (155) she calls this vs. “die Primärquelle für die Verwendung eines Lotusblattes im Feueritual.”

In c *vāghātaḥ* can be gen. sg. or nom. pl. (as I take it, with Ge and Re). Since I don’t know what’s going on here, I would certainly not exclude the gen. sg.: “... (churned) from the head of every *vāghāt*” (so Krick 297). It is perhaps relevant that *viśvasya vāghātaḥ* phonologically echoes *viśvasya jágataḥ* “of the whole world” (I.101.5, IV.13.3, VI.50.7, VII.60.2, 101.2, X.73.8).

VI.16.16: The stem *ítara-* is very rare in the RV and has a late distribution: besides this passage it is found only in the funeral hymns X.16.9–10 and X.18.1. This comparative isolation makes it difficult to determine its nuance here. Both Ge and Re (cf. also Klein DGRV I.266, Oberlies RdR I.242) think the phrase “other hymns” (*ítarā gíraḥ*) refers to the hymns of a rival sacrificer (or sacrificers), and certainly the *-tara-* suffix implies a choice of two, which has the further potential implication that one of them is bad. But, though the publ. tr. rather vaguely reflects this interpr., I now think it is likely wrong. Instead, I think that the implicit contrast is between *itthā* ‘in just this way’ and *ítara-*, and I further think that *ítarā gíraḥ* is the acc. obj. of *brávāṇi*, not the nom. subj. of a nominal clause in embedded direct speech. By this interpr. the speaker is telling Agni that in addition to the hymn or hymns he [=Agni] has already heard, the speaker will tell him other hymns *in the same manner* as the previous ones. In other words, he is promising a continuation of the recitation that has already pleased Agni, as well as promising to strengthen him with a physical offering — the usual pairing of verbal and physical in the sacrifice. This interpr. follows that of Hertha Krick (Feuergründung, p. 571): “Komm herbei, Agni, schön will ich dir auf solche Weise noch andere Lobpreisungen sagen! Durch diese Tropfen sollst du wachsen.” I would now emend the tr. to “Come here. I will speak other hymns to you, Agni, in this same way, and with these drops here you will become strong.”

Oberlies claims that this is one of the only places in the RV that soma is pressed for Agni, but I do not see why the drops (*indu-*) can’t be drops of ghee. To be sure, *indu-* overwhelmingly refers to soma drops, but I don’t think that soma *has* to be the referent.

VI.16.17: Note the phonological resonance between 16b *ítarāḥ* and 17b *úttaram*.

The temptation is very strong to take *dadhase*, despite its lack of accent, as the verb of the subord. cl. introduced by *yátra kvà ca* in pāda a, whose correlate *tátra* begins the last pāda (c). And indeed almost all interpr. (Old, Ge, Re, Klein DGRV I.266) have succumbed to this temptation. Old (ZDMG 55. 314–15) constructs an elaborate justification for the interpr., which he maintains in the *Noten* (though without the extensive special pleading). But despite Old’s claim (*Noten*) that “*dadhase* kann nicht ohne Gezwungenheit als Hauptsatzverb aufgefasst werden,” I see no problem. I agree that a form of $\sqrt{dhā}$ should be supplied in the *yátra* clause -- perhaps *hitám*, as in I.187.6 *tvé ... máno hitám*. The main clause of b, with its short-vowel subjunctive *dadhase*, expresses the next step in the process: after he has set his mind on something, he then will apply his skill to it -- the progression from mental conception to physical realization that we frequently encounter in the RV. I take *úttara-* here not as a qualification of value, ‘higher’ (e.g., Klein’s “higher skill”), but as a temporal or logical ‘next, later’ expressing the progress from a to b. The *tátra* clause of c gives us a third step, but the fact that this adverb correlates with *yátra* does not mean that the intermediate clause has to be under the domain of *yátra*.

VII.16.18: It is not clear whether *te pūrtám* refers to a gift given *to* Agni or *by* him. The publ. tr. takes it in the former sense, assuming that our gift to Agni will trigger his own actions for us in pāda c, in the standard reciprocal model of Vedic sacrifice. Scar (293), in keeping with his interpr. of *nemānām* (see below), also thinks it’s a gift to Agni, but from others (“was [dir von anderen] geschenkt wird”). Re (see esp. his n. expanding his tr.) takes it as Agni’s gift to us, and I interpr. Ge’s “deine Schenkung” in the same fashion. In fact, either interpr. is possible, and the choice will be influenced by one’s interpr. of pāda c.

The stem *néma-*, cognate to Aves. *naēma-* ‘half’, is implicitly oppositional, picking out one moiety or side, or simply “some” out of a larger group. Here the unaccented gen. pl. *nemānām*, part of the voc. phrase headed by *vaso*, refers, in my view, to *our* side. This is clearly Ge’s view because he footnotes his slightly awk. “du Gott der einen Partei” with “Der Fromme oder Arier.” Other renderings are so awkward as to be almost unintelligible: Re “o Vasu, (dieu) de quelques-uns,” Klein (DGRV II.71) “o Vasu of some (races).” And Scar (293) takes it as referring to the opposition (“o du Vasu der andere”), which then requires Agni to do some amends-making in pāda c. I consider it extremely unlikely that the poet would address Agni, the focus of his praise, as a god of just *some* people, diluting his power and denying his omnipresence -- much less as a god of others. I might, however, slightly modify the publ. tr. from “on (our) side” to “of (our) side.”

At first glance pāda c, *átho dúvo vanavase*, with its middle voice seems to involve Agni’s winning *dúvas-* for himself. This would be compatible with the Ge/Re interpr. of pāda a: if Agni gives us a not insignificant gift in pāda a, he has a good chance of winning our *dúvas-* in c. However, the almost identical expression in the immediately preceding hymn, VI.15.6d *devó devéṣu vānate hí no dúvaḥ* “for the god will win friendship for us among the gods,” with the crucial loc. *devéṣu* and dat. of benefit *naḥ*, suggests that Agni is winning something on our behalf. Cf. also, in this hymn, VI.16.28 *agnír no vanate rayím* “Agni will win us wealth.”

The root \sqrt{van} ‘win’ is strongly represented in this hymn, esp. in the middle section. Here we have *vanavase*; elsewhere *vanvánn ávātaḥ* 20, *vanván* 26, *vanvāntaḥ* 27, *vanate* 28, as well as *vivāsasi* 12. This repetition cuts across *ṛca* boundaries.

VI.16.19: The “passive” aorist *agāmi* is a hapax and, in this context, a scrambling of adjacent *āgní(r)*.

VI.16.20: The root $\sqrt{dās}$ ‘piously serve’ almost never takes an acc. object of the service or offering (but see vs. 31 below); moreover, it almost exclusively has a mortal subject and a god as recipient of the piety. Here, however, we have the opposite situation: it is impossible to avoid taking Agni as subject and a very concrete *rayím* as acc. object, with the implied recipients being us mortals. The clue here may be the preverb, as *āti* $\sqrt{dās}$ in its other occurrence seems to mean something like ‘out-pious the pious’: *maghaír maghóno áti sūra dāsasi* “With your bounties you outdo the bounteous ones in piety, o champion [=Indra].” Although the case frame is not exactly the same, the nuance is similar: human patrons are bounteous, but Indra is super-bounteous. In our passage Agni provides wealth “beyond all earthly (goods).” I previously thought that “earthly goods” were simply those material things that have their origins on/in the earth rather than heaven, but it may well be more pointed than that here: “goods that are given by those who stem from/dwell on earth, that is, humans.” So Agni outdoes human givers by providing wealth in excess of all the goods they can supply. On ‘goods’ as the appropriate noun to supply with *vísuvā ... pāṛthivā*, cf. VI.45.20ab *sá hí vísvāni pāṛthivām̐, éko vásūni pátyate* as well as VI.59.9, IX.100.3, X.111.10.

VI.16.22: Pāda a contains a 2nd plural enclitic prn. and a plural voc. (*vaḥ sakhāyaḥ* “to/of you, o comrades”), while c has two 2nd singular imperatives (*árca gāya*). The discrepancy in number must reflect the common situation of a poet’s mixing address limited to himself with address to his colleagues and fellow ritual participants. So Ge (n. 22), and see my 2009 “Poetic Self-Reference in the *Rig Veda* and the Persona of Zarathustra,” BAI 19 (Fs. Skjaervø). Ge suggests without much enthusiasm that *árca gāya* could be shortened 1st sg. subjunctives (**árcā *gāyā*), evidently responding to Caland/Henry’s reading the verbs thus in their 1906 *L’Agniṣṭoma*, p. 428 (see Old, who likewise rejects it). It’s worth noting that VI.45.4 has the same configuration but with 2nd plural imperatives: *sákhāyaḥ ... , árcata prá ca gāyata* “o comrades, chant and sing forth ...” This parallel is adduced by Bl (RR) ad V.52.4, where he calls our verse “a scrappy stanza ...modelled after existing patterns” (that is, VI.45.4). The parallel is certain apposite, but I doubt that our number discrepancy is simply the result of our poet jumbling together scraps drawn from different sources.

VI.16.23: The injunc. *sīdat*, in conjunction with the acc. of extent of time *mānuṣā yugā* “through the human lifetimes,” seems almost to have shed the literal sense of the root \sqrt{sad} ‘sit’ in favor of expressing pure durativity (“who, through the human lifetimes, *has* (always) been ...”) -- though the immediately following *hótā* evokes the standard phrase for the installation of Agni as Hotar, with the full ‘sit’ clearly present if metaphorically meant. as in VI.1.2 *ádha hótā ny āsīdaḥ ...* (“then you sat down as Hotar”) in this Agni cycle. I rather imagine both senses are meant.

VI.16.25: Given the proximity of *ūrj-* ‘(solid) nourishment’ beginning c, *iṣayaté* in b might better be rendered in a manner closer to *iṣ-* ‘refreshment’ in the same semantic domain. So Ge “für die speisewünschenden Sterblichen,” Re “pour le mortel cherchant la jouissance.” I might suggest an alternative “... for the mortal seeking refreshment, / o child of nourishment.” What gives me pause, however, is *iṣáyantaḥ* in vs. 27 in the same trca, where the ‘prosper’ sense is favored. Although our dat. part. has accent on the ending, whereas *iṣáyantaḥ* has (secondary) “causative” accent, in fact oblique forms of -*áya*-participles seem regularly to have desinential accent: cf. *mahayaté* (VII.32.9) to *maháyati*, *kṛpayatáḥ* (VIII.46.16) to *kṛpáyati*. See disc. in my 1983 -*áya*-book, p. 49 with n. 3. Therefore these two nearby forms are likely to belong to the same stem and invite the same tr.

VI.16.26: The *krátu-* is presumably Agni’s; cf. vs. 23 *kavíkratuḥ* used of him. Ge tr. *krátvā* as “Mit dem Gedanken,” and takes the interior pādas bc as the directly quoted content of that thought. In addition to the aberrant tr. of *krátu-* (though one could tr. “with the intention”), this seems unnecessary. Although, as Ge notes, *krátvā* in IV.1.1 does introduce such direct speech, it is marked there by *íti*, and the circumstances there are different as well.

VI.16.29: This vs. ushers in a set of forms of *√bhṛ* (also vss. 36, 40, 41, 47, 48).

VI.16.30: Note the close sandhi effect in the voc. phrase *brahmaṇas kave*. As Ge points out, this pāda is a variant of I.18.3 *rākṣā ṇo brahmaṇas pate*, with the more usual head noun *pāti-*. Because it is part of a voc. phrase and such phrases show close sandhi effects elsewhere, this does not necessarily belong with the other instances of irregular sandhi of -s before *kaví-*, on which see comm. ad VII.18.2, though that may be a factor.

VI.16.31: I do not know what the *ā* ending the first pāda is doing. Sāy. takes it as preverb with *dāśati*, but this root doesn’t otherwise appear with *ā*, and pāda-final position is a strange place to put a preverb. There’s a pāda-final *ā* also in 35a, but it is easier to justify, as governing a locational acc.

I am disturbed by the usage of *dāśati* here; for another problematic form to this root, see disc. ad vs. 20 above. The example here describes not pious service but a hostile act exactly contrary to the standard usages of the root. It also deviates from the usual case frame (offer service to a god [DAT] with an offering vel sim. [INSTR]), though a few passages match ours by expressing the offering in the ACC, e.g., I.93.3 ... *yá āhutim*, *yó vāṃ dāśād dhavíṣkṛtim* “whoever will piously perform a poured offering or the preparation of an oblation for you.” Assuming the reading is correct, I think we must see this as a monstrous reversal: instead of piously offering an oblation (ACC) to a god (DAT), the evil mortal is impiously offering *us* (ACC), as a sort of oblation, to a weapon of death (DAT). The standard tr. (including mine) elide the shock of the use of this verb of ritual service in such a context, by tr. *√dāś* differently from usual. But I’m not sure how to remedy this in tr. without a lot of explanatory baggage. Perhaps “who will ‘piously’ offer us ...”?

Ge and Re take *tásmāt ... áṃhasaḥ* as a single NP “from that *áṃhas-*,” but this requires taking *yáḥ* in pāda a as an improper rel. for “when” (so Ge) or seeing the relation between ab and c as an anacoluthon (so Re), because their interpr. of c provides no referent for *yáḥ ... mártāḥ* in the dependent cl. This can all be fixed by separating the two abl. in the main clause, with *tásmāt* the correlative to *yáḥ*. Since the immediately preceding vs. (30) has exactly the structure envisioned for our c pāda -- two parallel ablatives, one *áṃhasaḥ* and the other referring to a person -- there is very local precedent.

VI.16.35: This vs. is syntactically incomplete (unless we take *sīdan* in c as a predicated pres. part., which seems unlikely, since this is a repeated pāda [=IX.32.4, IX.64.11]), but it works well as adjunct to the previous vs., 34.

Pāda a shows the preoccupation with kinship that is characteristic of Agni material. The paradox “father of his father” (*pitúṣ pitā* [note close sandhi effect]) probably reflects two themes -- 1) that the priest who kindles the fire is in some sense his/its father, but Agni the god has a fatherly relationship to his mortal worshipers, 2) that the offering fire (later called the *Āhavanīya*) is “taken out” of what is later called the *Gārhapatya* and is therefore in some sense its son, but the offering fire is more important than the other fires on the ritual ground and can therefore be considered their father.

The meaning ‘syllable’ for *akṣára-* is quite stable in later Skt., but in the RV it sometimes has its literal sense ‘imperishable’. Nonetheless in our passage I think ‘syllable’ is meant: the ritual fire is kindled when the hymn (here represented by the syllable) is recited. So, more or less, Ge “bei der (heiligen) Rede (?) aufleuchtend” (sim. Kü 250), though cf. Re “dans (l’espace) inépuissable.”

The pāda-final *ā* in c was mentioned above ad vs. 31, where it was pointed out that the occurrence here in 35c can easily be accounted for. *ā* frequently governs a preceding acc. (see collection in Gr., col. 169), and in fact *yónim ā* is found not only in this pāda and its repetitions (see above), but also in similar pādas in IX.61.21, 65.19).

VI.16.39: Unlike most *-hán-* cmpds, whose 1st member is the target of the smiting, in *śarya-hán-* the 1st member *śarya-* ‘arrow’ must be in an instr. relationship with the 2nd (see Scar 693), like *muṣṭi-hán* ‘smiting with the fist(s)’. Because “like a powerful shooter with arrows / one who shoots arrows” is exceptionally awkward in English, I’ve substituted ‘sharpshooter’, though it interferes with the *tigmá-* in *tigmá-śṛṅga-* ‘sharp-horned’ in the next pāda.

VI.16.40: The simile marker *ná* is wrongly placed in pāda b, for no obvious reason.

The two comparanda to Agni -- a bangle in the hand, a newborn babe, both carried -- suggest that this is the newly kindled fire, probably the offering fire, being taken out of the householder’s fire and carried to the east.

VI.16.41: This impression about vs. 40 is supported by vs. 41.

VI.16.42: However, the waters are somewhat muddled by vs. 42. The loc. *jātávedasi* (the only such form in the RV) is puzzling, since *jātávedas-* is one of the standard epithets of Agni and the accusatives in the vs. clearly refer to Agni as well. Thus we must be dealing with two fires. This idea would be perfectly compatible with the scenario I suggested for

vs. 40 -- *except* that acc. *grhapátim* in pāda c suggests that the newly born fire being “whetted” is not the offering fire (later to be called the Āhavanīya) taken out of the old fire and moved to its new location, but rather what will come to be called the Gārhapatya. The (later) ritual complex that our passage most resembles is the creation of the Mahāvedi (see my Hyenas, p. 89, *inter alia*), in which the old Āhavanīya of the standard ritual ground is moved further to the east during the creation of the Mahāvedi, and the old Āhavanīya becomes the Gārhapatya. Thus it seems that vss. 40–41 concern the further displacement of the Āhavanīya fire and 42 depicts the resettlement of the original householder’s fire onto the place the Āhavanīya occupied in the more restricted ritual ground. This may be Ge’s view; see his n. 41ab, where he refers to the *agnipranayana*, which is the technical term for carrying the Āhavanīya to the Uttaravedi in the animal sacrifice (see Sen, Dict. of Vedic Rituals, s.v.; Caland-Henry, Agniṣṭoma pp. 78–79). However, his n. 42 goes in a different direction. If this really does concern the creation of the Mahāvedi from the ordinary ritual ground, we would have evidence for this degree of elaboration already in (late) Rigvedic ritual.

VI.16.43: The *hí* in the impv. clause is somewhat disturbing, since there is no following impv. in this vs. to which the *hí* impv. clause could serve as basis. However, 44a contains two impvs. that logically follow the *yukṣvā* ‘yoke!’ -- namely *yāhi ā vaha* “drive and convey here!” and so the usual use of *hí* in impv. clauses can be seen here, across two vss.

VI.16.44: The very compressed pāda b could be elucidated with “... for (them=gods) to pursue (them=offerings).” There are numerous parallels that establish this as the intention.

VI.16.47: Bloomfield (ad V.6.5) proposes tr. our passage “We bring ... oblation with song fashioned in the mind,” suggesting that “the cases of *ṛcā* and *havīḥ* are inverted.” This is certainly true at the level of deep-structure formula: *hṛdā taṣṭá-* “fashioned by the heart” normally modifies a verbal product, e.g., I.171.2 *stómo hṛdā taṣṭáh*. But, as so often, the poet is playing with our expectations by producing a twist on the standard phraseology.

VI.16.47–48: This long hymn (or the short final *ṛca*) seems to end with a buried poetic signature: 47b ends with *bharāmasi*, 48c with *vājínā*, the last word of the hymn. Together they are the elements that make up the poet’s name Bharadvāja.

VI.17 Indra

This hymn is marked by clusters of localized repetitions and echoes; see disc. below.

VI.17.1–3: These first three vss. form something of a unity. Each begins with a “drink!” imperative (1a *pībā sómam*, 2a *sá im pāhi*, 3a *evā pāhi*), and each contains the lexeme *abhí √tṛd* ‘drill through to’. As outlined below, it is a pleasingly designed rhetorical structure, whose balance and contrast only become evident after conscious analysis.

VI.17.1: Ge (flg Gr, fld. by Schmidt, B+I, 144) takes *yám* as obj. of *abhí* and referring to *sómam* in the opening impv. phrase (“Drink the soma, towards which ...”). As Old points out (both ZDMG 55.319–20 and Noten), this entails either that the soma is within the cow enclosure or at least that breaking into the cow enclosure is a necessary auxiliary action for getting or preparing the soma -- which is, of course, not a standard part of the Vala myth. Old therefore emends the text, from *yám* to **yáh*, producing parallel rel. clauses concerning the Vala myth and the Vṛtra myth respectively, with Indra the subject of both, represented by **yáh*. But how would this corruption arise? Old suggests that **yáh* (**yá* in this sandhi context) was changed to *yám* because it immediately follows *abhí*, but it is hard to conceive of a Rigvedic poet who could be misled by a separable preverb, esp. since the 2nd hemistich has a supposedly parallel rel. cl. containing *yáh*, likewise following a preverb (*ví*). I agree with Old that Ge’s interpr. is unlikely, but I do not think this requires changing the text. Instead I think *píbā sómam* is an abrupt hortatory opening, essentially detached from the rest of the vs., and I take the *yám* as referring to the *ūrvām gávyam*. This whole clause anticipates the imperatival main clauses that end the next vss., 2d *sá indra citrāṁ abhí tṛndhi vājān* and 3d ... *abhí gā indra tṛndhi*, both with *abhí √tṛd* and an obj. that refers to the contents of the cattle enclosure. My interpr. requires the rel. cl. of 1ab to float in syntactic suspension till it is resolved in 2d, with a number of other things going on in between -- mostly rel. clauses with Indra as subject, but I do not think this is much to ask of a Rigvedic audience. In fact, I think that the rel. cl. in 1ab is the initial marker of the ring structure that prevails in these three vss.

In d Ge suggests that *vṛtrām* is a “collective singular” and should be construed with neut. pl. *vísṣvā amitríyā*, tr. “alle feindseligen Vṛtra’s.” I see no advantage to ignoring the number, and the passages he adduces as parallel do not impose the notion of “collective singular.”

VI.17.2: Again I think the “drink!” imperative is semi-detached from the rest of the vs., a mere interruption of the sequence of rel. clauses with Indra as subj., which begins with a fully realized clause in 1cd and continues in 2abc with a set of five compressed definitional nominal clauses with an izafe-like feel.

VI.17.3: The “drink!” sequence is brought to an end with a summary *evā* in 3a. The verse continues with a series of 7 choppy imperatival clauses, all but the first (*māndatu tvā*) with Indra as subj., which balance the choppy nominal relative clauses of vs. 2. The last of these clauses is the third iteration of *abhí √tṛd*, with which we began.

VI.17.3–5ab: *māndatu tvā* in 3a inaugurates a 3-vs. sequence chained together by the root *√ma(n)d* ‘exhilarate’, a sequence whose 1st vs. (3) overlaps with the last vs. of the initial triad. The other representatives also occur in the 1st pāda: *mādāḥ* in 4a and *mandasānāḥ* in 5a. Cf. also *matsarāsaḥ* in 4d. The conceptual unity of the sequence is underlined by the fact that 5ab is a rel. clause that must hang off the previous vs. The 2nd hemistich of 5 marks a sharp break.

VI.17.6: This last vs. of the Vala section reprises *ūrvām gávyam* from 1b with *ūrvāḍ gāḥ* in 6b, both immediately pre-caesura, producing a ring. Thus, the supposedly problematic

rel. cl. of lab participates in two rings in this brief 6-vs. section, with different parts of the clause in play in the two rings. See disc. ad vs. 1.

VI.17.7-10: An initial phonological sequence unifies this set of vss.: from the 2nd half of 7 through the 1st half of 10, every hemistich begins with *ádḥ* (or the variants *ád* and *áh*): 7c *ádḥā(rayo)*, 8a *ádha*, 8c *ád(eva)*, 9a *ádha*, 9c *áh(im)*, 10a *ádha*.

VI.17.7: Both Old (ZDMG 55.320 and Noten) and Ge (fld. by Klein DGRV II.92–93) strongly argue that *paprātha* belongs to \sqrt{prath} ‘spread’, not $\sqrt{prā}$ ‘fill’, to which Gr assigns it. I find their insistence puzzling. On their side, *ví* \sqrt{prath} is a fairly common lexeme, used often of the earth, whereas *ví* is rare to non-existent with $\sqrt{prā}$. But the actual verb form is wrong for all sorts of reasons. First, the indic. pf. of \sqrt{prath} is otherwise only middle, but this would be act. Second, the root \sqrt{prath} never otherwise has vr̥ddhi forms, but the root syllable here is *prāth*. Then, if it is a 3rd sg. (so Ge “Er breitete ...”), it opens a cosmogonic sequence of 2nd sg. expressions, and such formulaic cosmogonies tend to be consistent in ps. and no. (though see 9cd below). Recognizing this last problem, Old suggests it’s a 2nd sg., standing for **paprath-tha* > **papraththa*, with the heavy syllable **atth* redistributing metrical weight [not his terminology] to *āth*. This type of change would not be unusual in Middle Indic, but it would have been useful to provide parallel examples in the Rīg Veda. Moreover, since \sqrt{prath} is a set root, we should in any case expect a 2nd sg. **paprathitha*. The only factor on their side of the ledger is the preverb, and since our poet no doubt playfully recognized that the form would evoke \sqrt{prath} , it is not surprising that he would import the preverb. Unambiguous perfect forms to $\sqrt{prā}$ ‘fill’ frequently take the earth as obj. as here (e.g., III.30.11 *índra ā paprau pṛthivīm utá dyām*), which makes the Old/Ge intransigence all the more surprising.

In pāda a *māhi dáṃsaḥ* interrupts the obj. phrase *ksām ... urvīm*. Ge’s nominal phrase “— ein grosses Meisterstück—” is less disruptive than my nominal clause “great is your wondrous skill,” and might be preferable on those grounds.

VI.17.8: As Ge points out, the non-god (*ádeva-*) is presumably Vṛtra. This identification is clinched by the fact that the verb here, *áuhiṣṭa* ‘vaunted himself’ ($\sqrt{uh/oh}$), reappears in the (pseudo-)participle *óhasāna-* modifying *áhi-* ‘serpent’ in the next vs. (9c).

In d the pres. *vr̥ṇate* is a bit surprising in this mythological narrative.

VI.17.9: The word and particle order of the 1st hemistich seems designed to produce despair in those of us who seek (and believe in) principles and rules for such ordering: *ádha dyaúś cit te ápa sã nú vájṛād, dvitānamat ...* seems randomly to scatter nouns, pronouns, and particles through the first pāda. However, I think that my interpr. of the first pāda imposes more rationality on the sequence than Ge’s does and also eliminates at least one further problem. Note first the preverb *ápa* in the middle of the 1st pāda, though preverbs in tmesis (as this is, from *anamāt* in b) usually move to metrical boundaries. [It is true that it appears directly after the caesura, but generally a preverb in tmesis takes this position only when the verb is in the same pāda, or such is my impression.] Note, moreover, the apparent doubling of the subject *dyaúḥ* with the pronoun *sã* likewise in the middle of the same pāda, directly after the preverb. Note finally that after a beginning

that seems to conform fairly well to Rigvedic word-order norms (extraclausal introductory *ádha*, noun+emphatic ptcl *dyaúś cid*, enclitic prn. in modified 2nd position *te*), the clause seems to begin over again: preverb *ápa*, prn. *sā* (curiously, fem. *sā* seems more inclined to 2nd position than masc. *sá*), modified 2nd pos. ptcl. *nú*. Ge's tr. simply ignores this stuttering start ("Da wick selbst der Himmel von deiner Keule ..."), and he also doesn't comment on the fact that his interpr. implicitly requires *dyaúh* to be picked up by a fem. prn.: Gr lists this passage as one where that noun has fem. gender. Although 'heaven' sometimes does seem to be fem., such passages are rarer than Gr makes out, and this example would be esp. striking because there's no reason for *dyaúh* to be doubled by a pronoun in the first place, whatever its gender.

I think both problems can be solved by assuming that *sā* actually adds a second referent to the clause; in context with 'heaven' this would obviously be the fem. 'earth' (generally *prthivī*-, but perhaps here, because of their joint presence in 7ab, *kṣā*-). No Rigvedic audience would need further specification, once the feminine gender of the referent was established. By this interpr. the post-caesura sequence *ápa sā nú* ... is not an awkward redo of the 1st half of the pāda, but introduces a parallel subject to *dyaúh*, more clearly distinguished from 'heaven' than in the usual dual dvandva formulation. The separation of the two subjects is, in my opinion, signaled by *dvitā* 'yet again' beginning the next pāda; I render it here as "likewise also." The parallels adduced by Ge (IV.17.2, I.80.11, II.12.13, V.32.9) actually support my interpr. because all four of them depict *both* heaven and earth (or in the case of the last, the two world-halves) trembling in fear of Indra.

Alternatively, MLW suggests (p.c.) that *dyaúh* could have fem. gender here because of its unmanly behavior in flinching away from Indra's weapon. Restarting with *sā* would emphatically draw attention to this gender switch: "Then even Heaven, really a *she* ..." This is clever, but I still prefer my own solution.

Flg. Ge ("... dass er für alle Zeit erlag"), I take *śayáthe* here as a quasi-infinitive expressing purpose with *jaghāna*; in this function it seems directly parallel to *śayáthāya* in the next hymn (VI.18.8), to the same stem. Unfortunately they must then be in different cases, the dative, understandably, in VI.18.8, the loc., less understandably, here. However much I would like to, I cannot find a way to make our *śayáthe* a dative, there being no athematic stem **śayáth-*. We could, of course, interpr. the locative as a real expression of location: "struck down the serpent in his lair," but not only am I reluctant to lose the semantic connection with VI.18.8, but the acc. extent of time *viśvāyuh* 'for a full lifespan' only makes sense with the verbal interpr. of *śayáthe* 'to lie'.

Despite Gr and Lub, a number of *viśvāyuh* forms, which they assign to the stem *viśvāyu-* and therefore interpr. as nom. sg. masc., must have the 2nd member *āyus-* and therefore be nom./acc. sg. neut., often used as an adverbial indication of extent of time as here (so Ge's tr. as well; see above). See AiG II.2.479. I concede that it would be possible to take the form as a nom. here — "when Indra, having a full lifespan, struck down the serpent ..." — with Indra's full lifespan implicitly contrasting with Vṛtra's death, but I find the extent-of-time adverbial more compelling. And in a passage like I.68.5 *viśvāyur viśve āpāmsi cakruḥ* "all have performed their tasks lifelong," the plural subject rules out a nom. sg. interpr. for *viśvāyuh*. Although the stem *viśvāyu-* certainly exists, it has a doublet with final *-s-*, exactly like the simplex pair *āyu-/āyus-*.

Assuming the correctness of the above disc. of *viśvāyuh*, Vṛtra's fate, "to lie there for a full lifespan," is somewhat ironic, since he's dead: he will spend his full lifespan dead.

VI.17.10: With Old I assume an underlying *mahé*, contra Pp. *maháh*, despite Ge's doubts (n. 10b).

The morphological identity of *vavṛtat* isn't at all clear. Gr calls it a "Conj." aor.; Whitney seems to suggest a subj. to a redupl. pres. Lub identifies it as a "[RED.AOR.inj.(them.)]." A pf. subj. makes the most formal sense, save for the zero-grade root syllable, but a subjunctive would be out of place in this mythological passage. Kü (460) treats our form as a "Sonderfall" and calls it a thematic injunctive, expressing an action prior to that of the verb *sám piṇak* in d. Since, in his view, this same anterior value is expressed by the impf. of the caus. (*ávartayat* in I.85.9), he calls our form an "Oppositionsbildung zum Kausativ," whatever that means, but ultimately gives up on determining its morphological identity. I agree that the form cannot functionally be a subjunctive and am willing to accept that it is a nonce injunctive -- but this is a description, not an explanation. Note the pf. opt. *vavṛtyāt* in 13d, whose redupl. profile *vavṛt-* matches that of this form.

As for what the clause expresses, I assume that Tvaṣṭar is manufacturing the *vájra*- by turning it on a lathe or lathe-like device. (The internet tells me that the lathe dates back to antiquity, with good evidence from ancient Egypt, but it is difficult to know how much to trust this.) Alternatively, but less likely in my view, Tvaṣṭar is displaying it to Indra by turning it here and there to allow its spikes and edges to glint in the light.

The other verb form in this vs., *sám piṇak* in d, also presents difficulties, because, despite being in a relative cl., it is unaccented. I have no explanation for the failure to accent (nor does Old, I'd point out). Of course, one can note the unusual position of the rel. prn. *yéna*, at the end of pāda c as the first word of the subord. clause that otherwise occupies d, with the rel. prn. intervening between the acc. sg. masc. phrase *níkāmam arámanasam* that modifies the *vájram* of the main cl. and the acc. sg. masc. phrase *návantam áhim* that provides the object of the rel. cl. But Rigvedic poets are unlikely to be thrown by this positioning. It is also noteworthy that pāda c as it stands has only 10 syllables; Old suggests that we might read *iéna* to round out the Triṣṭubh, which would be unprecedented in the rel. prn., as far as I know. Pāda c is also unusual in having 5 light syllables in a row: (*níkā*)*mam arámana(saṃ yéna)*, and indeed, were we to read *i'éna*, this would rise to 7. Since *arámanasa-* is a hapax and it participates in a metrically disturbed sequence, it may be that the pāda is somehow corrupt. But no way of fixing any of this comes to mind.

On the retroflex *ṇ* in *piṇak*, see Old, ZDMG 55.321.

VI.17.11: For Agni as the subj. of *pácat* and cooker of the buffaloes, see V.29.7–8 adduced by Ge and Old, ZDMG 55.321.

In the 2nd hemistich we have only two expressed subjects, Pūṣan and Viṣṇu, but a plural verb *dhāvan*. The obvious solution, as seen by all, is to assume that other gods participated in this action.

The question is -- what action? The verb is generally assigned to *√dhāv* 'run'. Gr gives a transitive-causative value to this stem in this passage and this passage alone (Gr

“jemandem [D.] etwas [A.] zuströmen”); Ge follows this trans. interpr.: “... liessen für ihn den ... (Soma)stengel ... strömen,” and indeed interprets another passage as having this value (IX.54.2). However, since all other acc. with $\sqrt{dhāv}$ are goals to an intrans. verb of motion, this contextual adjustment is unacceptable. Gotō (1st Klasse, 183 and n. 325) disputes both of Ge’s trans. interpretations and fixes this passage by dividing the two pādas into two clauses. The first has an acc. goal *sārāṃsi* (“...eilen zu den drei [Soma]seen”), which seems reasonable (indeed cf. IX.54.2 *ayām sārāṃsi dhāvati*), but he must supply a verb (‘gave’) out of thin air to make pāda d to work: “[sie geben] ihm den Vṛtratötenden, berauschenden Somastengel.” The problem can be solved by assigning the verb to the other root $\sqrt{dhāv}$ ‘rinse’, part of the standard vocabulary of soma preparation. VIII.2.25 (*ā dhāvata ... sōmaṃ vīrāya*) presents an exactly parallel construction with soma as acc. obj. and the recipient, Indra, in the dat. Moreover, ‘rinse’ would add a complementary food-preparation term to \sqrt{pac} ‘cook’ in pāda b, with both solid and liquid nourishment thus covered, whereas ‘run’ is a bit of a non sequitur. The only thing that gives me pause is X.113.2 *tām asya viṣṇur mahimānam ójasā, aṃśúm dadhanvān ...*, where we have Viṣṇu, the *aṃśú*, and an undoubted ‘run’ (to the separate root $\sqrt{dhan[v]}$). But this late passage does not seem to me sufficient to outweigh the fact that a ‘rinse’ interpr. here allows the hemistich to be a single syntactic unit and forestalls the need to supply a verb for d out of nowhere.

VI.17.12: In d *apásah* ‘busy, industrious’ (Ge’s fleissig) is, of course, a pun on the ‘water’ word, whose acc. pl. is *apás*.

VI.17.14: I take the construction $\sqrt{dhā}$ ACC [anim.] ACC.ADJ -*mant*/-*vant*- to mean “provide someone (X) with something (Y),” lit. “establish X as possessing (-*mant*/-*vant*-) Y.” The datives of ab are then further objects to aspire to: once the poets have brilliance, they can use that brilliance, which transforms into poems, in pursuit of more worldly goals, the prize, etc. This interpr. essentially follows Ge’s.

VI.18 Indra

VI.18.1: This vs. contains two pairs of positive/negative etymological figures, both consisting of a pres. participle with “active” value (though one of them is morphologically middle) and a negated past part.: *vanvánn ávātaḥ* “vanquishing but unvanquished” and *āṣālham ... sáhamānam* “conquering but unconquered.” It may not be an accident that the root syllables in each pair, though related by standard derivational processes, are quite distinct because of morphophonemic changes: *van* / *vā* and *sah* / *ṣālh*.

VI.18.2: On unclear *khaja*- see comm. ad VII.20.3.

VI.18.3: The sequence 2ND SG. PRN *ha tyád* (here *ha nú tyád*) is fairly common and appears to be strongly emphatic, hence my tr. “it was just you” (etc.). In several hymns (I.63.4–7, VIII.96.16–18) this construction is found in series.

I take the fronted *ásti* followed by *svid* to be a strong existential “does it exist?” rather than simply the possessive constr. that Ge sees: “Hast du ... diese Manneskrafte ...?”

For *tád ṛtuthā ví vocaḥ* see the nearly identical phrase in X.28.5 and the disc. of the lexeme *ví* √*vac* at X.11.2. I argue there that it means ‘provide a decisive answer to a question’, and a question has certainly been posed here.

VI.18.4: The fronted *ásti* in the previous vs. is matched by equally emphatic, fronted *sád íd*. Although Ge takes *sát* as the modifier of the *sáhaḥ* that begins the next pāda, I think instead that it answers the question posed in 3cd and therefore implicitly modifies *vīryām* in 3c. This is then further specified as *sáhaḥ* beginning in b, which then is qualified by the adjectives *ugrām* and *tāvīyaḥ* in c.

The last three pādas of the vs. are a veritable riot of etymological figures, with two each in b and c and one in d: b *sáhaḥ sahiṣṭha turatás turásya*, c *ugrām ugrásya tavásas tāvīyaḥ*, d *áradhrasya radhratúraḥ* ... The 2nd member of this last cmpd, *-tur-*, belongs etymologically with the 2nd figure of b, *turatás turásya*, though unfortunately since it’s used in a somewhat different sense, this connection cannot easily be conveyed in translation. Similarly, the 2nd figure of c, *tavásas tāvīyaḥ*, picks up the *tuvi-* of the cmpd in a, *tuvi-jātá-*. So, in addition to the juxtaposed linear figures, there is some interweaving across pāda boundaries.

VI.18.5: As the opening words of pāda b, *itthā vādadbhiḥ*, indicate, the previous pāda is the direct speech of the Aṅgirasas. In keeping with the two immediately preceding vss., I take *astu* as an existential: “let that partnership (still) exist.” The wording is otherwise very like IV.10.8 *śivā naḥ sakhyā sántu ... devéṣu yuṣmé*. The clear loc. *devéṣu* in that passage anchors the loc. identity of *yuṣmé* both in that passage and this one. The loc. is somewhat odd: generally *sakhyá-* is construed with gen. or instr., as already set forth by Gr s.v. However, cf. VII.22.9 (=X.23.7), which also contains a pl. ps. prn. in *-e*: *asmé te santu sakhyā śivāni*. In the publ. tr. I take the *asmé* there as a dat.: “Let there be friendly fellowship of you for us.” But in light of the two parallel structures with *yuṣmé*, I think it must be a loc., and these three passages, each of which is rendered differently in the publ. tr., should be harmonized. I now think that all three are existential (although the two with *śivá-* could be equational, with a pred. adj.) and that the loc. specifies the locus of the partnership, either in or “bei” the pronominal referent. Though this is functionally equivalent to “with,” as in the publ. tr., I would slightly modify the tr. to better reflect the loc.: “Let there (still) be age-old partnership for us among you,” though “... with you” would in fact be clearer.

The placement of *valám* in the middle of the instr. phrase in b, with its governing verb (*hán*) not found till c, is somewhat odd, but see comm. ad vs. 8 below.

Presumably the Vala cave is “prospering” because it is full of cows. On the accent of *iṣáyantam* here, see my *-áya-*Formations, p. 49 and n. 3.

The positive active / negative passive figure found twice in vs. 1 is here embodied in the single word, the root-noun cmpd voc. *acyuta-cyut-* ‘shaker of the unshakable’.

VI.18.6: The vs. contains 3 coreferential *sá*, at the beg. of a and of c and in the middle of c. I have interpr. the first half of c as belonging with ab, with the loc. *tokásātā tánaya* parallel to loc. *mahatí vṛtratūrye* in b and the mid-pāda *sá* in c introducing a new cl. Others (Ge, Schaef., Intens. 126) take all of c with d. There is no way to determine and very little riding on it. However, see the comm. on the next vs.

The *hí* in pāda a seems to have little or no causal value; similarly the one in 4a.

Although the overt *ásti* reminds us of the other overt forms of *√as* in previous vss. (3, 4, 5), which were (at least by my lights) existential, *ásti* here seems to be a straight copula and therefore pleonastic.

In *tokásātā tánaye* we can assume that *tánaye* shows a kind of gapping of the 2nd cmpd member found in *toká-sāti-*, hence a putative **tánaya-sāti-*. Ge's cited parallels, e.g., II.30.5 *tokásya sātaú tánayasya ...*, confirm this.

VI.18.7: This vs. continues the overabundance of *sá* from the last vs., esp. in the 2nd hemistich, with initial *sá* and post-caesura *sá* in c and initial *sá* in d, in addition to the one opening the vs. Each of these *sá* is associated with a different instr. phrase or phrases. The one in the first hemistich has the capacious bipartite *majmánā ... ámartyena nāmnā* embedded in a full clause with the verb *prá sarsre*; the two in pāda c occur only with instrumentals (*dyumnéna* in the opening and the conjoined *śávasotá rāyā* after the caesura); the one in d has only a single instr. (*vīryèṇa*) but is part of a clause again, though with a pred. adj. *sámokaḥ*, not a finite verb. Since the structure of this vs. is like that of vs. 6, the question again arises as to where to attach c (or the two parts of c). Flg. Ge I take all of c with d, construing all the instrumentals with *sámokaḥ* 'at home (with)'. But I now see that, because the structures in c are minimal, it could as well go with ab (or the first half with ab, the second with d). This would produce alternative translations "Through his greatness and his immortal name he extended himself, (and also) through his brilliance and his power and wealth. He is at home with heroism." or even "Through his greatness and his immortal name he extended himself, (and also) through his brilliance; he is at home with power and wealth and with heroism." (This last, with the first part of c leaning backward and the 2nd leaning forward, would mimic my interpr. of vs. 6.) Again I do not see a way to decide the question, but I think it's worth noting how the poet has cleverly constructed pāda c so that it is ambig.

VI.18.8: As Ge points out (n. 8b), the role of Cumuri and Dhuni in the RV is to be put to sleep by Indra, so that Dabhīti can deliver the coup de grâce to them. See the various passages adduced by Ge and esp. nearby VI.26.6. In our vs. they are marooned at the end of the first hemistich, and after an initial verb in c another set of Indra's victims is introduced: Pipru, Śambara, and Śuṣṇa. Ge asks whether we should assume an ellipsis with the Cumuri/Dhuni phrase (in other words, supply a form of "put to sleep") or a zeugma (in other words, to take them as objects of *vṛṇák* with the Pipru group, though their fates were met in different ways). I have chosen the 2nd option. The audience would certainly know the particular destiny of Cumuri and Dhuni but would also be able to lump them in with other targets of Indra, all as objects of a generically violent verb. (It may be worth noting that *vṛṇák* here is one of the very few forms of *√vṛj* that lacks a preverb, though cf. nearby VI.26.3.) The segregation of Cumuri and Dhuni in pāda b, away from the verb and the other victims, might give us pause, but cf. vs. 5, where the obj. *valám* is found in the interior of pāda b, with the verb beginning c.

In d the datives *cyautnāya* and *śayáthāya* have parallel infinitival function. For the latter cf. also *śayáthe* in the preceding hymn (VI.17.9, with disc. ad loc.) with the same apparent meaning but in a different case.

VI.18.9: *udāvātā* is read *udāvatā* by the Pp. and is generally considered the instr. of the pres. act. part. of *úd √av* ‘help’, with metrical lengthening (so explicitly Lub), a lengthening that is unmotivated. It is also the case that *úd* is not especially common with *√av*, though I concede that the six passages I’m aware of make this an established usage. I also find it surprising that there is no preverb with *tiṣṭha* in the expression in b, *rātham ... tiṣṭha* “mount the chariot,” since this expression is almost always found with preverb, generally *ā*, also *ádhi*. I therefore wonder if the initial string in pāda a is actually concealing the preverb(s), in tmesis: *ud-ā*, followed by the uncompounded pres. part. *āvatā*. This analysis is responsible for my tr. “up and mount ...” I realize, however, that a number of objections can be raised. The combination *ud-ā* doesn’t otherwise occur with *√sthā*, but I would point out that both occur with that root individually. Two further potential problems: 1) two preverbs next to each other in tmesis, rather than the usual single one. I confess I do not know of other examples. 2) the accentuation: the accented vowels of *ā* and *āvatā* would coalesce, resulting in a single udātta -- this is unproblematic -- but the lack of accent on *ud* looms larger. Here I rely on Macdonell’s observation (VGS, p. 469) that when *ā* is immediately preceded by another preverb, *ā* alone has the accent. In Macdonell’s formulation this applies (only) to these sequences when compounded with verbs; I would here extend that to the same sequence in tmesis. This may be too much machinery to deploy simply in order to account for the surprising, supposed metrical lengthening of *udāvātā* and the surprising lack of preverb with *tiṣṭha*, but it seems worth considering. Alternatively, it could be that *udāvātā* is a compounded pres. part., but compounded not only with *úd*, but also *ā*. This is the solution of Rivelex (I.541), and it may be the best compromise, though *ā* is not otherwise found with *√av*, as far as I know. (I have not been able to find the *ā + √av* claimed by Rivelex in the head note on p. 538, and in the claimed *prā ā* passage (VIII.23.2), *ā* is a postposition, as is more or less admitted p. 543 n. 1.)

The *ca* in the instr. phrase in pāda a seems pleonastic, and if it is implicitly connecting the two adj. modifying *tvákṣasā*, viz. *āvatā* (or *udāvātā*) and *pányasā* (Klein DGRV I.71 “aiding and wondrous”), they seem ill-assorted semantically. I wonder if it is meant to connect the first ADJ.-NOUN pair with a 2nd, with gapping of the noun modified by *pányasā* (“with your helpful energy and ever more admirable X”). But there is no standard *pányas-* NOUN formula, so I will not pursue this.

In d Old (Noten) and Ge assume that the *māyāḥ* are negative magical wiles that belong to Indra’s opponents. A negative valuation of *māyā-* is of course common, and is clear in the nearby passage VI.22.9, where a pāda almost identical to our c, urging Indra to take his mace in hand, precedes one in which he is urged to destroy *māyāḥ* (VI.22.9cd *dhiṣvá vájraṃ dáksina indra háste, víśvā ajurya dayase ví māyāḥ*) -- though see comm. ad loc: a secondary positive reading is also possible. This parallel is an important piece of evidence for both Old’s and Ge’s assessment of *māyāḥ* here. However, this reasonable interpr. ignores one major factor in our passage: the verb *abhí prá manda*. This lexeme occurs a number of times elsewhere (V.4.1, VII.33.1, VIII.12.13, 93.19), and it is always otherwise positive: act. ‘exhilarate’, mid. ‘become exhilarated’. A negative interpr. of *māyāḥ* requires a serious distortion of the meaning of the verb (e.g., Old’s ‘verwirren’, adopted from BR), whereas assuming the *māyāḥ* belong to Indra allows it to have a small extension of its usual sense: ‘exhilarate’ → ‘stimulate’. Just as soma exhilarates and stimulates Indra for the Vṛtra-smashing, so does Indra exhilarate and stimulate his own

powers. Old in fact previously (ZDMG 55.323) made a good case that the *māyāḥ* are Indra's, third in a list of his Kampfmittel that includes the chariot of b and the mace of c, and he suggested a tr. "Setze deine Wunderkräfte in freudige Erregung" very much like mine. He attributes his change of heart in the Noten to VI.22.9 just cited and to his consideration of "Der Gesamteindruck des Auftretens von *māyāḥ* in den Indraliedern." But, in fact, he overlooked one very crucial occurrence, in this very hymn: in vs. 12 Indra himself is called *purumāyā-* 'having many magical powers' [or, as I now would tr., 'uncanny powers' / 'wiles'] (cf. also nearby VI.21.2 and 22.1 in this same Indra cycle, also III.51.4). This seems to me clinching evidence against the Ge/Old interpr. of our d: Indra has many *māyā-* and he deploys them to achieve his ends. (Gotō [1st Kl., 236 n. 521] finds the passage puzzling, but does try to reconcile it with the usage of the verb, not entirely successfully.)

VI.18.10: The imagery is somewhat mixed here: it is hard to see how either a missile (nom. *aśāniḥ*) or a lance (instr. *hetī* [contra Pp. *hetīḥ*, as seen already by Gr etc.]) can *burn down* anything. I assume it's a transferred visual image from the fire simile, since flames can have a lance-like shape and shoot out dramatically.

The fem. instr. adj. phrase *gambhīrāya ṛṣvāyā* lacks an overt referent. Ge supplies *Stimme* without disc. In the absence of any obvious choices, I follow Gr in assuming *hetī* from pāda b. Neither *ṛṣvā-* nor *gambhīrā-* has a standard fem. referent.

The obj. of *rurōja* is likewise unexpressed. Ge supplies *Burgen* (*púrah*, a common obj. of this verb), but (n. 10cd) suggests that *rākṣaḥ* from b is also possible. Since the *yó rurōja* rel. clause of c is picked up by the main cl. of d, I instead supply *duritā*, which is the obj. of the conjoined verbs of d. Elsewhere *duritā* is the obj. of *√han* (IX.62.2, 90.6, 97.16), a verb semantically similar to *√ruj*.

VI.18.11: Gr takes the referent of *yásya* as 'wealth' (see col. 1114, s.v. *yótu-*). But it is far more likely that it is Indra, whom we are urging to come here -- and whose arrival might be threatened by the actions of the ungodly man. (It is not possible to determine from Ge's tr. ("den") what he thinks the referent is.) The relationship between *yāhí* and *yótoḥ* might be clearer if the rel. clause were tr. "... never has the power to keep away."

On *yótoḥ* see now also Keydana (Inf., 77–78), who does not consider it a true infinitive. He takes *yásya* simply as the determiner of a gen. action noun *yótu-*. I am more inclined to see *yótuḥ* as an infinitive, and therefore consider *yásya* as an example of "attraction" to the case of the infinitive from an underlying obj. **yām*. The dative to the same stem does function as an infinitive and takes acc. rection: VIII.71.15 *agním dvēṣo yótavai no grṇīmasi* (cf. VIII.18.5 *dvēṣāmsi yótave*).

VI.18.12: I would now change "magic powers" to "uncanny powers."

VI.18.13: This vs. is structurally reminiscent of vs. 8. Like there, we have a clause occupying the first pāda (both ending in *bhūt / bhūt*, as it happens), with (most of) b belonging to a different but radically incomplete clause, containing a marooned set of accusative PNs whose fate at the hands of Indra is well known. Pāda c continues with other accusative victims of Indra, but also provides a verb to govern them. In both vss. the names in the b clause have a well-known and quite specific outcome at Indra's hands:

Cumuri and Dhuni in 8b were put to sleep by Indra, to weaken them for a death blow administered by someone else; as for our vs., acdg. to I.53.10 Indra made Kutsa, Āyu, and Atithigva subject (*arandhanāyaḥ*) to Tūrvayāṇa, who also appears by name in our pāda d. In both 8b and 13b the publ. tr. follows the same strategy: co-opting the verb in c (*vṛṇák* in 8, *ní śísāḥ* in 13) to govern not only the accusatives in its own pāda but also those in pāda b. This is syntactically a bit more complex in our vs. because b is a relative clause (with *yád*) so the unaccented verb of c cannot be applied to it directly. I still think this is the correct strategy in 8 and probably also here as well, but the presence of dat. *asmai* in b along with its likely referent *tūrvayāṇam* in d makes me wonder if Ge (n. 13b) may be right in simply supplying the verb found in the very phrase in I.53.10 *tvám asmai kútsam atithigvám āyúm, ... arandhanāyaḥ*, despite the isolation of that passage and its distance from ours. (Alternatively we could use *árdayaḥ*, which governs the same three names in VIII.53.2, but there is no dat. there; and it is likewise isolated and distant.) Old (both ZDMG 55.323 and Noten) is also in favor of supplying such a verb. Note in passing that unaccented *asyai* in our b presupposes a referent already in the discourse, so it must be anticipating *tūrvayāṇam* in d. For Tūrvayāṇa cf. the simile *tūrvan ná yāman* in nearby VI.15.5 with disc. ad loc.

VI.18.14: The aor. subjunctive *kāraḥ* is generally taken as preterital, an interpr. licensed by Gr, who identifies it as “Impf.” But this is morphologically irresponsible, and further, given the injunc. *mādan* in the main cl. (b), a proper subj. value is quite possible. I think this is an example of the standard rhetorical move to take Indra’s signal mythological deeds and make them a model for his behavior in the future, to our benefit. The next and final vs. continues this point of view. See Hoff (Injunk. 55 and n. 37) for a similar assessment, though he also envisions the possibility of “Konjunktiv im präteritalen Sachverhalt.”

VI.19 Indra

This hymn is something of a bricolage, with numerous phrases, pādas, and whole verses borrowed from elsewhere. (I say “borrowed” rather than the more neutral “parallel to,” because the sheer number of the matches strongly suggests that there is a magpie quality to the construction of this hymn.) For details of the matches, see Ge’s nn. (though he doesn’t note all of them) and Bloomfield RR.

VI.19.1: The publ. tr. should read “manfully” with adverbial *nrvát*.

On possible configurations of the terms connected by *utá*, see Klein DGRV I.341.

Gr derives *aminá-* from *√am* (‘mächtig andringend, gewaltig’), but it must belong to *√mī* as thematic parallel to *áminant-*. See Old ZDMG 55.323.

The phrase in d, *súkṛtaḥ kartṛbhir bhūt* “he was well made by his makers,” is somewhat startling as a description of the great god Indra. Who are his makers? Is this a depiction of his original creation, or does it have a more narrow and current application? Because of the previous pāda, ... *vāvṛdhe vīryāya* “he has been strengthened for his heroic deed,” I am inclined towards the latter: the soma drinks and ritual activities and praise have made him the consummate heroic actor. The pl. agent noun *kartár-* may refer to the soma drinks or to the priests who prepared and offered them to Indra. Because I

think the reference is to the immediate past, I would slightly alter the tr. from “was well made” to “has been well made.”

VI.19.1–2: These two vss. show a penchant for synonymous pairs: 1d *urúḥ prthúḥ* “wide (and) broad,” 2b *bṛhántam ṛṣvám* “lofty (and) towering,” *ajāraṃ yúvānam* “unaging (and) youthful.”

VI.19.2: *śávasā sūśuvāṃsam* “swollen with strength” is an etymological figure, though *śávas-* has lost its tight connection to $\sqrt{sū}$ ‘swell’. Both words are reused in this hymn: 6a *śáviṣṭham ... śávaḥ* “strongest strength”; 7b, 8b *sūśuvāṃsam*.

VI.19.4: Since *śāká-*, so accented, is the adj. ‘able’, not a noun *śāka-* ‘ability’, I supply ‘men’ on the basis of IV.17.11 *ebhír nṛbhiḥ ... asya śākaḥ*.

With pāda d I supply opt. *syāma*. Cf. II.27.7 *úpa syāma puruvîrā áriṣṭāḥ*, sim. vs. 16; X.128.3 *áriṣṭāḥ syāma tanvā suvîrāḥ*.

VI.19.5: The gen. phrase *vāmasya vásunaḥ* in b is difficult to construe. Ge supplies “(Spender)” as its head noun; my tr. assumes that it is a loose genitive specification of the *paśú-* that is lurking in the *-kṣú-* in the bahuvrīhi *puru-kṣú-* ‘possessing much livestock’. This interpr. is suggested by the other occurrence of this gen. phrase in VIII.1.31 *utá vāmasya vásunaś ciketati, yó ásti yādvah paśúḥ* “of the valuable goods what will stand out is the livestock coming from Yadu,” where the *vāmá- vásu-* is identified as a particular *paśú-*. But the syntax proposed for our passage is sketchy.

By accent *rāyah* should be nom. pl., not, as I have tr. it, gen. sg. As Ge suggests in his n. 5c, it reads literally “the paths, the riches ...” Nonetheless, Old (ZDMG 55.324 and Noten) considers the nom. pl. reading “forced” (gezwungen) and interprets it as a gen. sg. (on the basis in part of VII.18.3 *pathyā rāyāḥ* with a clear gen. sg.). In the ZDMG treatment he explicitly says that emending the accent isn’t necessary, though he doesn’t indicate why.

In d Ge suggests a haplology of **samudréṇa ná*, with an instr. rather than a loc., as in III.36.7 *samudréṇa síndhavo yādamānāḥ*, where he proposes a similar haplology. This is possible, but not nec.: I see no reason why rivers can’t unite *in* the sea as well as with it. As for III.36.7 see comm. ad loc.; I do not think that a simile particle is necessary there.

VI.19.6–8: As noted in the publ. intro., all three of these vss. contain the phrase “bring here to us”: in 6a and 7b *na ā bhara* straddles the early caesura; in 8a *ā no bhara* opens the vs. Since vss. 6–8 are the middle vss. of this hymn, this repeated phrase might identify an omphalos, but if so it is quite a weak one. The vss. are not particularly noteworthy for their content, and the enclosing vss. do not provide the usual frame structure.

VI.19.6: The first hemistich is notable for the superlative etymological figures: double *śáviṣṭham ... śávaḥ* “strongest strength” (or, in fact, triple, since *sūra* ‘hero’ is ultimately related to these words) and triple *ójiṣṭham ójah ... ugrám* “mightiest mighty might.” The triple etym. connection of the first phrase is better conveyed by Ge’s “Bring uns, du

Starker, die stärkste Stärke” than by the publ. tr. Note also that the adjacent words in b *ójo abhibhūta* “... might, o overpowering one,” though not syntactically connected here, form a bahuvrīhi modifying Indra in the preceding hymn, VI.18.1 *abhíbhūti-ojas-* ‘of overpowering strength’.

On the phrase *dyumnā ... mānuṣāṇām* see comm. ad X.42.6.

VI.19.7–8: I tr. *sūśuvāṃsam* in both vss. as ‘swollen with strength’, although the *sávasā* found in 2c is absent, as a portmanteau tr. to capture the full sense of the root. This participle picks up *sáviṣṭham ... sávaḥ* in vs. 6.

VI.19.7: On the long root vowel in *jigīvāṃsaḥ*, see Old ZDMG 55.324, where on the basis of the metrical evidence he surmises that, at least in this post-caesura position, the form should be read with short root vowel (**jigi-vāms-*), the form found in the younger Vedic texts. See also Arnold (Ved. Met. 143), who considers the short-*i* form required in 3 of the 5 occurrences of the strong stem, and Kü (189 n. 225), who considers it proper except in III.15.4. Kü cites Anttila (1969, Schwebeabl. 61) as explaining the lengthening in the Saṃhitā text as analogy to *ninīvāms-*. However, it is much more likely that it is a morphologically conditioned lengthening, meant to distinguish the -*i*-vowel proper to the root from the -*i*-liaison vowel that has become associated with suffixes/endings. Thus *jigī-vāms-* with long vowel is kept separate from the type *tasth-ivāms-*, as I already argued in my 1988 article on the vocalized laryngeal (224–25), though without factoring in the metrical evidence pointing to this lengthening as late and redactional. (Of course, in *tasthivāms-* the -*i*- would originally have represented the zero-grade of this -*ā* root, but by synchronic RV it has been reanalyzed as part of the suffix. See disc. in my 1988 art.)

VI.19.8: In d the *utá* is oddly positioned, since it appears to be meant to conjoin *jāmīr ājāmīn* “kin and non-kin,” there being no other likely candidates. Klein (DGRV I.356–57) calls it a “peculiar passage” and classes it with two other examples of what he schematizes as *utá X Y (/ Z ...)*. The pair *jāmī- ājāmī-* is several times asyndetic (I.111.3, IV.4.5, VI.44.17) as here, so no conjunction is actually necessary, but we can cite nearby VI.25.3 ... *jāmāya utá yé 'jāmayah*, where the *utá* is correctly placed. Perhaps our passage is a blend of the asyndetic figure and the “X and which Y” construction in VI.25.3.

VI.19.10: The medial 1st pl. s-aor. opt. *vāmsīmáhi* contrasts with the active 1st pl. s-aor. subjunctive *vāmsāma* in 8c, but the medial optative must have been modeled on the rhyme form *māmsīmáhi* in the same metrical position in 7d. The “rest” following *vāmsīmáhi* may call attention to the verb by isolating it metrically.

Besides this echo, note also *nṛvát*, which replicates *nṛvát* in 1a, and *vāmám* recalling *vāmāsyā* in 5b, while the gen. *vāsvaḥ* is in slight discord with the differently formed gen. *vāsunaḥ* in 5b.

I tr. *śrómatebhiḥ* as ‘attentions’, that is, the attentive hearing(s) that Indra gives to men’s words. For similar use of *śrómata-* in a somewhat clearer context see VII.40.5.

The referent of the “both kinds of good[s]” in c is not clear, at least from immediate context. In the very similar passage VII.82.4 *īśānā vásva ubháyasya*, it seems to refer to goods belonging to war and peace; similarly in the next hymn, VII.83.5 *yuvám*

hí vásva ubháyasya rājathah, where a reference to war and peace -- or perhaps to the goods of enemies and of allies -- is likely. In II.9.5 the referent of *ubháyam* ... *vasavyàm* is also open-ended, but Re's suggestion there that it's livestock and offspring is perhaps the most satisfactory. In our passage the nearest contrastive pair is *jāmūṁr ājāmīn* "kin and non-kin" in 8c, so perhaps "both kinds of good[s]" refers to the goods belonging to these two groups whom we hope to vanquish in battle. Note *vṛtrāṇy ubháyāni* "both kinds of obstacles" in 13c, which Ge, persuasively, takes as referring to the "kin and non-kin" of 8d. MLW suggests another possibility: "movable and immovable," which has a fine Indo-European pedigree.

The acc. obj. phrase in d, *rátanam máhi sthūrám bṛhántam*, contains an apparent gender clash: *rátana-* is neut., as is *máhi*; *sthūrám* can be either neut. or masc., while *bṛhántam* must be masc. It is tempting to correlate the two genders with the two kinds of goods in pāda c: a "great treasure" (neut.) and "substantial lofty X" (masc.). This might be possible: *sthūrā-* *bṛhánt-* qualifies masc. *rayí-* in IV.21.4 *sthūráśya rāyó bṛható yá íśe* (and cf. X.156.3 *āgne sthūrám rayīm bhara*), and *bṛhánt-* not infrequently modifies *rayí-* (cf., e.g., VI.6.7). Thus, we could assume an underlying **rayīm* for the last two adjectives, yielding a tr. "grant a great treasure (and) substantial lofty (wealth)." This might be supported by *rāyā ... bṛhatā* in the last pāda of the hymn (13d). Nonetheless, this seems unduly artificial, and I would prefer to assume that at the end of this acc. phrase, encouraged by ambig. *sthūrám*, *bṛhántam* has simply taken its accustomed pāda-final place in Triṣṭubh. As reported by Old (ZDMG 55.325 and Noten), Ludwig suggested *substituting* (that is, emending) *rayīm* for *máhi*, a suggestion roundly rejected by Old, who simply says (Noten) that masc. *bṛhántam* is construed with neut. *rátanam*.

VI.19.12: Note a different kind of gender mismatch in pāda a. Though in the idiom with *√man* "consider oneself X" / "be considered as X," X is in the same case as the underlying subject (see, e.g., 7c *maṁsīmahi jigīvāṁsaḥ* "we could be considered victors"), here it is construed with an adverbial neut. *máhi*. That this is not necessarily a property of "think oneself great" is shown by I.178.5, VII.98.4 *maható mányamānān* "... those thinking themselves great," with acc. pl. matching the subject of the participle.

VI.19.13: On *vṛtrāṇy ubháyāni* "both kinds of obstacles" see comm. ad vs. 10.

VI.20 Indra

On the metrical irregularities in the hymn, see Old ZDMG 55.324 and Noten.

VI.20.1: As noted in the publ. intro., the "ask" in this hymn comes at the beginning, not the end as is more usual. It is also excessively convoluted in syntax and phraseology. (My interpr. of the vs. is in great part guided by Th [Fremdl. 58] and to a certain extent Ge., though as far as I can see Ge simply fails to tr. parts of it.) The actual referent of the definitional rel. cl. that occupies the first hemistich is not encountered until the second word of pāda b (*rayíḥ*), preceded by a discontinuous simile *dyaúr ná ... bhūma* "like heaven the earth," whose first part has been fronted around the rel. prn. *yáḥ*, and by a verb in tmesis, *abhí ... tasthaú* "surmounts," whose preverb is stationed after the caesura in pāda a and whose verb form proper opens pāda b. And this is only the beginning!

A first paraphrase of the first hemistich would be “as heaven (surmounts) the earth, the wealth that surmounts ...,” with “wealth” corresponding grammatically and functionally to “heaven.” This first stab makes it immediately clear that we need an acc. obj. in the frame to correspond to *bhūma* in the simile, something that wealth can “surmount.” One acc. is obvious: *jānān* at the end of the hemistich. But what do we do with *aryāḥ* at the end of the first pāda? Old (ZDMG 54.169–70) takes it as an acc. pl., tr. “wie die Himmel über der Erde (sollen) die Schätze über den Geizigen (erhaben sein).” However, there is a reasonably well-attested phrase *rāyo aryāḥ* “the riches of the stranger” (IV.48.1, VI.14.3, VI.47.9, and esp. VI.36.5; cf. also VI.1.5 and comm. on all those passages). In VI.36.5 it is found in exactly this context: *dyaúr ná bhūmābhí rāyo aryāḥ* “Like heaven over the earth, sur(mount) the riches of the stranger,” with *rāyo aryāḥ* an object phrase exactly parallel to *bhūma* in the simile. It therefore seems best here to assume a gapping of acc. pl. *rāyah*, whose presence is suggested by the nom. *rayīḥ*, with *aryāḥ* a gen. as elsewhere. Hence “wealth that surmounts (the wealth/ riches) of the stranger ...”

And what does this “wealth of the stranger” consist of? In all cases it seems to refer to manpower, not to material wealth, and our passage makes this clear by further specifying it as *jānān* ‘people(s)’.

As if the poet hadn’t misled us enough already with the intertwining of constituents and gapping of a crucial word, he also plants a false cue. The word *bhūma* is of course the acc. sg. to the neut. *n*-stem *bhūman-*, as shown esp. by the parallel VI.36.5. But in its position directly after the preverb *abhí*, it looks mighty like a verb -- and could almost (but only almost) be the 1st pl. root aor. *bhūma*, though with wrong accent (expect **bhūmá*, a form not found in the RV). The lexeme *abhí* √*bhū* is close in meaning to the *abhí* √*sthā* we have here (whose verbal part has been postponed till the 2nd pāda), and given its sandhi form the rel. prn. *yá* (underlying *yāḥ*) could equally be underlying *yé*, which could match the number of the putative 1st pl. verb form (“we who surmount ...”). Of course, as just noted, the accent on *bhūma* is wrong, and we would further expect *abhí* to lose its own accent and unverbate with an immediately following verb in a rel. clause. But I nonetheless think that the poet meant for his audience to follow this false trail, however briefly.

After this tangled beginning, the second hemistich is completely straightforward: the acc. *tām* picks up the rel. cl. couched in the nom., with the implicit referent “wealth,” modified by three acc. OBJ+VERBAL NOMINAL cmpds, all objects of “give” (*daddhí*). This is the last time in the hymn that Indra is asked to give us anything; the only other appeal to Indra is in 10a, where we pray to “win anew.” Almost all of the rest of the hymn treats previous heroic deeds of Indra, though it should be noted that many of these are presented in the injunctive, and the notoriously slippery usage of the injunctive may leave the possibility of current application open.

VI.20.2: This vs. begins like vs. 1, with a form of ‘heaven’ followed by the simile marker *ná* (1a *dyaúr ná*, 2a *divó ná*). In this case there is nothing in the frame that explicitly corresponds to the gen. *divāḥ* in the simile, though the dat. *túbhyam* is roughly parallel: like the “lordship of heaven,” lordship was conceded to you (Indra) and is therefore yours.

The standard idiom for ‘concede’ is *ánu √dā*, not, as here, *ánu √dhā*. Cf., with phraseology similar to here, VI.25.8 *ánu te dāyi ... satrā te víśvam ...* (sim. II.20.8). But *√dhā* is also found in this idiom elsewhere, e.g., VI.36.2 *satrā dadhire ánu vīryāya*. Old (ZDMG 55.326, Noten) seems prepared to follow Gr (Tr.) and v. Bradke in emending *dhāyi* to **dāyi*, but this seems unnec. The two roots are formally very parallel and in many contexts their meanings are barely distinguishable; I see no reason why *√dhā* cannot have acquired this idiomatic meaning with *ánu* in imitation of *ánu √dā*. In this particular case *ánu √dhā* may have been used in preference to *ánu √dā* because of the technical use of *anudéya-* in vs. 11 below. See disc. there.

Note that the ‘lordship, lordly power’ (*asuryà-*) is in the control of the gods and conceded to Indra, another indication that the later Asura/Deva divide is not present in the core RV. See also VI.36.1 below.

VI.20.3: The publ. tr. takes Indra as the subj. of *āvat* in d, with *dartnúm* an action noun “when he aided the splitting ...” But, on the basis of other *-(t)nú-* stems (cf. AiG II.2.696–97 and 741–42), *dartnú-* is more likely verbal/agentive (‘splitting, splitter’) and the subject of *āvat* should then be soma (“the somian honey” *mádhu- somyá-*). So explicitly Old (ZDMG 55.326, with convincing parallels; Ge appears to follow, though his tr. is more equivocal. I would therefore change the tr. to “when it [=soma] aided the splitter of all the strongholds.”

VI.20.4–5: As Ge (n. 4–5) notes, these two vss. probably belong together as an account of the ever-fragmented Śuṣṇa / Kutsa myth, though the connection of the Paṇis (pāda a) to this myth is somewhat uncertain. Old (ZDMG 55.325–27 [=KISch 785–86]) treats these vss. in detail.

VI.20.4: I read the instr. plurals opening the two hemistichs (*śataiḥ* 4a, *vadhaiḥ* 4c) “vertically” -- that is, as a single NP distributed over two clauses. This seems to be Ge’s solution too: “Durch hundert (Streiche) ...; durch (deine) Streiche ...”; so also Old ZDMG 55.326. The fact that a form of *√pad* needs to be read in pāda c, matching *apadran* in pāda a supports this interpr. It would, however, be possible to interpr. *śataiḥ* as “by the hundreds,” referring to the felled Paṇis. So Kü (424).

In the publ. tr. I took the beneficiary of Indra’s actions in pāda b to be a single person, “the ten-armed poet” (*dāśoṇaye kavāye*) (so Ge), and since *dāśoṇi-* recurs in 8a apparently qualifying *vetasú-*, I considered this to be a reference to this shadowy Vetasu. But I now think this identification is incorrect or at least misleading. When the word *kaví-* is found in an Indra / Kutsa / Śuṣṇa context it always (in my current view) refers to Uśanā Kāvya, and I believe that to be the case here — strengthened by the fact that the other two occurrences of *arká-sāti-* (I.174.7, VI.26.3) are found with *kaví-* in the Kutsa / Śuṣṇa myth, where the word must surely refer to Uśanā Kāvya. (Old makes the same point, ZDMG 55.326–27.) I therefore now think that “for the poet” means “for Uśanā Kāvya,” and “for the ten-armed” is likely a reference to a different person, identified as Vetasu in vs. 8. (Old considers the additional possibility that *dāśoṇi-* is an epithet of UK, but seems to favor the separation into two individuals.) On the basis of 8a and Ge’s disc. there (n. 8), it further seems likely, or at least possible, that *vetasú-* in 8 refers to Kutsa, and

therefore in our 4b the two datives refer to Kutsa and UK. I would therefore now alter the tr. to “for the sake of the ten-armed one [=Kutsa?] and of the poet [=Uśanā Kāvya].”

My tr. of *dāśoṇi-* in this vs. and in 8a reflects the current consensus, endorsed by Mayr (EWA s.v. *oṇi-* “offenbar ‘Arm’”), that *oṇi-* means ‘arm’ (as opposed to Gr’s ‘Schutz’ and ‘Mutterbrust’), but I think that this interpr. might be ripe for revisiting. The passages are not particularly diagnostic -- the most important evidence is the fact that the stem is generally dual -- and it lacks a clear etymology (though it’s sometimes connected with *√av* ‘help’). There is also the question of the cmpd. sandhi: if *dāśoṇi-* consists of *dāśa* + *oṇi-*, it should of course come out as **dāśauṇi-*. The *-o-* has been accounted for (see EWA s.v. *oṇi-* [p.c from J. Schindler], Mayr PN s.v. *dāśoṇiya-*) by invoking TS I.2.6.1, where the widely attested mantra *abhī tyāṃ devāṃ savitāram oṇyòḥ kavíkratum* (AV VII.14.1, etc.) instead contains *ūṇyòḥ*. The *ū-* initial would indeed yield the proper sandhi result, but given the otherwise overwhelming attestation of *oṇyòḥ* in the mantra, the TS variant does not have much support. Since at present I don’t have a better solution, I stick with ‘ten-armed’, but consider it quite dubious.

That *arká-sāti* means ‘winning of the (sun’s) rays’ is strongly suggested by *sūryasya sātaú* in the next vs. (5d), though, as Old points out (ZDMG 55.327), it could in addition mean ‘winning of the chants’.

I don’t understand pāda d, but I would point out that another “insatiable Śuṣṇa” passage also has a mention of mealtime: IV.16.12 *kútsāya śúṣṇam aśúṣaṃ ní barhīḥ, prapítvé áhnaḥ kúyavaṃ sahásrā* “For Kutsa you laid low insatiable Śuṣṇa, who brings bad harvest, with his thousands, before the day’s first meal.” Perhaps the point is that despite his voraciousness, Śuṣṇa is deprived of his meal by Indra’s timely blow. In that case the subj. of *arirecūt* ... *prá* here is Indra, who leaves nothing for Śuṣṇa.

VI.20.5: For the unusual position of *sá* and its rukied initial (*urú śá*) see disc. ad VI.2.4.

VI.20.6: *Namī* is found also in I.53.7, also along with Indra against Namuci, and in X.48.9, where he also has the patronymic *sāp’yá-* as here.

VI.20.8: This vs. is made difficult both by our very sketchy knowledge of the personnel and the myth and by the syntax. Both Old (ZDMG 55.328–29 [=KlSch 787–88]) and Ge (n. 8) devote considerable space to disc. of it. The vs. seems to pun on PNs in a way discouragingly similar to VII.18, the very obscure account of the Ten Kings battle. The nearby vs. VI.26.4 is of some help in the interpr. of this one, as is X.49.4.

My approach to the vs. partly follows Ge’s, but differs in several important ways. Like Ge (who adopted it from Baunack; see his n. 8), I supply a verb of speaking to introduce the second hemistich, which we both take as the direct speech of Indra. (By contrast Old construes *úpa sṛjā* in d as the verb governing the acc. in ab, but given the distribution of the rest of the elements in the vs., esp. the preverb *ā* opening pāda c, this seems unlikely.) But rather than taking the acc. PNs in ab as the addressees of this speech as Ge does, I construe them (loosely) with the hapax *bahuvrīhi svabhiṣṭi-sumnah* ‘having/showing the favor of his dominance’, with Vetasu [=Kutsa?] and Tuji as the recipient of this favor. The intens. adj. *tūtuji-* ‘thrusting’, found elsewhere modifying a whirlwind (*bhīmi-* IV.32.2) and a chariot (X.35.6), punningly points to Tuji, who is

found in nearby VI.26.4 in the company of Vetasu and Tugra, as here. (In that vs. there is also redupl., but it is located on the verb: *tvám tújim ... tūtoḥ* “you strengthened Tuji.”)

In that vs. Indra strikes down Tugra for Vetasu (VI.26.4c *tvám túgraṃ vetasáve sácāhan*). I think the same situation is depicted here in cd, though less violently, with Vetasu(-Kutsa) referred to by the adj. *dyótana-* ‘brilliant, flashing’ expressing a dat. of benefit. In this connection Baunack’s adducing (see Ge’s n. 8c) of I.63.3 *kutsāya dyumaté* “for heaven-bright Kutsa,” another dat. of benefit in the Śuṣṇa myth, is apposite. Ge (also Gr, Mayr PN) takes *dyótanāya* as a PN, but no such person Dyotana is found elsewhere, and in its other two occurrences (I.123.4, VIII.29.2) the stem is an adj. with the expected etymological meaning.

The next question is *ibham*. This is pretty much universally interp. as a PN, referring to another enemy of Indra. This is in part based on X.49.4, where Tugra and one Smadibha are made subject to Kutsa (and the Vetasu [pl.] and Tuji are also found). Old, for ex., considers Ibha here simply a shortening of Smadibha, and the context of the word in our pāda certainly supports a pun on the latter name: (*ā túgraṃ śá)śvad íbham* ...; cf. X.49.4 (*túgraṃ kútsāya) smádibham*, with the last syllable of the adverb *śáśvad* a close match for the 1st syllable of the PN in X.49.4 (if it is indeed a PN). But *ibha-* is elsewhere in the RV a common noun meaning ‘retinue’ or ‘vassal’ (the common denominator being the inferior position vis-à-vis someone in power); cf. also the MIA evidence, such as Pāli *ibbha*. And ‘vassal’ would be an appropriate word for someone made subject to another - hence my tr. of the phrase *śáśvad íbham* as “perpetual vassal,” referring to Tugra. (For a somewhat despairing attempt to fit X.49.4 into this scenario, see comm. ad loc.)

Finally, we must deal with the verbal expressions at the end of the vs., *úpa śrjā iyádhyai*. The first question is what form *srjā* represents out of sandhi. The Pp. reads *srja*, that is, a 2nd sg. act. impv., with lengthening of the final vowel in the Saṃhitā text. But of course in that case the normal outcome in sandhi should be coalescence into **srjeyádhyai*. After some agonizing, Old accepts the Pp interpr. (though he also flirts with a 2nd sg. subj. *srjāh*), but Ge (n. 8) opts instead for Baunack’s suggestion, that the underlying form is *srjai*, i.e., a 1st sg. middle subjunctive (so also Lub, though with !). This is the interpr. I have also adopted. Although the 6th cl. pres. *srja-* is predominately active, there are a few middle forms; the pf. is about evenly divided between active and middle forms in transitive usage (including several 1st pl. *sasrjmáhe* with *úpa*), and there are two 1st sg. *s-aor.* forms *ásrkṣi* with *úpa* in trans. usage. Taking the form as a 1st sg. also entails the direct-speech interpr. of Baunack/Ge. (It’s worth noting as an aside that Sāy. simply glosses *úpa srja* with *upāsrjat*, apparently untroubled by matters of sandhi and grammatical identity; this was followed by Gr [Tr.], though unmentioned in the Wö.)

As Old points out (ZDMG 55.328), the lexeme *úpa √srj* is often used of releasing / dispatching calves to their mother, and this must account for the simile *mātúr ná*. Although this idiom is generally benevolent, it also emphasizes the hierarchical dependency of the young on their mother, and this would be appropriate for the vassal Tugra’s subordinate position with regard to Kutsa.

I take the inf. *iyádhyai* to *√i* ‘go’, or more particularly to the stem *īyate* ‘speeds’ (*√i* or *√yā*), rather than to *√yā* ‘implore, beg’ with Lub. It simply completes the action of the main verb “release/despatch them to go ...” The preverb *ā* beginning the 2nd hemistich is more likely to go with this inf. than with *úpa srjai* (pace Gr, also Ge, who thinks [n.

8c] it could go with either one), simply because we'd otherwise expect the order *úpa+ā* (cf. VIII.27.11 *úpa ... ām̐, ásr̥k̐ṣi ...*).

After all this, the alterations of the publ. tr. would be minimal:

“Indra showed the favor of his dominance to Vetasu [=Kutsa?] of the ten tricks and ten arms and to the thrusting (Tuji), (saying)

‘Tugra as perpetual vassal for brilliant (Vetasu=Kutsa?) shall I dispatch, like (calves) to their mother, to speed (to him).’”

VI.20.9: The participial phrase *bíbhrad vájram* here and in VI.23.1 below may be intended to invoke the name *bharád-vāja-*, the poet of this hymn and indeed of this *maṇḍala*, by an expression that seems the syntactic equivalent of that type of governing compound — with the prior member belonging to the same root and the 2nd member a phonological variant of the obj. Matching the first member exactly would be problematic, since the nom. sg. of the participle would be *bhāran*. The punning on PNs noted with regard to the immediately preceding vs. may be in evidence here as well.

VI.20.10: In b *enā* can simply be adverbial, as Ge and KH (Injunk. 168) take it, but it is also regularly used as demonstrative with forms like *nāmasā* ‘homage’ (I.171.1, II.23.14, etc.), *sūktēna* ‘hymn’ (II.6.2), *bráhmanā* (IV.36.7), and in this context, where the sacrifice is mentioned (*yajñatīh*), I think it likely that the verbal part of the ritual evidenced by the verb *prá ... stavante* “they start up the praise” is further specified with the near deictic, referring to this current praise hymn.

The syntactic relationship between *pādas* c and d is ambiguous. With Ge, I take d as the main cl., with c dependent on it. But KH (Injunk. 168) takes them as parallel subordinate clauses dependent on b. Either is possible, because the verb of d, (*d*)*hán*, is initial in the *pāda* and can owe its accent to that alone.

Note the allit. in (*śāra*)*dīr dārd, dhán dās(īh)*, esp. noticeable because it consists of four syllables in a row, belonging to four separate words.

Old (ZDMG 55.329–30 and Noten) calls *dart* in c into question, arguing that it should be a 2nd ps. and the *-t* is faulty. But there seems no reason not to assume that both *dart* and (*d*)*han* are 3rd ps. verbs; although Indra is referred to in the 2nd ps. in *pāda* a, shift between the persons is a commonplace in RVic discourse. The sandhi situation here favors the retention of the *-t*, though the matter is somewhat complex. As is generally known, final clusters are simplified, retaining only the first. The exception is that *-t*, *-ṭ*, and *-k* after *-r-* are retained if they belong to the root (Wh, Gr. §150b Macd. VGS §28a, etc.) -- which the *-t* in *dar-t* does not (*√dṛ*). However, *dart* is *pāda*-final and the next *pāda* begins in the transmitted text with *dhán* (for *hán*), whose *dh* is the automatic result of the (re-)introduction of occlusion of initial *h-* after a final stop (see, e.g., Wh, Gr. §163). The standard practice is that the *h-* is replaced by the voiced aspirate corresponding to the place of articulation of the final stop -- in this case, a dental. If we assume that this rule was operative before final clusters were simplified, a sequence of 3rd sg. *dard dhán* with apparently pleonastic gemination would favor the non-simplification of the cluster *-rd dh-*. (On cases of gemination and degemination in the text, see my “False Segmentations and Resegmentations in the Rigveda: Gemination and Degemination” [Fs. Pinault 2021].) *Pāda* c is identical to I.174.2b, and in that passage the case is more difficult because there

the context is entirely 2nd ps. As I argued in the comm. to that vs. (q.v.), the final *-t* there may have been introduced from our passage.

VI.20.11: Pāda c contains one of the three instances of the gerundive *anudéya-* in the RV and the only masc. form -- a form called by Ge “ganz unsicher.” This gerundive belongs to the lexeme *ánu √dā* ‘hand over, concede’ discussed above, ad vs. 2. I have discussed one of the fem. forms *anudéyī* in the difficult hymn X.135 at length (“The Earliest Evidence for the Inborn Debts of a Brahmin: A New Interpretation of Ṛgveda X.135.” *Journal asiatique* 302.2 [2014]: 245–57). In that article I established that the idiom *ánu √dā* can be further narrowed in certain contexts to mean ‘forgive/acquit a debt’; and the debt in question can be referred to with the gerund *anudéya-*, *-ī*, as (the debt) ‘to be acquitted’. In X.135.5-6 this debt is actually a reference to the inborn debts of a Brahman, which he must pay off during his lifetime, one of which is the need to provide his ancestors with (grand)sons. As argued in that article (255–56), I think the same sense can be seen in our passage. To cite from the article: “The second half of this verse seems to allude to a complex intergenerational relationship in which Indra intervenes. The god hands over a grandson (*nápāt-*) to his grandfather (*mahé pitré*), a transaction that sounds like a man’s fulfillment of his debt to his ancestors by fathering a son, thereby providing them with a grandson. This grandson is said to be *anudéya-*. I would suggest that the grandson here serves as the concrete manifestation of the debt that is to be acquitted, and the technical term *anudéya-* is therefore applied to him. If I am correct, this is another, though more muted, piece of evidence for the existence of the notion of a man’s inborn debt in the Rig Veda.”

On Navavāstu or Navavāstva, see comm. ad X.49.6

VI.20.12: This is identical to I.174.9; see comm. on that vs., esp. with regard to *pārṣi*.

VI.20.13: Dabhīti is the beneficiary of Indra’s putting Cumuri to sleep in VI.26.6. Cumuri’s companion Dhuni is found with him in VI.18.8, and in our passage he immediately follows vs. 12, which contains two adj. usages of *dhúni-* ‘tumultuous, boisterous’.

The second hemistich portrays Dabhīti assembling or preparing four different requisites of the sacrifice in four different morphosyntactic expressions: 1) a full participial phrase *sómebhiḥ sunván* “pressing with the soma juices,” 2) a bahuvrīhi *idhmábhṛtiḥ* lit. ‘having the bringing of the firewood’, 3) an *-ín-*stem possessive *pakthī* ‘having cooked food’ (based on an unattested **pakthá-* ‘cooked food’), and 4) an instr. of accompaniment *arkaiḥ* “along with the chants.” The identity of the third has been called into question by Old (ZDMG 55.330, Noten). Though the sandhi form *pakthy* is analyzed by the Pp. as *pakthī* with the long vowel appropriate to the nom. sg. of an *-ín-*stem, in fact in the cadence it would better be read short (though keep in mind the metrical disturbances throughout the hymn). Old toys with the idea that it has been influenced by the PN *pakthá-* and that it is underlyingly an instr. to the *-ti-*stem *pakti-* ‘cooked food’, hence **paktī* with shortening before the following vowel. This seems unnecessarily complex, and the PN *pakthá-* is neither well attested nor found nearby this passage. Since shortening of *-ī* in hiatus was available for the instr., I see no reason why it shouldn’t have been analogically extended to the nom. of an *-ín-*stem in this case. Moreover, I think

the morphosyntactic variety just described was deliberate, and replacing 3) with an instr. like that of 4) would disturb the sequence.

VI.21 Indra

VI.21.1: As with hemistich-initial *#sataīḥ* ... *#vadhaīḥ* in VI.20.4 in the immediately preceding hymn, I take *#imāḥ* ... *#dhīyaḥ* as a “vertical” NP, “these insights.” Their positioning allows them to get out of the way of the intense etym. figure in b: *hāvyaṃ* ... *hāvyaḥ havante*. This figure is complicated by the fact that *hāvya-* is used in two slightly different senses, controlled by slightly different constructions of the verb *√hū* / *hvā*. Although the normal object of this verb is a god or other being called upon, very occasionally it can take the call itself as object (see comm. ad IV.23.3), and of course derivatives like *háva(na)-* express the call itself. In our passage *havante* ‘they invoke’ takes the usual type of object, namely Indra here, who is qualified by the gerundive *hāvya-* ‘to be invoked’. But the insights (*dhīyaḥ*) themselves are also so qualified; here *hāvyaḥ* must mean not ‘to be invoked’, but ‘to be called [=spoken]’. In order to keep the vocabulary constant, I have tr. ‘deserving to invoke’, in contrast to ‘deserving to be invoked’ applied to Indra.

The vertical NP just discussed unbalances syntactic constituency, and, unusually, the hemistich boundary cannot be respected.

In d most take *īyate* to *√yā* / *ī* ‘implore, beg’; so, e.g., Ge “... wird ... erbeten” (likewise Lub, Kulikov, -ya-presents 495). I assign it rather to ‘speeds’, though either is possible.

VI.21.2: The nominal rel. cl. *yó vídānaḥ*, interrupting a string of accusatives, is syntactically curious. It seems to represent a sort of izafe, rather than a real embedded relative cl. I have tr. it as if acc. *índram* were the predicate of the participle (“who is known as “Indra”), despite the difference in cases. Ge, in contrast: “der bekannt ist.” My interpr. might be better represented as “I will praise him — Indra, as he is known — whose ...” This interpr. fits well with the doubts expressed about Indra later in the hymn, esp. vs. 4. See also *vídānaḥ* in 12b.

The instr. *gīrbhīḥ* in b might be better construed with the verb *stuṣe* in a: “I will praise him with songs”; it has been displaced to the right to be nearer to *gírvāhasam*.

The second hemistich contains a strikingly mixed construction, with the usual matched pair heaven and earth in two different cases, acc. *dívam*, abl.-gen. *pr̥thivyāḥ*, though construed with the same verb. The two different cases are controlled by two different PREVERB + *√ric* combinations, one overt, one implied. Overt is *āti* *√ric* ‘extend beyond, surpass’, which is rather rare but takes the acc., as in VIII.92.14, 22 *ná tvām indrāti ricyate* “nothing surpasses you, Indra” (cf. also X.90.5); hence our ... *dívam āti* ... *riricé*. The implied construction is the more common *prá* *√ric* ‘extend beyond’ which takes the abl., as in I.61.9 *asyéd evá prá ririce mahitvám, divás pr̥thivyāḥ pári antárikṣāt* “his greatness projected beyond heaven and earth, beyond the midspace” (note clear abl. *antárikṣāt*) (cf. also I.59.5, 109.6, etc.), hence our ... *pr̥thivyāḥ* ... *ririce mahitvám*. Examples of this latter constr. are found in this group of Indra hymns (VI.24.3, 30.1), and despite the absence of *prá* here it is not surprising that the abl. construction would creep in.

VI.21.3: On the meaning of *vayúna-*, see comm. ad II.34.4.

As has long been known, the RVic desid. stem *íyakṣa-* belongs to *√naś* ‘attain’, not (*pace* Gr) *√yaj* ‘sacrifice’. See, inter alia, EWA s.v. *NAŚ*¹; Heenen (Desid. 79–82).

The question in the 2nd hemistich seems like a non sequitur, which makes me somewhat sympathetic to Sāy’s reading as a (negative) indefinite: *kadā cid* “they do not ever violate ...” But this reinterpr. is arbitrary, of course, and further, the *kadā* question inaugurates a series of questions in vs. 4, each with a *ka-* form: a *kúha*, b *kám* ... *kāsu*, c *káh*, d *káh* ... *katamáḥ*. It may be that we have to ask about the whereabouts of Indra in vs. 4 because he has ceased to appear to us because we have (or may have) violated his ordinances.

VI.21.4: *-tama-*forms implicitly index a referent among three or more possibilities. The interrog. *katamá-* here echoes *purutáma-* of 1a. I have chosen to render *katamá-* with the heavy tr. ‘which of many’ because in this series of questions the poet is anxiously surveying all the possible sacrifices and sacrificers who may have attracted Indra away from us.

VI.21.5: The *utá* in the middle of pāda c uncomplicatedly conjoins the temporally contrastive *madhyamāsaḥ* “the middle ones, those in between” and *nūtanāsaḥ* “the current ones” (see Klein DGRV I.301, 311), but the one beginning pāda d, in Klein’s words (DGRV I.382) “introduc[es] a new nonparallel clause.” It is not represented in the publ. tr., which should perhaps read “And ... take cognizance of the one who is closest.” The reason for this apparently pleonastic conjunction may be that “the closest one” (singular *avamá-*) is not only a subset of “the current ones” (plural *nūtanāsaḥ*), but the climax of the series of temporally sorted comrades.

VI.21.6: This ultimate insider, “the closest one” of 5d, is immediately picked up by the slightly more distanced “closer ones” (*āvarāsaḥ*) in 6a. Here their comparative closeness is not contrasted with previous generations of Indra’s comrades, as in vs. 5, but with the older, distant deeds of Indra. These closer ones are “asking” (*prchántaḥ*) about Indra. Their asking may refer directly to the questions in vs. 4, but it also implies that, however “close” they are, they do not have direct access to knowledge about Indra.

The limits on our knowledge are explicitly acknowledged in the 2nd hemistich, where we praise Indra only insofar as we know him (*yāḍ evá vidmá*). This subordinated expression is embedded in the larger clause: *ārcāmasi* ..., *yāḍ evá vidmá tāt tvā mahāntam*, where the obj. of *ārcāmasi* is *tvā*, but the *yāḍ* ... *tāt* diptych is clearly formulaic and frozen. This expression reminds us slightly of the *yó vídānaḥ* of 2b, likewise with *√vid* ‘know’ and likewise technically embedded.

VI.21.7: JPB suggests that the “face of the demon” spreading out against Indra is the hood of the cobra, namely *Vṛtra*.

The referent of the expression beginning b, *máhi jajñānám* “having been born great,” is entirely ambiguous. It may be, as the publ. tr. takes it, an acc. with *tvā*, referring to Indra. Or it may be, as Gr and Ge take it, a neut. nom. modifying the neut. *s*-stem *pājah*. Technically speaking, of course, *máhi* is neut. and might therefore give weight to

the latter possibility. But *máhi* can be adverbial here, evoking the apparently fixed expression *máhi jātām* (I.163.1, III.31.3, cf. I.156.2); cf. also V.60.3 *máhi vṛddhāḥ* ‘grown great’. I now think the ambiguity is meant, and the phrase can apply to either of the antagonists (or rather, in the case of the *rakṣás-*) its visage. The ambiguity is hard to convey in tr.; perhaps “... (each) born great.”

The two verbs in the first hemistich, *abhí ... ví tasthe#* and *... abhí ... tiṣṭha#*, belong to the same root ($\sqrt{sthā}$), are positioned identically, and differ fairly minimally from each other: tense-aspect stem, voice, person, as well as an extra preverb with the first. Unfortunately the etymological connection can’t be easily captured in tr.: “has stood wide against you” is unidiomatic and opaque.

The 2nd hemistich seems implicitly to convey that our anxieties about our intimacy with Indra were well-founded. In 5ab our forebears were identified as Indra’s “ancient comrades” (*pratnāsaḥ ... sákhāyaḥ*), with later generations apparently grandfathered into this select group (5cd). But here we learn who Indra’s “ancient comrade” really is — his mace: *táva pratnéna yújyena sákhyā vájreṇa*.

VI.21.9: The use of parallel and etymologically related purpose datives *ūtáye* and *ávase*, stationed in the a and b pādas respectively, seems pleonastic. I have tr. one as nominal and one as infinitival, but this distinction rests on nothing in the passage.

VI.21.10: Like 1b, pāda c here contains an extravagant etymological figure based again on $\sqrt{hvā}$ ‘call’: *hávam (ā) huvató huvānāḥ*.

The phrasing of d also seems awkwardly pleonastic -- *ná tvāṁ anyāḥ ... tvád asti* “no one like you exists, other than you” -- in comparison with the usual expression, found in nearby VI.30.4 *ná tvāṁ anyó asti* “there exists no one else like you” (cf. VII.32.23).

VI.21.11: In c Ge tr. *āsúḥ* as if it were a present: “die Agni zur Zunge haben und die Wahrheit pflegen.” Although this is contextually tempting, the pf. of \sqrt{as} is never presential. Cf. Kü (111): “Es ist stets (zumindest auch) vergangenheits bezogen gebraucht.” At best we could render it “who have (always) had Agni as their tongue ...”; this might in fact be better.

In any case the pf. *āsúḥ* in c matches *cakrúḥ* in d, and this latter action appears to be one in the distant past -- even though it’s not entirely clear what action it refers to. Interpr. is not helped by the fact that *dāsa-* is a hapax, though it is reasonable, with Ge (n. 11d), to take it as “der mythische Stammvater der Dāsa’s oder Dasyu’s,” or indeed referentially identical with the well-attested stem *dāsa-* referring to some variety of enemy to the Ārya (see Old, etc.). But what the relationship between Manu and Dasa is in this passage and what the gods were attempting to bring about are both unclear -- an unclarity also facilitated by the ambiguity of *úpara-*, which can mean, inter alia, ‘lower’, ‘closer’, or ‘later’. The publ. tr. “... put Manu very close to Dasa” is opaque; in fact I do not now know what I meant by it. Ge takes *úpara-* as ‘later’ and assumes that the gods made Manu Dasa’s successor (Nachfolger). I am now inclined towards Old’s solution, however: that the gods put Manu below (the ‘lower’ sense of *úpara-*) in the earthly region “for Dasa,” with the dative of malefit, not benefit: they set Manu to do to Dasa whatever he deserved. MLW comments “Wouldn’t this make most sense if it meant ‘they

made Manus superior to Dasa'? Could the original meaning of **upara-* as preserved in Avestan, be kept here? For the sentiment cf. VI.19.13 *śátroḥ-śatror úttara út syāma.*" This would be a neat solution, though I wonder whether a reading that requires the opposite sense ('above') of one of the senses of this stem ('lower') would be available.

VI.21.12: *vidānaḥ* in b reprises *yó vidānaḥ* in 2a and thus forms a weak ring.

VI.22 Indra

VI.22.1: To add to the similarities between VI.21 and VI.22 noted in the publ. intro., *havya-* is applied to Indra in the first pāda here, recalling 22.1b *havyam ... havyā havante*; note also *purumāyá-* in b, a descriptor of Indra also in VI.21.2d (as well as nearby VI.18.12).

On *sátvan-* see comm. ad I.173.5.

I would now change "magic wiles" simply to "wiles."

VI.22.2: The vs. lacks an overt finite verb. With Ge I supply a form of *√arc*, picking up the main clause verb of vs. 1, *abhy ārca* of 1b. The instr. *matíbhiḥ* in our d is parallel to *gīrbhūḥ ... ābhīḥ* of 1b.

The "seven inspired poets" (*saptá víprāsaḥ*) evokes the Saptarṣi, the "seven seers." I am not certain whether the phrase here refers to the Saptarṣi and, further, whether they are identical to the Navagvas; the numbers suggest not. It is worth noting IV.42.8 *asmākam átra pitáras tá āsan, saptá řṣayaḥ* "Our forefathers, the Seven Seers, were here," with *pitáraḥ*, as here, as well as IX.92.2 *řṣayaḥ saptá víprāḥ*, where the Seven Seers are identified as *vípra-s*.

The interpr. of the cmpd *nakṣad-dābhá-* given in the publ tr., 'who catches up to the cheat', cannot be correct. That tr. assumed a structure of the verbal governing cmpd type, like *bharád-vāja-*, but the accent is wrong. I therefore now see that a conventional tatpuruṣa interpr., with the 2nd member an agent nominal governing the first, should be the correct interpr.; so Gr 'den Nahenden vernichtend', Ge 'der den Einholenden (?) täuscht'. (Curiously AiG does not seem to comment on this cmpd, despite its somewhat aberrant form) The cmpd thus conforms to the type *hasta-grābhá-* 'grasping the hand', at least as to its 2nd member, but the first member appears to be the weak form of the pres. part. to the pres. *nákṣati* (*√nakṣ* 'approach, reach'). I do not know, offhand, of any cmpds formally so constructed, and I am further puzzled by the apparent sense 'tricking / cheating / outwitting the one who approaches'. Forms of the root *√nakṣ* generally have benevolent sense, as in the medial *nákṣate* in this very hymn (5d), where the song 'catches up' to Indra, or act. *nákṣanti* in this same Indra cycle, VI.34.3, where thoughts and voices approach Indra, strengthening him, so there is no apparent reason for Indra to *√dabh* someone innocently coming up to him. I would emend the tr. to "him who outwits the one(s) approaching," but still feel that the first member is concealing something I can't crack. Some light on the cmpd may be shed by the verb forms *ānaśúḥ* and *nákṣate* in the following vss. (4b and 5d respectively; see below), and this set of vss. seem to share preoccupations and themes. MLW suggests that *nakṣat* could represent the root *√naś* 'disappear, destroy', with -s- suffix and desid. meaning ("who deceives the one who seeks to destroy him"). This is semantically much more attractive than the suggestions

given above, but I am dubious about the morphology. The root $\sqrt{naś}$ does not have a desid. at any period of the language, and in any case we should properly expect reduplicated **ninakṣa-*. Moreover, non-caus. stems to this root have the intrans. sense ‘disappear, perish’. The forms in the immediate vicinity cited above that belong to *naś* / *nakṣ* ‘reach, attain’ would also cause interference.

Note the presence of both \sqrt{dabh} ‘trick, cheat’ and \sqrt{druh} ‘deceive, lie’, with Indra depicted as engaging in the former activity, but possessing speech that is *ádrogha-* ‘undeceptive’. In 8a he attacks the “deceitful people” (*jána- drúhvan-*).

VI.22.3: The lack of accent on the demon. in the phrase *asya rāyāḥ* is notable. Ge tr. “um solche Reichtum,” clearly taking *asya* as modifying *rāyāḥ*, and Old (ZDMG 61.828 [=KlSch 259]) defends a similar interpr., saying “der weitere Verlauf schildert dann den Reichtum ausführlicher.” However, unaccented oblique stems of *ayám* are ordinarily pronominal, and that interpr. is readily available here: the *asya* can refer to Indra, who immediately precedes in a different case (*índram*).

On the *yāḥ* of pāda c as breaking the pattern established earlier in the hymn of reference to Indra, see the publ. intro.

VI.22.4: Although there is no overt mark, I take initial *tán no ví vocaḥ* as a question (contra Ge), matching the overt questions in cd and introducing the indirect question in the *yádi* clause; see also *prchántī* in the next vs. and the questions in the previous hymn, VI.21 3–4, 6).

The poet seems to be harking back to vs. 2 in 4ab and vs. 3 in 4cd. In vs. 2 the ancestral poets praised Indra, but the god is described as *nakṣad-dābhá-* ‘outwitting the one(s) approaching’. Here the poet asks if previous singers obtained (*ānaśúḥ*) Indra’s favor. Although this pf. belongs to the root $\sqrt{(n)aś}$ ‘attain, reach’, which is synchronically separate from $\sqrt{nakṣ}$ ‘approach’, the latter root is a fairly transparent enlargement or development of the former (see EWA s.v. *NAŚ*¹, p. 28; Narten, SigAor. 160, Gotō, 1st Kl., 192), and, of course, some forms of $\sqrt{(n)aś}$ have the root syllable *nakṣ* (e.g., desid. *ínakṣati*, though see *íyakṣati* in the previous hymn, VI.21.3). I therefore suggest that *ānaśúḥ* implicitly responds to *nakṣat-* in 2c. With my new (and, I hope, more accurate) interpr. of *nakṣad-dābhá-* in 2c, I now think that vs. 2 implies that Indra may deviously rebuff the attentions of his praisers and have done so even to the legendary poets of the past. Here the poet directly asks the question if these previous poets (/singers) actually obtained (*ānaśúḥ*) the favor they sought in approaching (*nakṣat-*) Indra, whose benevolence cannot be taken for granted.

In the 2nd hemistich the questions turn to Indra’s portion (*bhāgá-*) and his vital energy (*váyah*) in battle, but also refer to the wealth he may bring. The two cmpds *púruhūta purūvaso* respond to *puruvīrasya ... purukṣóḥ* in 3d.

The voc. *khidvaḥ*, presumably to a *-vant*-stem **khídvant-* (AiG II.2.896, or, less likely, **khídvant-* or **khídvāms-*), belongs to the synchronic root \sqrt{khid} , which, despite its relative rarity, displays a variety of senses centered around aggressive action. Since this stem is a hapax, it’s difficult to know which of the senses is reflected here; Gr renders as ‘drängend (so also EWA s.v. *KHED*), bedrängend’, Ge ‘Abzwacker’. The only RVic nominal form to this root is *khédā* (3x), which in its clearest occurrence (VIII.77.3) means ‘hammer’ or the like. I have evoked this sense here, in the English idiom

‘hammer-head’, thus forming an unjustified etym. figure in tr. “headstrong hammer-head” -- ‘headstrong’ representing *dudhra*. Although the standard tr. are safer, the fact that the form is a hapax to a poorly attested root invites a more noticeable tr. than ‘pressing’.

I follow W. E. Hale (*Ásura*-, 65) in taking *asura*- in *asurahán*- as referring to human ‘lords’ who lead forces inimical to us.

VI.22.5: This vs. is beset with difficulties, starting with the syntax, on which see Old. The major problems are that there is no finite verb until *iṣe* in d and that it is unclear what the limits are of the rel. cl. marked by *yásya* in b. If we follow Old’s first option, that the rel. cl. occupies pādas a-c, the rel. prn. (towards the end of b) is positioned far too deeply in the clause. His 3rd option envisions a discontinuous rel. cl. partly embedded in and partly following the main cl., with the rel cl. verb being *nákṣate* in d -- a syntactic configuration that is simply impossible. His 2nd option, basically adopted by Ge as well, takes the rel. cl. as limited to *vēpī vākvarī yásya nū gīh*. This is more acceptable, though the rel. cl. would be definitely embedded, not only in the main clause but within a long acc. NP (*tám ... índram* [REL CL] *tuvigrābhám ...*). My own solution is similar to this, but limits the rel. cl. to *yásya nū gīh*; this not only better accounts for the position of the particle *nū* but also diminishes the effect of the embedding, because brief nominal rel. clauses, roughly equivalent to izafe constructions, are acceptable in RVic syntax (see my Fs. Hale article). See esp. *yó vídānaḥ* in the previous hymn, VI.21.2. Scar’s (208) tr. appears to follow the same analysis, with the rel. cl. limited to “[das Lied,] das nun ihm gehört ...”

The root noun cmpd *rabhodā*- is glossed by Scar (208) in the first instance as ‘Ungestüm, Gewalt, Kraft gebend, aufnehmend’, leaving it undetermined whether Indra bestows or assumes *rābhas*-, a question that Scar discusses in some detail without coming to a definite conclusion. Since, as Scar notes, there are several good exx. of *rābhas*- and related words as objects of medial *ā* *√dā* ‘take, assume’ (e.g., I.145.3) and since the pāda in which the adj. is found seems to depict Indra on a rampage (*tuvigrābhám tuvikūrmím* “powerfully grasping, powerfully ranging”), the medial ‘assume’ value makes the most sense. Although ideally we might want the preverb *ā* represented, root noun cmpds with the structure NOUN–PREV–*√* are disallowed (see my “Limits on Root-noun Compounds,” Fs. Kellens). (Cmpds of the type *tveṣā–sam–drś-* in 9b below aren’t counterexamples, because, as the accent shows, the root noun cmpd *saṃdrś-* has been in turn incorporated into a bahuvrīhi), and in any case the outcome of *rabhas–ā–dā-* would be hard to parse once sandhi rules had applied.

The verb of the main clause must be *iṣe* in d, but what it represents is uncertain. Gr (Nachtr., 1755) assigns it to *√iṣ* ‘send’, identifying it as a 1st sg.; Old tr. as 3rd sg. ‘er regt sich ... an’, which I assume means that he assigns it to *√iṣ* ‘send’, though he doesn’t comment on either root affiliation or morphology. Ge suggests a 3rd sg. either to *√i* (built like *stuṣe*, acdg. to him, though *stuṣe* is overwhelmingly *first* sg.) or to *√iṣ* (which *√iṣ* he doesn’t say, though his tr. ‘sucht’ suggests *√iṣ* ‘seek’). Lub gives *iṣe* as an independent lemma (p. 321), with a question mark, no gloss, and 4 occurrences. As my tr. ‘seeks’ indicates, I think it belongs to *√iṣ* ‘seek’ and is a 3rd sg. A number of other forms to this root take *gātúm* ‘way’ as obj. (pres. *ichá-* I.80.6, IV.18.10, VI.6.1; pf. *īṣ-* I.112.16, III.1.2). But what is the form? Almost the only way to get a 3rd sg. in *-e* (outside of archaic forms like *duhé*) is in the perfect, and as we just saw, other forms of the pf. of this

root take the same object. I suggest that we do, or did, have a pf. here, whose expected form would be *īṣe. This putative form with heavy root syllable would in fact work metrically here. See also IV.23.6 and X.20.7, where I suggest the same underlying form for the transmitted form with light root vowel; the suggested long vowel is a significant metrical improvement in both passages. (Lub’s 4th ex. in VIII.46.17 is better taken as part of a cmpd. *āramiṣe*.) There are several ways to explain the short vowel. On the one hand, it can be wrongly extracted from combinations with preverbs like *upeṣé* in I.129.8, whose correct analysis is *upa īṣé*, but could also in principle contain *īṣé. On the other hand, the dat. *iṣé* to the root noun *iṣ-* ‘refreshment’, found in nearby VI.13.2, 17.14, might have influenced it. MLW suggests that it’s simply an archaic 3rd sg. middle pres., like *duhé* just cited – which would cut the Gordian knot.

Stepping back from the formal difficulties of the vs., we can try to fit its contents into the context of the hymn. The vs. seems to express the same questioning anxiety as vs. 4: do the singers -- and their song -- succeed in reaching Indra and attaining his good opinion, or does he respond to their approach with disdainful tricks? While asking this question, the song seeks her way and approaches what sounds like an intimidatingly formidable Indra, hoping for acceptance and favor. That we have moved from the plural male poets/singers of vss. 2 and 4 to the lone female song (fem. *gīḥ*) makes the mismatch of power all the clearer. The verb *nākṣate* in the final clause brings us back to *nakṣad-dābhā-* in vs. 2.

VI.22.6: Indra’s overwhelming power, viewed with some apprehension in the previous vss., is a positive force when it is exercised for our benefit against external foes, and the hymn now turns to this happier theme.

The publ. tr. assigns the instr. phrase *ayā ... māyāyā* “with this magic power” to Indra, whereas Ge and Old assume that the phrase goes with *vāṛdhānām* and refers to Vṛtra’s *māyā*; Old is in fact quite scornful of the former interpr. However, see comm. ad nearby VI.18.9, where I argue that Indra is regularly credited with *māyā* in this Indra cycle. See, e.g., 1d in this hymn and 2d in the previous one (VI.21.2), both with *purumāyā-* qualifying Indra. It is also the case that this hymn contains hostile *māyā*; see 9d. I therefore now think that *māyayā* in this vs. has double application. Its tight embedding in the acc. phrase *tyām māyāyā vāṛdhānām* does suggest that it belongs to Vṛtra, but the initial near-deictic *ayā*, outside that NP, refers, in my opinion, to “this (*māyā*) right here” -- namely Indra’s. I would therefore amend the tr. to “With this (uncanny power of yours) right here ... (you shattered) him who had grown strong with his uncanny power.”

The identification of the vajra with “the mountain that has the speed of thought” goes back to Sāy.

Though the first hemistich lacks a verb, it is easy enough to supply ‘shattered’ from *rujō ví* in the 2nd half-vs.

VI.22.7: The predicated inf. *paritaṃsayādhyai* has no clear subject, but *vaḥ* must serve in this capacity, referring to the poets, who will perform this action with “their newer insight” (*dhiyā nāvasyā*). The model for this action is the previous poets referred to in 2ab who praised and stimulated Indra, here represented by the adverbial *pratnavāt* ‘in the

ancient way, as the ancients did'. The force of *pari-* in the infinitive must be to indicate that poets from all competing groups will try to pull Indra to their side.

Ge renders *animāná-* as 'ohne Vorbild' (pattern, model), but there seems to be no support for this tr. The only occurrence of *ní √mā* that I know of in the RV is in the enigmatic creation hymn III.38.7d *ní ... mamire*, where it is paired with *ā ... mamire* (7a), with both verbs referring to the 'measuring out' of creation and created things. There is another occurrence of the negated adj. *animāná-* in I.27.11, but nothing in that passage pushes the word to mean anything beyond 'without measure'.

VI.22.9: The lexeme *ví dayate* is often used positively, of distributing good things to deserving people; cf., e.g., III.2.11 *vásu rátnā dáyamāno ví dāśúṣe* "distributing goods and treasures to the pious man." However, a few passages are, or can be, negative, esp. III.34.1 *dáyamāno ví śátrūn* "fragmenting his rivals" (probably also IV.7.10). Here the dominant sense must be negative and the wiles must be Vṛtra's (and perhaps those of other enemies) — though a positive spin is just possible as a second reading: "distributing your magic wiles," that is, deploying his own *māyā*-s widely. See comm. ad VI.18.9 on Indra's use of his *māyā*-s in combat.

VI.22.10: The main cl., occupying the first hemistich, has no verb; I supply *dhiṣvá* from 9a, though any verb of providing, giving, bringing would work as well (see Ge's "bring").

The phrase *dāsāny āryāṇi vṛtrā* "Dāsa and Ārya obstacles," with the contrastive pair *dāśa- ārya-* juxtaposed in c, is, surprisingly, a fairly well-attested formula, variously realized. In addition to the phrase here, also

VI.33.3 *dāsā vṛtrāṇi āryā ca*

VI.60.6 *vṛtrāṇi āryā ... dāsāni*

VII.83.1 *dāsā ca vṛtrā ... āryāṇi ca*

X.69.6 *dāsā vṛtrāṇi āryā*

Although the existence of *Ārya* obstacles might seem odd, *dāśa- ārya-* is a species of merism that would seem to encompass all the types of human obstacles we might encounter, both belonging to our larger community and alien.

The further specification *nāhuṣāṇi* in d appears to be an afterthought that focuses our enmity on a defined group within the larger whole; elsewhere the clan ancestor Nahus and derivatives of that word are generally positively viewed members of the community, including in the two other occurrences in VI (VI.26.7, 46.7). See comm. ad IX.88.2, X.80.6, etc.

VI.23 Indra

For the repetitive lexicon and the unusual amount of linkage between vss., see publ. intro.

VI.23.1: The rendering of *nímiśla-* as 'intertwined' may be a bit over the top, but 'attached to' or 'linked to' is too anodyne; assuming an underlying sense 'mixed', the point is that Indra can't be separated from the substances and words offered to him in the ritual.

The standard NP *suté sóme* is polarized at the boundaries of pāda a, allowing *sóme* to directly adjoin its rhyme form (and ritual partner) *stóme* over the pāda boundary - a simple but effective use of word order.

On *bíbhṛad vájram* see comm. ad VI.20.9.

VI.23.2: The gen. phrase *dákṣasya bibhyúṣaḥ* is troublesome, as it is not clear who or what it refers to or what its syntactic function is. Old interpr. it as a “dativischer Gen.,” though he gives no tr. But Ge seems to take it as a gen. absolute: “während der Entschlossene Furcht hatte.” In either case *dákṣa-* seems to be taken as an adj. qualifying a human and this fearful human is taken to be one on our side, aided either directly (dative gen.) or indirectly (gen. abs.) by fearless Indra. In this passage the single ‘skillful’ (or ‘determined’: Ge’s ‘entschlossen’) person would presumably be the soma-presser (*súṣvi-*) of ab, and this is not impossible. However, although there are a few undoubted exx. of adjectival *dákṣa-* ‘skillful’ (e.g., I.51.2 *dákṣāsa ṛbhávaḥ*), in most clear exx. the stem is a masc. abstract ‘skill, ability’, and in doubtful cases I prefer to seek such a meaning. Here I suggest that the “fearful skill” belongs to Indra’s enemies, the *dáśyūn* of d, and depicts their fading confidence in their skill or ability to counter Indra. Under this interpr. it can either be a gen. abs. with Ge (though this construction is rare at any stage and is supposed not to exist before Vedic prose; see Delbrück, AIS 389–90) or is a gen. of quality (although this construction is also marginal) with *dáśyūn* “the Dasyus of frightened skill.” The publ. tr. represents an absolute interpr.; the gen. of quality might be a better analysis, but is difficult to render in Engl., as the tr. just given shows (better “of daunted/craven skill,” but this would lose the etymological figure). (Kü’s [336] tr. avoids the problem, but unfortunately only by an unusual grammatical lapse on his part: he explicitly identifies *bibhyúṣaḥ* as acc. pl., which it could be, but tr. the phrase *dákṣasya bibhyúṣaḥ* as a single NP [“für den Geschickten die sich fürchtenden”] apparently failing to remember that *dákṣasya* requires the whole phrase to be gen. sg. He takes this supposed acc. pl. as parallel to *śárdhataḥ*, which he separates from *dáśyūn* and takes as another qualifier of those aided by Indra. His full tr. is “Oder wenn du für den Geschickten die sich fürchtenden furchtlos unterwarfst für den Kühnen, Indra, die Dasyus.” The misparsing of *dákṣasya* excludes this tr.)

VI.23.3–4: The alternation of root-accented *-tar-* agent nouns and redupl. agentive *-i-* stems, both with verbal rection, is a distinctive characteristic of these two vss.

VI.23.4: The phrase *vīra- nárya-* also occurs in the next hymn in VI.24.2, but with a different referent, Indra. Here it must refer to a human who is favored by Indra.

VI.23.5: The first pāda contains an example of an embedded relative that is difficult to sidestep: in *ásmai vayám yád vāvāna tát viviṣma* the first two words dat. *ásmai* and nom. *vayám* rightly belong to the main cl. *tát viviṣma* “we toil at that,” which follows the dependent cl. *yád vāvāna* “what he holds dear.” The two preposed pronouns set the participants and case roles for the vs. (see esp. *indrāya* opening b and d, as well as the two 1st pl. verbs *viviṣma* and *stumasi*) -- hence my tr. as a cleft construction -- but the construction still seems unusual.

The opening of c, *suté sóme stumasi*, takes the same elements found in the figure in vs. 1ab and plays on different phonological similarities. Here *sut(é)* and *stu(masi)* are scrambled versions of each other, while *sóme* stands somewhat apart.

VI.23.6: The first hemistich can be interpr. as a rough repair of the problematic 5a: what Indra holds dear (5a) are the formulations that he makes strengthening for himself (6a), and this is what we have toiled for (6b), with *viviṣmaḥ* in a syntactically more orthodox position than in 5a. (6a also of course is responsive to 5d.)

The phrase opening the 2nd hemistich, *suté sóme sutapāḥ*, echoes 5c, with *sut(apāḥ)* an anagram of *stu(masi)*.

The referent of the acc. pl. neut. adjs. in cd is unspecified; either the pressings or the formulations -- or, better, both -- would work. Both are elsewhere qualified as *śāntama-*: cf. VIII.33.15 *sávanā santu śāntamā* and V.73.10 *imā bráhmāṇi vārdhanā ... santu śāntamā*.

A rare ex. of variant readings, the hapax *rāṇḍya-/rāṇḍrya-* is unclear. Ge refuses to tr. it. The publ. tr. 'enjoyable' (which should be marked with ?) rests on Hoffmann's suggestion (reported in EWA s.v. *rāṇḍya-*), deriving it from $\sqrt{raṇ}$ (or \sqrt{ram}). Certainty of course is impossible, but some such meaning fits the context.

vākṣana- in d serves as a synonymous substitute for *vārdhana-* (5d, 6a).

VI.23.7: Note pleonastic *#urúm ... ulokám#*.

VI.23.8: As in III.41.6 (=VI.45.27) *mandasvā* is not accented despite following *hí*; see comm. ad III.41.6. I have no explanation (nor does Old, despite his ref. to himself). It can be noted that in all three passages the *hí* occurs in 3rd position, after the verb (all three identically *sá mandasvā hí*), but this position is not sufficient to explain the lack of accent, since *hí* elsewhere occurs after its accented verb (e.g., I.2.4 *índavo vām uśánti hí#* ; cf., e.g., I.105.18, 131.6, III.14.5, 26.8, VII.3.3, 23.5, 59.5, VIII.21.18, IX.85.2, X.30.12, 34.11). Note esp. I.189.6, IX.49.4, X.68.7, where *hí* is in 3rd position after the verb as here. Since *hí* often appears after initial accented verbs -- for 2nd sg. med. impvs. like *mandasvā* see the numerous exx. of *#yukṣvā hí* (I.10.3, etc.) -- it might be possible to construct a scenario wherein when such an impv. is displaced from initial position by the pronoun *sá*, it loses its accent by some sort of syntactic analogy. But I find this unlikely: RVic poets are quite sensitive to their accent rules.

Pāda c lacks a verb, but the close parallelism of b and c (*prá [...]* *imé*) and the semantic connection of the two nom. pls *yajñāsaḥ* and *hāvāsaḥ* impose *aśnuvantu* from b.

In c the 1st pl. prn. *asmé*, which could be either dat. or loc., doesn't work very well as either. Ge tr. "von uns," which makes contextual sense but ill fits either possible case form. The publ. tr. takes it as loc., though the tr. is awkward.

I don't know why the modal temperature has been raised, as it were, by precative *yamyāḥ* in d -- though it is the case that there are no 3rd sg. root aor. impvs. attested to \sqrt{yam} , perhaps because a putative **yamtu* or **yantu* would coincide with the much more common 3rd pl. root pres. impv. to \sqrt{i} 'go'.

VI.23.9: Once again a dependent clause seems to follow fronted portions of the main clause, in this case *tām vaḥ sakhāyaḥ*. (Although *vaḥ sakhāyaḥ* could belong semantically in the dependent clause, their lack of accent requires them to follow along with *tām*, or so it seems to me.) As in 5a the fronted material seems to establish the participants in the rest of hemistich: the god and the worshipers. The acc. *tām* is then doubled by both *īm* and the real referent *īndram* in the main clause of b.

The foregoing assumes that the ellipsis of the verb in pāda a is not to be filled with a verb that could take *tām* as object or goal. I have in fact tried to find such a verb that an audience would supply when confronted with *sām ... sūtēṣu*, but I have not been able to come up with a plausible one. The most likely verb to supply is *√as*, esp. given 5d *yáthāsat*, 9c *ásati*, and 10c *ásad yáthā*. Ge supplies “sich ergötze,” presumably a form of *√mad* or *√mand*, which would work contextually. But there is no positive evidence for this conjecture (unlike the three subjunctive forms of *√as* with *yáthā* just cited), and both roots are only marginally construed with *sām*.

VI.23.10: I would slightly change the tr. of the loc. absol. to ‘has been pressed’ or ‘was pressed’ to accord better with the immediate past of the hymn-summary verb *astāvi*.

Klein (DGRV I.442–43) interpr. *maghónaḥ* as acc. pl. (“the liberal ones”), which it could be morphologically, but *√kṣi* ‘rule over’ always takes the gen. (Gr gives one passage with supposed acc., V.37.4, but it belongs to the etymologically separate root *√kṣi* ‘dwell’, and in any case in that passage I do not construe the acc. with that verb.)

The *utá* in c is troubling: it does not seem to conjoin anything and it seems randomly positioned in the pāda. Klein groups it with a small set of passages where he thinks *utá* means ‘(and) also, as well’, and he suggests that it focuses on the immediately preceding word *jaritré* ‘singer’, who will also receive patronage from Indra, in addition to the soma-presser in 9d. I find this unpersuasive, though I don’t have an altogether better solution. One possibility is that we should supply the nom. sg. corresponding to gen. sg. *maghónaḥ* of b, namely **maghāvā*, and *utá* would conjoin this supplied noun with *sūrīḥ*. This would change the tr. to “so that he will be (liberal [/a benefactor]) and a patron to the singer.” A slightly different solution, but still with the supplied **maghāvā*, would be to take *utá* as starting a new clause, with *sūrīḥ* qualifying Indra, yielding a tr. “so that he [=the liberal mortal of b] will be (liberal) to the singer, and Indra (will be) a patron and giver of wealth ...” Indra is called a *sūrī-* in this Indra cycle (VI.29.5=37.5) and elsewhere. This second suggestion is probably less disruptive to the syntax than the first one, but I weakly favor the first because *sūrī-* is more often used of human patrons than of gods.

VI.24 Indra

VI.24.1: In the publ. tr. *ślóka-* is rendered as ‘noise’, but I would now alter that to the sense I usually give that word, ‘signal call’ (see comm. ad I.51.12) -- namely the noise that emanates from the sacrifice, often made by the pressing stones, to alert the gods that the sacrifice is underway. Of course, it is possible here that it refers to more general noise (as in the Engl. expression “joyful noise”) associated with the sacrifice.

In the publ. tr. I give full lexical value to the expression *sácā sómeṣu* as “when the soma juices are in his company.” This is certainly possible, but, as noted in the comm. ad

IV.31.5, *sácā* with loc. often lacks lexical value and simply signals an absolute (or absolute-like) construction. Here I might substitute the tr. “when the soma juices (are pressed).”

Ge seems to take *nṛbhyaḥ* as a beneficial dat. (“für die Männer”), but it is more likely that it is an agent with the gerundive, since such formations do take dat. agents. (See my “Case of Agent ...”) It is possible, however, that I’ve misinterpreted his tr. “... ist er ... für die Männer zu preisen,” and it’s actually the equivalent of an English “for ... to” construction (“for the men to praise”), which would give it agentive value.

VI.24.2: The phrase *vīra- nárya-* is also found in the immed. preceding hymn, VI.23.4, where it refers to a man favored by Indra, not Indra himself. The shift in referent may justify a different rendering of *nárya-*, ‘favorable to men’ as here, but alternatively we may tr. them both the same “manly hero,” since *nṛ-* and *nárya-* are regularly applied to gods in that sense.

The bahuvrīhi *urvyūtiḥ*, matching 1d *ākṣitotiḥ* at pāda end, is morphologically problematic. It must be read as a quadrisyllable, and, further, the 2nd vowel must be short (*urvī(y)-ūtiḥ*) in the Triṣṭubh cadence. (The Pp. reads *urvī 'ūtiḥ*.) Old simply remarks of it that the expected form **urū-ūtiḥ* “wäre phonetisch unbequem,” which is perfectly true but doesn’t account for the form. There are several different analyses of it in the lit. Wack (AiG II.1.52 [also 274], flg. Johansson 1897) assumes that it represents **urvī+ūti-* with the fem. form of the adj. *urū-* as 1st member compounded with a fem. 2nd member. He does not mention that the form has to be metrically distracted, much less that the distracted vowel must be read short. Of course, the prevocalic outcome of *-ī (<*iH)* would indeed likely be *-ī(y)* as here. But the real problem is that there seem to be no other good Vedic examples of the type of cmpd envisioned, with a derived fem. adj. stem as first member showing gender agreement with the 2nd; the cmpds *uru-kṣiti-* and *urū-gavyūti-* with the stem form of the adj. as 1st member even when cmpded with a fem. *-ti-* stem, provide counterexamples. (Wack could argue that the fem. was used in our case for metrical convenience; but without a grammatical model for this kind of compounding, it seems difficult to imagine a Vedic poet inventing this type even to rescue his cadence.) By contrast Lanman (Noun Inflection, pp. 380–81, esp. 381 B.4c) suggests that the first member represents the older fem. instr. in *-ī*, shortened to *-i*. (Actually he thinks *-ī* is a “contracted” form of *-iā*, but that aspect of his view is not relevant here.) Although there is more precedent for the instr. sg. than for a fem. stem-form as first cmpd. member, at least with archaic personal pronominal stems (type *yuṣmā-datta-* ‘given by you’), the problem here is that there is no functional reason to have an instr.: the cmpd. must mean ‘having broad/wide-ranging help’, not ‘having help with a broad [fem.] X’. Lanman’s solution is found, in a slightly different package, in BR and is reproduced by Gr (though dismissed by Wack). The BR lemma contains the lapidary “*urviyā + ūti*,” expanded a bit by Gr to “*urvī = urviyā*, I. f. von *urū*.” Although I think the purport of these formulations is the same as Lanman’s, the invocation of *urviyā* allows us to pursue a different path: to take *urvī-* as truncated from the adverbial *urviyā*, orig. of course the long instr. of fem. *urvī-* but only used as an adverb. Although the fem. instr. is still the ultimate source, it would be possible for the poet to perceive *urvī-* in *urviyā* as a base form to which the instr./adverbial ending had been affixed and therefore available for compounding. I would also tentatively put forth yet a different, though related, analysis: that *urvī-*

preserves in altered form the old Caland compound-forming *-i-*. The derived *u*-adj. *urú-* should substitute this *-i-* when compounded, yielding **ur-i-* (of the type *r̥ji-* ‘silvery’, Aves. *bārāzi-* ‘lofty’). This **ur-i-* of course never appears, but I would suggest that *urvī-* may indirectly contain it, grafted onto the adj. stem *urú-*, encouraged by the independent adv. *urviyā*.

The phrase *śámso narām* is a reordered variant of *narām (ná) śámso-*, on which see comm. ad II.34.6. Here I interpr. it as I do the similar phrase *śámso āyóḥ* (IV.6.11, V.3.4) “Laud of Āyu,” as referring to the god as a sort of embodiment of the praise he receives. As I point out in the comm. ad IV.6.11, it is rather like referring to someone as “the toast of the town” or perhaps “the talk of the town” -- both of which English expressions are quite peculiar when considered literally.

On *dāti* as a root aor. subj., see comm. ad IV.8.3. Here it would be better rendered ‘he will give’.

VI.24.3: The ‘help’ (*ūtí-*) found in the first two vss. (*ákṣitotiḥ* 1d, *urvyūtiḥ* 2b) recurs here uncompounded. The forms of help “have grown outward” (*vy ūtáyo ruruhuḥ*) in d, an image that expands on *urvyūtiḥ* ‘having broad help’ in 2b.

Despite Old’s detailed disc. of the first hemistich, in which he takes *bṛhán* with *ákṣaḥ* as “the lofty axle,” I am persuaded instead by Ge’s interpr. Citing the nearby passage VI.21.2 ... *āti mahnā* ... *riricé mahitvám*, where Indra’s greatness (nom. *mahitvám*) projects beyond the two worlds in/with their greatness (instr. *mahnā*), he supplies synonymous nom. *mahimā* here as well, referring to Indra’s greatness, with instr. *mahnā* belonging to the two worlds as in VI.21.2. Although *te* is adjacent to *mahnā*, it has been independently positioned by Wackernagel’s Law and need not limit the following instr. Ge presumably chose to supply *mahimā* rather than the *mahitvám* in VI.21.2 because we need a masc. here, given masc. *bṛhán*, but it also works better because *mahnā* also belongs to this *-mán*-stem.

VI.24.4: The vs. begins and ends with pādas containing triple etymological figures: a: *śácīvatas te puruśāka śākāḥ* and d: *dāmanvanto adāmānaḥ sudāman*. The effect seems clumsily heavy, but it is quite possible that I’m missing something. At least in the 2nd case, *sudāman* is a pun uniting two roots *√dā* ‘bind’ and ‘give’. It is possible that there is a buried pun also in pāda a. The previous vs. compared Indra’s aid to the branches of a tree (*vṛkṣasya* ... *vayāḥ*); another word for ‘branch’ is *śākhā-*, which is phonologically close to the *śāk-* forms. Perhaps the poet is punning off this unexpressed synonym.

Old is insistent that *srutí-* should be read **sṛtí-* here and in most other instances in the RV (see his comm. ad I.42.3). I don’t understand his reasons and stick with the transmitted reading.

The imagery in pāda b is complex. In its other occurrence (I.56.2=IV.55.6) *saṃcāraṇa-* is used of the converging of rivers into the sea. Here the word *srutāyaḥ* ‘streams’ maintains the flowing imagery (another reason to keep the reading, *pace* Old [see immed. above]; see also 6a), but they are streams of cows, not of water, and this phrase (“converging like streams of cattle”) is a simile, where the comparandum is Indra’s abilities. But in what way do Indra’s abilities flow? On what are they converging? Indra himself? or, more likely, the lucky mortal recipients of his aid?

The simile in the 2nd hemistich, “like cords for calves,” likewise applying to Indra’s abilities, is also opaque. Ge cites the dharmasūtra compd *vatsa-tantī*- (ĀpDS I.31.13, GDS IX.52), but though apposite, it is not helpful. The passages in question simply state that a *snātaka* should not step over a *vatsa-tantī*. Without knowing more about the details of Vedic animal husbandry, we cannot get too far, but I assume -- based on “binding without bonds” -- that calves were kept under control with very gentle ropes or perhaps by means other than tying. But why should these gentle measures be compared to Indra’s abilities?

VI.24.5: The publ. tr. of this vs. differs in a number of respects from the standard interpr. In particular, in the first hemistich, flg. an interpr. of JPB’s, the two pairs *anyád adyá kárvaram anyád u sváh* “one deed today and another tomorrow” and *ásac ca sāt* “non-existent and existent” are taken as a chiasmic square, with *anyád adyá* matching *sāt* and *anyád u sváh* matching *ásat*. In other words the deed Indra does today is existent, while the one he will do tomorrow is (as yet) non-existent. The standard interpr. takes *ásat ca sāt* as an expression of process: Indra makes each deed (the one today, the one tomorrow) that was as yet non-existent into an existent one (so Ge “... macht Indra das Unwirkliche alsbald wirklich”). This does seem a possible interpr., and I would suggest an alternative tr. “One deed today and another tomorrow -- Indra makes the not (yet) existent (deed) existent.” The problem with these interpr. is that the *ca* is left without function. Klein (DGRV I.170, II.24) takes *ásac ca sāt* as “the bad and the good,” which deviates from the usual sense esp. of the former and breaks the thematic connection with the first pāda: “(Performing) one deed today and another tomorrow, Indra turns hither immediately the bad and the good.”

In the 2nd hemistich the standard interpr. takes Mitra, Varuṇa, and Pūṣan as the individualized seriatim singular subjects of *paryetāsti* (= *paryetā asti*), as in Ge’s “Mitra und Varuṇa und Pūṣan kommen uns dabei dem Wunsche des Nebenbuhlers zuvor.” (Tichy [-tar-stems, 188] follows Ge’s syntactic template, but with an aberrant interpr. of *pāri ví*.) As Ge’s blithe disregard of the sg. verb shows, the triple subject is somewhat awkward, given sg. *asti* (though singular verbs with a series of singular subjects are indeed found). But there are several other problematic aspects to this strain of interpr. On the syntactic level, it is surprising to find *asti* in a main clause if its function is simply copular (“M, V, and P is/are *paryetā*”); *asti* in main clauses is almost always existential. On the thematic level, these other gods are intrusive in the hymn -- the focus so far has been entirely on Indra -- and it seems odd suddenly to credit these gods with the power to effect a desirable thing for us, when Indra has been performing the heavy lifting all along. I therefore think that Thieme (Fremdling, 53) is correct in taking Indra as the unexpressed subject of *paryetā asti*, though he doesn’t discuss the passage or, rather disingenuously, even quote the preceding pāda with the other possible subjects. Given these factors, I think that *asti* is implicitly contrastive and emphatic: the other gods are there for us in some sense, but *it’s Indra* who ... As for the sense of *paryetā* and *pāri ví* in general, the literal meaning is ‘go around’, hence ‘encompass’ and hence to contain and control, a sense that works very well here.

VI.24.6: The simile in pāda a makes explicit the flowing water implicit in 4b (see disc. above). But it is not clear what the waters are being compared to. Old suggests Schätze

and Segnungen, with various rather vague parallels suggested. I find Ge's citation of nearby VI.34.1 more to the point. Pāda b of that vs. reads *vī ca tvād yanti vibhvo manīṣāḥ* "Out from you go inspired thoughts far and wide." Although Indra is generally viewed as the goal and recipient of poetic thoughts and praises, he is also, as Ge says in his n. 6ab to our passage, "der Aufgangspunkt der Dichtkunst und des Kultus." Here we can supply as subject and comparandum the 'inspired thoughts' (*manīṣāḥ*) of 34.1 or some similar reference to poetic production. The more conventional view of Indra as poetic goal is expressed in the 2nd hemistich, which roughly corresponds to VI.34.1a *sāṃ ca tvé jagmúr gíra indra pūrvīḥ* "Many songs have converged on you, Indra."

The verb (*vī*) ... *anayanta* is a bit troubling because even the rare medial forms of the overwhelmingly active pres. *nāya(ti)* are otherwise transitive. Cf., e.g., V.45.10 *udnā ná nāvam anayanta dhîrāḥ* "Like a boat through the water the wise ones guided (him)." I see no choice but to assume that this form has acquired a nonce intrans. sense because of its middle voice.

VI.24.7: The distribution of the three measures of time vis-à-vis the two verbs *jāranti* and *avakarśāyanti* cannot be determined for certain, nor does it really matter. The pāda boundary favors keeping *māśāḥ* with *śarādaḥ* ("whom neither the autumns nor the months age, nor the days make lean"), but the position of the various *nā*-s might favor bracketing *māśāḥ* with *dyāvah*. This is how Ge tr., and I have followed suit, though I don't feel strongly one way or the other.

VI.24.8: *stavān* is an intractable form, found also in II.19.5, 20.5. In all three cases it is found in this same, apparently nom. sg., form, referring to Indra, and with the likely value 'being praised, having/receiving praise'. In all three cases it also occurs at the end of a Triṣṭubh pāda, which suggests that the root syllable should be heavy (**stāvān*) -- though Old (ad II.19.5) does not regard this as a problem. Old discusses the form in great detail ad II.19.5 without reaching a firm conclusion; see also KEWA III.521, with listing of the lit. but again no conclusions. Assuming that the form belongs to *√stu* 'praise' (other proposed root affiliations are properly dismissed by Old), there are two main strains of explanation: as a truncation or as a haplology. Several different underlying forms have been suggested for the truncation; the least problematic is Pischel's suggested pres. mid. part. *stavānāḥ* (1x; versus fairly common *stāvāna-*). But least problematic doesn't mean *unproblematic*: lopping off inflectional endings isn't a practice we find elsewhere in the RV, esp. when it leaves an unanalyzable form, and we might expect the accent to follow that of the common root-accented participle. The haplology explanation (owing ultimately to Johansson, who was responsible for one of the explanations of *urvyūtiḥ* above, vs. 2) has found more general acceptance (see AiG I. Nachtr. 161, though cf. Mayrhofer's lack of enthusiasm in KEWA, cited above) -- that it is derived from a *-vant-* stem, nom. sg. **stava-vān*, with haplologic loss of the medial syllable. Old raises several objections to this: first, that the accent is wrong. The accent of *-vant-* stems is overwhelmingly that of the base noun; if the putative stem was formed to *stáva-* 'praise', it should have yielded **stá(va)vān*. Old's 2nd objection has to do with this base form: that *stáva-* is found only once in the RV.

I tentatively advance a different explanation from either of the prevailing ones, that it is formed with a Hoffmann suffix (**-Hon-* / *-Hn-*), to the just mentioned *stáva-*

‘praise’, hence ‘having praise’. This would produce the attested long vowel; moreover, insofar as we can tell, the Hoffmann suffix attracts the accent. See *somān-* ‘having soma’ (based on root-accented *sóma-*) and discussion ad I.18.1. Of course, the rarity of the base form *stáva-* is a problem here, as it was for the *-vant-* stem explanation just presented, but perhaps because the Hoffmann suffix was not synchronically productive and therefore our *stavān* should be an old form, this rarity is less problematic than for the productive *-vant-* stems. It might also be possible to posit a long-vowel base **stāva-* (cf. fem. *stāvā-* VS XVIII.42), with expected Brugmann’s Law outcome for a standard **o*-grade thematic noun, producing **stāvān*. Though, once the formation of **stāvān* was no longer understood, this *vr̥ddhi* would have been eliminated in the transmitted text in favor of the *guṇa* prevailing in the verbal forms, it would still be reflected in the heavy syllable called for by the cadential pattern. As for the nom. sg. in *-ān* instead of the **-ā* expected for an *n*-stem, I would suggest that the stem was assimilated to a *-vant-* stem.

VI.24.9: In pāda a the instr. *ámatreṇa* can be supplied with the instr. adj.s, extracted from the possessive *amātrīn* ‘having an *ámatra-*’.

In b *sutapāvan* reprises *sutapā(h)* in 1b.

vyūṣṭau (*/-iṣu*) almost always occurs with dependent *uṣásah* -- “at the early brightening of the dawn” -- and of course is derived from the same root *√vas* ‘dawn’ as *uṣás-*. Here we find the apparent opposite: *aktór vyūṣṭau* “at the early brightening of the night”; despite the anonymity of the genitives, I think the two expressions refer to the same time period, the moment when the deep darkness of night begins to lift. This can be considered as brightening either of the night or of the dawn. On the almost identical expression in V.30.13 and its morphological twist, see comm. ad loc.

VI.25 Indra

As noted in the publ. intro., the hymn has an omphalos shape, with vs. 5 the omphalos, surrounded by matched vss. 4 and 6. Although vss. 3 and 7 do not show similar matchings, there is some repeated phraseology between vss. 1/2 and 8/9: *vr̥trahátye* 1c, 8b; *sp̥ṛdhah* (...) *mīthātīh* 2a, 9ab.

VI.25.1–2: On *avīh* (1c) and *áva tārīh* (2d) as “hortativ,” see Hoffmann Injunkt. 264.

VI.25.1: That *avīh* of c is also the verb of d is suggested by passages like I.110.9 *vājebhir no vājasātau aviddhi*, VIII.46.11 *dhíyo vājebhir āvitha* with *√av* and an instr. of *vāja-* ‘prize’.

VI.25.2: Ge supplies the verb ‘drive’ in c (“Mit diesen (treib) alle Angriffe auseinander”), but I see no reason why it can’t be in the orbit of d. In vs. 1 the two pādas cd share a single verb (*avīh* c), as do the first two pādas of this vs. (*vyathayā*). With this pattern established, it seems reasonable to take *áva tārīh* in d as also governing the accusatives of c. Under this interpr., I take *vīṣūcīh* as proleptic, rather like 3d *kṛṇuhī párácah* “put them far away.”

VI.25.3: Pāda c lacks a verb to govern the acc. *vithurā sāvāṃsi*. On the model of 1cd, 2ab, and 2cd, we might simply deploy the (first) verb of d, *jahí*, across the pāda

boundary: “smash their faltering powers” or, with proleptic adj., “smash their powers (to be) faltering.” However, *vithurā* is derived from the root $\sqrt{\text{vyath}}$ ‘falter’, whose causative supplied the verb in 2ab, *vyathayā*. I therefore think there’s a different kind of trick here: the poet expects us to supply the CAUSATIVE feature of the verb in 2b with the lexical feature of that verb contained in the adj. *vithurā* -- hence my tr. “(render) their powers faltering.”

VI.25.4: *tanūrúc-* is, of course, a root noun compd., ‘shining with/in their bodies’, but the bahuvrīhi-like tr. works better in context.

kṛṇvaíte is clearly meant as a 3rd du. mid. subjunctive to the 5th cl. pres. of $\sqrt{\text{kr}}$, but it has the wrong grade of the suffix: we expect **kṛnávaíte* (cf. 2nd du. mid. *áśnávaithe* [VII.70.4]). It clearly simply anticipates the root pres. 3rd du. mid. *brávaíte*, which ends the next hemistich (4d). This imitation comes at a metrical cost: the heavy root syllable *kṛṇv* produces a bad Triṣṭubh cadence. (The grammatically correct form would also, of course, be metrically problematic.) A root aor. subj. **karaíte* would fit the meter better, but there’s no warrant for emendation. For a passage in which the poet simply avoids the middle dual subjunctive of $\sqrt{\text{kr}}$ altogether by substituting a plural, see comm. ad I.178.2.

The locative string in cd is the usual expression of the stakes -- a type of loc. absol. lacking an overt participle. The full expression is *dhāne hité* “when the stake is set” (VI.45.11, 13, etc.). The string here contains a formulaic pair, *toké ... tánaye* “progeny and prosperity” with three other locc., one inserted inside the formula. On the basis of VI.31.1 (q.v.), where a *ca* after *tánaye* better delineates the pairing, I would slightly change the tr. to “when progeny and prosperity [or, offspring and lineage], cattle, water, and fields are at stake.”

The two *vā*-s (4a, 4c), in conjunction with the subjunctives, seem to set out a deliberative choice: “it may be that X ... or it may be that Y.” The two possibilities floated as to how one champion might defeat another set the stage for the next vs. (5), which forecloses any possibility that one of the champions, even a successful one, could take on Indra. The two *vā*-s are slightly off-balance, however, since the first one is located in the main clause (a) to which the first *yád* clause is immediately appended (b), while the second is found in the second *yád* clause, whose main clause seems to be, by default, the original pāda a. This seems to me a minor problem: the point is that the two champions (*śūra-*) in pāda a may defeat each other in single combat (b) *or* in a full-on battle (cd). The first *vā* would be better positioned in pāda b, but it has been shifted to the front of the whole main-cl./dep.-cl. construction -- a sort of super-Wackernagel’s Law position. Klein (DGRV II.194, 201–2) treats the two *vā* occurrences separately, taking the 2nd as conjoining (or disjoining) the parallel *yád* clauses b and c, but the 1st as the equivalent of “the asseverative particle *vaí*.” This seems somewhat perverse to me: two occurrences of the same particle in a single verse, esp. a particle that regularly appears in pairs, invite a unified explanation; moreover, I am very dubious that *vā* is ever used for *vaí*, a particle that is rare in the RV anyway. Even Klein can only identify 6 passages where he thinks *vā* = *vaí* (DGRV II.201), of which he finds syntactic support for only 3. That 6c contains a pair of *vā*-s whose syntactic connection is clearer provides evidence that these two *vā*-s also form a pair.

VI.25.5: Like other exx. of the negated pf. of \sqrt{yudh} , *yuyódha* here seems to mean “has (successfully) fought”; the point is presumably not that no one has tried to fight Indra, but that none of them has succeeded. See comm. ad VII.83.7.

VI.25.6–8: Each of these vss. contains at least one derivative of $nṛ́-$ ‘(superior) man’: 6a *nṛmṇám*, 6c *nṛvāti*, 7c *nṛtamāsaḥ*, 8d *nṛśáhye*.

VI.25.6: By my analysis this vs. matches 4 in structure and in referents, forming with 4 a ring around the omphalos vs. 5. In the first pāda the unspecified pair (*ubháyoḥ ... ayóḥ* “of both of these”) refers, in my view (as also, apparently, Ge), to the two *krándasī* (lit. ‘war-cries’, viz., opposing forces) of 4d; Indra has mastery over the manly power of both of them, as vs. 5 has already implied. The verb of 6b, *hávante*, doubles *brávaite* in 4d semantically; both refer to verbal appeals to Indra for help in battle. The two forces referred to in an oblique case in pāda a return as subject in pāda d, with yet another 3rd du. med. subjunctive, *vitantasaíte*.

Pace Ge, who gives them different roles, the locc. in c are parallel and match those of 4c, expressing what is at stake in the battle. Although it might seem odd to name a *vṛtrá-* as a stake, I think the point is that the battle may be about confronting an obstacle or about acquiring a rich dwelling place. Klein’s tr. (DGRV II.159) “when they battle each other in the (struggle with the) obstacle or in (the struggle for) great dwelling space rich in heroes” reflects the same view. See Schaeffer (Intens. 126–27) for detailed disc. A similar use of *vṛtréṣu* is found in the next hymn (VI.26.2), where it is implicitly parallel to *gōṣu*, an expression for the stakes.

I take the subordinator *yádi* in b as representing *yád + ī* (‘when’ + acc. particle) (as described pp. 305–9 in my 2002 article “Rigvedic *sīm* and *īm*”), rather than conditional *yádi* ‘if’. All that needs to be done is to insert a notional word space between *yád* and *ī*. The pāda could use an overt acc. (*ī* ‘him’, as obj. of *hávante*), and ‘if’ does not make sense.

The publ. tr. implicitly reflects a similar analysis of *yádi* in d, but I now think that interpr. is probably incorrect. In favor of it is the parallelism with the matched vs. 4, which contains two parallel *yád* clauses. But several factors, both formal and functional, weigh against it: the final *i* of *yádi* is short and does not occur before a cons. cluster, which elsewhere facilitates the shortening of the particle *ī* (though it is not a necessary condition). Moreover, an acc. referent is not necessary to the clause, since the verb is a reciprocal middle (though see I.131.3, also with med. *ví √tams*, *ví tvā tatasre* “They have tussled over you,” a passage that also contains a loc. of the stakes). The publ. tr. also renders the subjunctive *vitantasaíte* as an indicative. I now think that the conditional *yádi* and the subjunctive contribute to the same semantic effect. For a full revised tr. see below.

On the assumption that cd forms a single dependent clause (as it does in the publ. tr. and in Ge), the *yádi* is too deep in the clause, following not only the nom. du. adj. *vyácasvantā* that opens pāda d but also the complex loc. phrase that occupies pāda c. This problem could be easily remedied by connecting c with b, rather than with d, leaving *yádi* in standard 2nd position in a clause now consisting only of d. The only obstacle to that reassignment is my interpr. of *maháḥ*, which in the publ. tr. I take as a sentential adverb and construe with *vitantasaíte* (“... keep tussling mightily”). However, that interpr. is

quite fragile, esp. because of the position of *mahāḥ*, and I am happy to abandon it, though I do not have a particularly good alternative suggestion. Schaeffer (Intens. 128) first suggests that it is an adverb, with adjectival aspirations (not her phrase), construed with the following phrase *nṛvāti kṣāye*, in the manner of Old's (ZDMG 55 [1901]: 270–71) interpr. of *mahó rāyē* “mächtiglich zu Reichtum” → “zu mächtigem Reichtum” -- in this instance “mächtiglich männerreiches Land” → “grosses männerreiches Land.” Alternatively she suggests it could be an acc. pl. with gapped *devān* as a goal or obj. of *vitantasaṭe* (“sooft die zwei ... (Völkerschaften) die Grossen (Götter) angehen ...”). This second suggestion seems quite implausible, but the first one is possible, in the absence of anything better. In any event, it is essentially the interpr. given by Ge (“um einen grossen männerreichen Wohnsitz”), however he arrived at it. (Judging from his n. 6cd it rests on Sāy.'s high-handed glossing of *maho* with loc. *mahati*.) Klein's tr. “great dwelling space rich in heroes” (see above) simply follows Ge and also shows a quasi-adj. interpr. of *mahāḥ*.

Putting all this together, I offer the revised translation:

“He is master of the manly power of both of these (armies) when the ritual adepts call on him in the clash,

whether an obstacle or a dwelling place rich in men is at issue — if the two (armies) in their expansion will keep tussling mightily back and forth with one another.”

VI.25.7: As usual, *aryāḥ* has a number of possible interpr. Ge takes it as nom. pl. identical to the *sūrāyaḥ* in d. Old suggests either acc. pl. or abl. sg. without choosing one. Thieme (Fremdling, 73–74) opts for the abl. sg., which he construes (as does Old) with the splv. *nṛtamāsaḥ*: “... als unsere, im Vergleich zum Fremdling sehr heldenhaften Schutzherren ...” But of course an ablative with a superlative would be highly unusual (though Old offers a single parallel and a ref. to Delbrück's Vgl. Syn.). I also take it as an abl., but suggest construing it with *purāḥ*. I now see that this is also problematic, since it is not clear that *purāḥ* ever takes the abl. Gr gives two exx.: but in IV.7.9 the supposed abl. is a gen. and construed elsewhere; in III.53.23 the form in question (*áśvān*) could be either an abl. sg. or an acc. pl. in sandhi. Nonetheless I hold to this interpr. Although *purāḥ* + ABL is not a robust construction, the related *purā* is regularly found with the abl. Here I would suggest that we have a sort of pun. The lexeme *purāḥ* + *√dhā* ‘set in front, install’ is of course very common, and that phrase is found here, *dadhiré puró naḥ*. Although, as I just said, to express “ahead of / in front of the stranger” we might expect *aryāḥ* [abl.] ... *purā*, there was interference with the VP *dadhiré puró naḥ* “they have set us in front,” and *purāḥ* prevailed.

VI.25.8: The HvN ed. resolves the contraction across pāda boundary of *yajatréndra* as *yajatrā́ índra*. This must be a careless error, since the Pp. has *yajatra índra*, and the stem *yājatra-* has root accent.

VI.25.9: Pāda c = I.177.5c and X.89.17c. Ge (fld. by Klein, DGRV I.458) construes *vástoḥ* with *vidyāma* (“Möchten wir Sänger ... den neuen Tag erleben”), but well-attested *vástoḥ* is otherwise a temporal expression ‘at dawn, in the morning’. In both the other passages, the pāda in question is adjoined by a pāda that likewise begins *vidyāma* (following in I.177.5, preceding in X.89.17). In those cases the object of the other

vidyāma can be supplied for the *vidyāma* in the repeated pāda. In our case there is no matching *vidyāma*, so the phrase is left incomplete. The d pāda of X.89.17 is almost identical to d here, with the substitution of a different poetic family: *viśvāmitrāḥ* for our *bharādvājāḥ*, a near duplication that encourages us to interpret the pāda here in that context.

The function and position of *utá* in d are unclear. The publ. tr. implicitly assumes that it loosely connects the 2nd hemistich with the 1st (“And with your help ...”), but locating this clausal conjunction in 2nd position of the 2nd pāda of what it’s conjoining would be an irrational poetic strategy. I now think it likely that it conjoins the temporal expressions *vāstoḥ* and *nūnām*, and I would alter the tr. to “With your help ... might we Bharadvājas know (this), as we sing at dawn and also now” (or “might we know (this) at dawn and also now, as we sing”). The curiosity then is the position of *te*, which can only belong to something in the preceding pāda: either “with your help” (as I take it in the publ. tr.) or “as we sing to you.” I suppose that *utá*’s strong tendency to take 1st position makes it a natural host for enclitics even when it is not so located, but it really seems odd that it would sweep *te* up and away from the elements it should be limiting.

VI.26 Indra

On the various stylistic tics of this hymn, see publ. intro.

VI.26.1–2: As noted in the publ. intro., the 1st two vss. play on the word *vāja-*, presumably as a reference to the Bharadvāja bardic lineage: 1b, 2b *mahó vājasya*, 2a *vājī ... vājineyāḥ*.

VI.26.1: On *vāvrṣāṇāḥ*, see comm. ad VIII.61.7 on *úd vāvrṣasva*.

Technically speaking, (*á*)*yanta* is a subjunctive, which would properly be rendered “will clash together,” which would be compatible with the flg. imperatival *dāḥ*.

VI.26.2: The hapax *vājineyāḥ* is somewhat surprising, because the *-eyá*-suffix generally builds metonymics (AiG II.2.505–11), and so it should mean ‘son of a female prize-winner / of a prize-winning mare’ -- a feminine connection that would be particularly surprising if it’s meant as a reference to the Bharadvāja family. Although I don’t have a good explanation, I do think the intrusion of this marked suffix, fairly rare in the RV, should be taken seriously, and if *vājineyá-* is derived from the *vājínī-* (found in *vājínī-vant-* and *vājínī-vasu-*) (cf. AiG II.2.507 for this possibility), this provides another support for my contention that *vājínī-* has real fem. reference, and its *-ī-* is not simply an Erweiterung (*pace* Debrunner, AiG II.2.409). See disc. ad I.48.6.

Since pāda c lacks a main verb, it could belong either with ab or with d. Ge takes it with ab, seeming to refer to VI.46.1 as a parallel, and the publ. tr. follows suit. On the basis of VI.25.6c with contrastive locatives of the stake, one of which is *vrtré* (see comm. immed. above), I am now inclined to reassign it to d, with *vrtréṣu* (c) and *góṣu* (d) the stakes. The revised tr. would be “... secured; to you ... when obstacles (are at stake), to you when cows (are at stake) does the fistfighter look as he fights.”

VI.26.3–6: These vss. are tr. and discussed by Hoffman (*Injunk.*, 183–84).

VI.26.3: As discussed ad VI.20.4, the three occurrences of *arká-sāti-* ‘the winning of the sun’s rays’ (I.174.7, VI.20.4, and here) are all found in conjunction with a poet (*kaví-*) and in connection with the Kutsa / Śuṣṇa myth. These associations point fairly decisively to Uśanā Kāvya as the poet in question.

Pāda b contains one of the few occurrences of \sqrt{vrj} ‘twist, wring’ without preverb; another is found nearby at VI.18.8.

Hoffmann (183) reads injunc. *pārā han* for Pp. *pārā ahan*. Given the preponderance of injunctives in these vss. and esp. *han* at the end of 5c, this seems likely. (See also *sácāhan* in the next vs. and 6d.)

VI.26.4: As in 3c, Hoffmann (184) reads *sácā han* in c rather than Pp. *sácā ahan*, which seems perfectly plausible. As for the unequivocal imperfect *āvaḥ* in b, he suggests that this may not have been the original form, citing the almost identical I.33.14b *prāvo yúdhiantam vṛṣabhām dásadyum*. If the original reading was **prāvaḥ*, it could contain the injunctive: *prā vaḥ*. However, it is unclear to me how the corruption would have arisen, particularly because in the next vs. (5) the d pāda begins *prāvaḥ*. Moreover the pāda preceding I.33.14b begins with *āvaḥ*, a clear imperfect matching the one here. Hoffmann’s other observation -- that this pres. stem has no clear injunctive forms (and only one possible one, *ávaḥ* in I.121.12, which more likely belongs to the *s*-stem noun; see comm. ad loc.) -- seems more apposite. For whatever reason the injunctive to this stem may have been avoided -- or, perhaps better phrased, *āva-* was treated as the injunctive stem. See, however, possible injunc. interpr. of ambiguous forms to this stem ad VII.83.1.

On the poorly understood myth in cd, see VI.20.8 and X.49.4 and comm. on both.

I do not entirely understand what *sácā* is doing here; it seems to add little and have no obvious syntactic connection to the rest. As discussed ad IV.31.5, *sácā* with loc. is regularly a pleonastic marker of the loc. abs., but there is no loc. here. Gr cites our passage here as an ex. of *sácā* after a dat. meaning “zu seinen Gunsten,” but I don’t understand how this meaning would have developed from ‘together with’. The same sequence (*sácā han*) is found two vss. later (6d) in the same general context: Indra’s smiting of an enemy on behalf of a mortal friend, and I.63.3 *tvám śuṣṇam ... kútsāya dyumáte sácā han* shows the same configuration. In all three passages I tr. it ‘in partnership’ as an adverbial. Perhaps *sácā* signals an esp. close relationship between Indra and his mortal beneficiary. The voc. epithet of Indra in 7c, hapax *sadhavīra* ‘you who have our heroes as companions’ in my tr., might support this view, and see also 8ab. I am not entirely persuaded by my own interpr., however.

On *tūtos*, *tūtot* as belonging to a redup. aor., not the perfect (contra Wh Rts, Macd VGS), see detailed disc. by Kü (220–21); Hoffmann also identifies it as an aor. (183); Gr already took it as a caus. aor., and see also Schaeffer (Intens. 129–30). On *tūtuma* (X.50.5–6) as a possible 1st pl. to this stem, see comm. ad loc.

VI.26.5: For the association of *barhāṇā* and *ukthá-* see VI.44.6 *ukthásya barhāṇā*.

Pāda b contains one of the few exx. of the “-*si* imperative” that betrays its non-imperative source, since *dárṣi* occurs in a subord. cl., from which imperatives are barred. Here it shows its original subjunctive value in a purpose cl. (so also Hoffmann, 183).

Initial *áva* in c breaks the long pattern of 2nd sg. pronouns beginning the hemistich (vss. 2–5a, resumed vss. 6, 7c, with such forms also beginning even pādas 2d, 4d, 7b). Perhaps it is meant to resonate with 4b #*āvo*, 5d #*prāvo*.

The tr. “the barbarian Śambara” should be corrected to “the Dāsa Śambara.” Note the plain *b* in the PN, which suggests a non-Arya origin.

VI.26.6: As I have discussed elsewhere (Sacrificed Wife, 176–84), *śraddhā-* in Vedic is not simply an abstract ‘trust, faith’, but refers specifically to trust in the efficacy of ritual and hospitality, and indeed to the concrete manifestations of this trust through ritual gift-giving. The plural *śraddhābhiḥ* here, paired with *sómaiḥ*, seems to refer to the offerings themselves. For Dabhīti’s hospitality as specifically ritual, see nearby VI.20.13 and for the use of *śraddhā-* in a Dabhīti context X.113.9.

On *sácā* see comm. ad vs. 4.

Pāda d contains a fine sequence of alliterative sibilants of all three types: *ṣaṣṭīm sahasrā śácya śácā han*.

VI.26.7: Acdg. to JSK (DGRV I.286), this is one of the two passages in which *caná* lacks negative value. (I think there are more, though negative context is the default; see comm. ad X.49.5, etc.)

Ge takes *tváyā* as the agent with *stávante*: “dass die Helden ... von dir gelobt werden.” But Indra as the *praiser* of mortals seems off; *tváyā* is better taken as an instr. of accompaniment, esp. given the larger context of the hymn, in which Indra works for and in conjunction with mortals (see esp. disc. ad vs. 4 with regard to *sácā*). The hapax cmpd *sadhavīra* applied to Indra seems to reflect this situation, though exactly what the word means is unclear (Gr ‘mit den Männern seiend’, Ge ‘Heldengenosse’), and its lack of accent makes it difficult to determine even what type of cmpd it is. (AiG has no disc. of it.) I take it as an underlying bahuvrīhi ‘having heroes together (with oneself)’ vel sim., expressing the mutual relationship between our men and Indra.

Ge takes the instr. phrase *trivárūthena náhuṣā* as referring to Indra: “da du ein dreifacher Nahus bist.” He bases this interpr. on X.49.8 *ahám ... náhuṣo náhuṣṭarah* “I [=Indra] am a greater Nahus than Nahus.” But that passage is in an ātmastuti, a genre in which Indra claims to be the best example of everything, and the construction with comparative in fact *precludes* an identification of Indra with Nahus: he is asserting that he has more of what makes Nahus Nahus than Nahus himself does. It is an expression like “more Catholic than the Pope.” (As for X.99.7, which Ge also cites, I have now changed my interpr. from the publ. tr.; see comm. ad loc.) I consider Nahus here another recipient of the praise being doled out.

I would also take issue with Ge’s bleaching of *trivárūtha-* from ‘having/providing threefold defense’ to simply ‘threefold’. This cmpd. otherwise has its full lexical value, mostly modifying *śárman-* ‘shelter’, and the simplex *várūtha-* ‘defense’ is robustly attested, so the 2nd cmpd member had not become opaque.

VI.26.8: This final wish to become Indra’s dearest companions neatly sums up the dominant theme of the hymn, esp. the last vss.

VI.27 Indra

VI.27.1–2: These two vss. form a tight pair, whose responsions are detailed below.

VI.27.1: This vs. is structured by the extreme repetition of *kím*, found 5 times in interlocking sets. In the 1st hemistich 3 occur in the phrase *kím (u) asya* LOC. The 1st 2 are initial in the 1st pāda and immediately after the caesura, while the third one, rather than opening the 2nd pāda, gives the impression of syncopation by being placed after pāda-initial *índrah*. The third pāda has the sequence in scrambled order: ... LOC *kím (té) asya*, with the tonic prn. *té* incongruously inserted. The last *kím u*, in pāda d, lacks both *asya* and the LOC, but clearly is conjoined with *kím* in pāda c with the rest of the phrasal construction truncated.

There are many possible ways to interpr. this construction. The first question is whether *kím* is a question particle or a neut. interrogative prn. (see, e.g., Etter, *Fragesätze*, 75, 124–25), or indeed if some of the occurrences are one, some the other. I am firmly of the opinion that, simply on rhetorical grounds, the number of repetitions favors a referential prn. for all, rather than a particle. Moreover, vs. 2 offers a concrete answer to the question “what?” — namely *sát* ‘being, what exists’ — in the same number and in the same positions as *kím* in vs. 1. The responsion could hardly be more complete. Another question is whether pāda a should be read independently, as containing two parallel nominal clauses, with the hemistich-final verb only having domain over pāda b, or whether the verb should be read with the whole hemistich. Because of the parallelism of the *kím (u) asya* phrases I opt for the latter solution, as does Ge.

Another curiosity is the fact that *asya* is unaccented in all its occurrences. Unaccented forms of this pronoun should be anaphoric, with a referent preceding in the discourse, but of course in the 1st vs. of the hymn there is no preceding discourse. However, the first two locatives, in pāda a, establish without doubt the identity of the referent -- soma: “in the exhilaration (*máde*) of it” and “in the drinking (*pītaú*) of it” could refer to nothing else in the universe of RVic discourse. See the numerous examples of *máde sómasya* (generally in that order) in Lub, beginning with I.46.12; the loc. of *pīti-* is almost confined to our passage, but the dat. phrase *sómasya pītáye* is almost inescapable (see again Lub). The 2nd set of locatives, *sakhyé* ‘in the fellowship’ and *niṣádi* ‘in the installation’ are less clearly typed for soma -- and in fact the latter might sidetrack us to Agni and his ritual installation -- but by that time the soma context has been unequivocally established. The unusual application of *ní √sad* to soma simply shows the frequent secondary fusion of the two principal ritual divinities/substances.

The first hemistich is otherwise unproblematic, but the second one raises some further questions. The first word, *ránā*, is taken by the Pp as nom. pl. *ránāh* in pausa, an interpr. followed by the standard treatments. By this interpr. these “joys” are the subj. of *vividre* in the main cl. Both act. and mid. forms of this pf. are normally transitive, and so the question should be “what did the previous joys find, what the new ones?” See Ge’s “Oder was seine guten Launen bei der (Opfer)sitzung sind, was haben die ... erreicht?” But this does not make a lot of sense to me: in what way are “joys” agents here? Old seems to get out of this semantic problem by taking the verb as a sort of pass./intrans. with gen. *asya* as the experiencer (presumably referring to Indra) and *kím* as a predicate nominative: “oder die Freuden, die bei (seinem, des Soma) Sichniederlassen ..., als was sind diese ihm eignen ... erfahren?” But besides forcing an unnatural sense on the verb, it

assumes a different referent for *asya* in c from the referents of the 3 occurrences in ab (as does Ge's). My own interpr. is based on a different analysis of *rāṇā* — as the instr. sg. of the root noun *rān-*, attested as dat. sg. *rāṇe*, loc. sg. *rān*, and indeed (*pace* Gr) as this same instr. sg. in IX.7.7 (see Old ZDMG 63 [1909]: 289 = KISch 305). (Note that with the elim. of the supposed nom. pl. in our passage, the stem *rāṇa-* is entirely singular, save for a single late loc. pl. *rāṇeṣu* [X.120.5], quite possibly confectioned to produce a Triṣṭubh cadence from sg. *rāṇe*.)

With *rāṇā* otherwise interpr., the subj. of *vividre* is open. I supply “priests” (or a similar group of mortal devotees of Indra); cf. *nūtanāsaḥ* in similar usage in nearby VI.21.5 and the similarly contrastive expression *pūrvabhīḥ ṛṣibhiḥ ... nūtanair utā* in I.1.2. One problem remains, however. By my interpr. *asya* in c has the same referent as the other 3 exx. in ab, and like them it is construed with a loc., here *niṣādi*: the insistent repetitive pattern of the vs. imposes this reading. But *asya* is stationed in the main clause, as marked by the immediately preceding *té*, correlative with *yé* in the nominal relative cl. (cf. the whole pāda *rāṇā vā yé niṣādi kīm té asya*), though it should precede *kīm té*. (Ge's rendering cited above also has this problem, though he construes *asya* with *rāṇā(h)*, not *niṣādi*.) I can only explain this by assuming that acdg. to the pattern established in ab, *kīm* (x) *asya* LOC, *kīm* here has carried the pronoun *asya* along with it into the main cl., even though the constituency is in all cases *asya* LOC.

VI.27.3: In the publ. tr. I followed Ge in rendering *samasya* as ‘whole’ (ganz), not very happily. This unaccented stem is an indefinite (‘some, any’), and, as disc. ad X.29.4, it generally has clear pejorative meaning. Perhaps here *ná ... sama-* means ‘not any’ = ‘none’ and the poet is complaining that Indra has been holding back on them. I would now emend the tr. to “But yet we do not know any of your greatness, nor generosity, o generous one, nor every current benefit (of yours). O Indra, your Indrian strength has not shown itself.” For the somewhat similar passage in X.54.3 see comm. ad loc.; in VIII.21.8 *sama-* is used in a context similar to this one, in which it's implied that Indra had previously been withholding his bounty.

VI.27.4–5: Hoffmann (Injunk. 163–64) tr. and discusses this pair of vss., with special reference to the change from augmented to injunctive verbs.

VI.27.5: Abhyāvartin Cāyamāna is the subj. of the dānastuti in vs. 8. Although I resist interpr. words with clear morphology as PNs, in this case *cāyamānā-* (so accented and appearing only in this hymn) should be separated from the pres. part. *cāyamāna-* (2x), on which see comm. ad VII.18.8.

As in VI.20.10, this vs. contains a 3rd sg. root aor. *dart* with retained (or restored) final cluster *-rt*, even though such retentions are supposedly only licit if the *-t* belongs to the root. I argued ad VI.20.10 that the sandhi situation there favored the retention of the cluster (before following *dh-* [*< *h-*]). I suggest that our form here has been adopted from that passage, since verse-final position would not favor the retention. Another passage containing *dart* that seems dependent on VI.20.10 is I.174.2b, identical to VI.20.10c, though in I.174.2 *dart* must be a 2nd sg., and so is doubly illicit.

VI.27.6: On the warriors' slang in this vs. and the curiously literal attempts at interpreting *pātrā bhindānāḥ*, see publ. intro. and Old ad loc., Ge n. 6d. For *sārave páyamānāḥ* see disc. ad X.27.6.

VI.27.7: The purport of this vs. and the referent of *yásya* in pāda are disputed. As Ge points out (n. 7), Sāy. thinks ab refers to Indra and his two fallow bays, while Ge thinks *yásya* refers to Śṛṇjaya found in c and marks the beginning of the dānastuti. I agree with Sāy. that Indra is the referent of *yásya*, but not that the two cows are really his two horses. As noted in the publ. intro., I instead assume *gāvau* refers to the two rivers found in vss. 5 (Hariyūpīyā) and 6 (Yavyāvatī). A strikingly similar expression refers unequivocally to two rivers in the famous hymn III.33 (Viśvāmitra and the Rivers): III.33.1 *gāveva śubhré mātārā rihāṇé* “licking each other like two mother cows (their calves)” (cf. also III.33.3). The only problem is that though, in this gender-variable stem, du. *gāvau* can be either masc. or fem. (for the latter, see *gāvā* in III.33.1 just cited), one of the du. adjectives in our passage, *aruṣā*, should be masc., since the fem. of this stem is *āruṣī*, which in fact appears with pl. *gó-* in I.92.1-2: *gāvó 'ruṣīḥ, āruṣīr gāḥ*. I can only assume that since the rest of this dual NP (*gāvau ... sūyavasyū ... rérihāṇā*) could be either masc. or fem., *aruṣā* was just slotted in, esp. because it looks like a possible fem. du. Alternatively, MLW suggests that *aruṣā* could in fact be feminine and an archaism, since the *devī-* inflection of thematic color adjectives is an innovation.

The verb *antár ... cárataḥ* is somewhat difficult to interpr. This lexeme generally refers to a journey between two locations -- often of Agni's journey as messenger between heaven and earth. Here no locations are specified, and, assuming the correctness of my identification of the dual subject as the rivers of vss. 5–6 (not a certain assumption), it is two rivers that must be performing the action. Perhaps the verb is reciprocal, expressing action between the two subjects: “(the two rivers) go back and forth one to the other,” but this would leave *yásya* without an obvious role in the clause. Instead I take *yásya* as the beneficiary of the action (that is, as if an honorary dative) and assume the rivers are acting as go-between for Indra, either between his forces and the enemy's or between the two divisions of the Vṛcīvant forces referred to in 5d. The genitive is assuming some of the functions of the dative already in the RV, and of course in later Sanskrit datival genitives are extremely common -- probably indirectly reflecting the loss of the dative in MIA.

VI.28 Cows and Indra

VI.28.1: In pāda a ‘house’ is supplied as obj. of *bhadrām akran* on the basis of 6c *bhadrām grhām kṛṇutha*. Ge simply “haben Glück gebracht,” Whitney (AV IV.21.1) “have done what is excellent,” and this is certainly possible.

VI.28.2: Pāda b contains what may be the only ex. in the RV of nominalized *svá-* to mean ‘own property’. Note that the owner of the *svām* here is not the subject of the verb *muṣāyati*, which is Indra, but rather Indra's client and worshiper. There is therefore no reflexive relationship between *svá-* and anyone in the clause. For similar usage see disc. of *svāpati-* ad X.44.1.

What precise kind of land *ābhinne khilyé* refers to is unclear; see disc. by Old and Ge n. 2d. The general opinion is that *ābhinne* (‘uncut, unsplit’) describes land that hasn’t been broken into parcels, but I wonder if it instead means ‘unploughed’ -- that is, unsplit by a plough.

VI.28.3: I do not understand what nuance the *ṽṛddhi* of *āmitrá-* adds to *amitra-*. Both seem simply to mean ‘enemy, foe’. MLW suggests that it might be a collective, a possible function for a *ṽṛddhi* deriv.

Ge takes *vyáthiḥ* as a “falsch Weg” upon which the enemy will lead the cows, requiring him to supply a complex verb phrase to *√dhr̥ṣ*, “wagen ... den falschen Weg (zu führen)” (see also his n. 3b for an even more complex alternative). But *vyáthis-* ‘wandering or meandering course’ fits the normal aimless wandering of cows in pasture, and surely we wish to prevent cattle rustlers (or the like) from taking advantage of the cows’ wandering. Cf. Whitney, AV IV.21.3 “shall dare attack their track (?)”; Klein (DGRV I.219) “a hostile one shall not venture upon their way.” For the wandering habits of cows, see 4cd *urugāyám ... ví caranti* “They wander far across wide-ranging (space).”

Given the acc., it seems best, with Ge et al., to take *devān* only with *yájate*, not, as in the publ. tr., also with *dádāti*. I therefore would emend the tr. to “With those (cows) that he sacrifices to the gods and (that) he gives ...” The expression is compressed: the instr. *yābhiḥ* should of course only be construed with *yájate*, and we should have an acc. **yāḥ* as obj. of *dádāti*. As a parallel to *devān*, Ge supplies a dative “(den Sänger)” with *dádāti* (sim. Klein loc. cit.), but I see no reason to limit the recipient in this way. Cf. the open-ended 2b *úpéd dadāti*, which specifies neither gift nor recipient. The unstinting giver is rewarded.

The tr. of the main cl. is also somewhat misleading. “Is accompanied by” for *sacate* sounds more passive in English than is meant, esp. given the *sahá*. I would now slightly emend to “he keeps company with them ...”

VI.28.4: On *reṇú-kakāṭa-* see EWA s.v. *kakāṭikā-*, *kṛkāṭa-*. Some part of the back of the head/neck is meant. What exact threat the dusty-necked steed poses to the cows isn’t exactly clear. Sāy. explains *árvā* as *yuddhārtham āgato ’śvaḥ*. I would limit the “intent to fight” more narrowly to a cattle raid, but there is no further evidence to bring to bear. See immed. below.

saṃskṛtatráṃ is also somewhat problematic. It is generally referred to the root *√kṛt* ‘cut’ (see AiG II.2.170 and, most recently, EWA p. 316 s.v. *KART*¹), but this affiliation is disputed by Whitney (Roots, p. 23) and, most vigorously, by Old, who assigns it to *√kr̥* for both formal and semantic reasons. The standard rendering is ‘Schlachtbank’ (slaughter or, Whitney [AV, despite Rts], slaughterhouse). Against this interpr., Old makes the reasonable point that in this pre-ahimsā era there’s no reason why a cow-owner wouldn’t have his cows slaughtered when he wanted to. But Old’s own solution is excessively convoluted and requires that the final *-tra-* belong to *√trā* ‘protect’, which seems dubious. (On *gotrá-* and other possible forms of the thematized root noun *-trā-* in compounds, see Scarlatta [194–95].) To meet Old’s objections, we can interpr. the clause in the context of the preceding clause and of the whole vs. The 2nd half of the vs. expresses a wish for the safety of cows that roam widely, presumably not always under the control and in the sight of a herdsman. The first hemistich mentions

several misadventures that could befall these roving cattle. Pāda a refers, if I'm right, to a cattle raid conducted by horsemen -- what in the Old West (or at least the Old West of the imagination) would be called rustlers. It may be that the "dusty neck" of the horse in question indirectly indicates that the horse is not a well-cared-for beast of the Ārya elite, or else that the raid requires hard riding in rough country. The second pāda may indicate that the cattle rustled were taken for meat or, under a different scenario, that the cows wandered into territory controlled by tribals, non-Ārya, or even non-elite Ārya (all without access to horses) who would ambush, kill, and eat them. Both pādas would imply that the cattle are far from the safety of their home and enclosure.

My "place for dressing" reflects the possibility (see above) that *saṃskṛta-* belongs to \sqrt{kr} not $\sqrt{kṛ}$, and is a euphemistic expression for slaughter. However, if it does belong to $\sqrt{kṛ}$ "... for slaughter" would be just fine.

The word order in pāda b is somewhat aberrant. The fem. pl. subj. *tā(h)* occurs right after the verb, followed by the preverb *abhī*, which ends the pāda: x x x x x, *úpa yanti tā abhī*. We would ordinarily expect the pronoun *tā(h)* to occur early in the clause (cf. pāda a #ná *tā(h)* [=3a]) and the preverb to precede the rest of the verbal complex. The word order disturbance may have been caused by the need to fit the bulky 4-syllable *sāṃskṛtatram* into the pāda, since it won't fit the Jagatī cadence.

VI.28.5: The publ. tr. follows the usual configuration of equational nominal sentences, with the subject in 2nd position, the predicate nominal 1st. This interpr. is supported by the fact that the verb *achān* is singular, agreeing with *bhāgaḥ* and *índraḥ*, not with pl. *gāvaḥ* 'cows'. However, the standard tr. (Ge, Wh) follow the opposite order, e.g., Ge "Diese Kühe sind mir wie Bhaga ..." In which case, we would have to assume that *achān* simply agrees with the nearer referent, even though it is the predicate.

In c the phrase *sá janāsa índraḥ* must be a deliberate echo of the famous refrain of II.12. It also demonstrates the standard Vedic prose syntactic rule that in an expression of the type "what is X, that is Y," the demonstrative in the 2nd cl. will agree with Y, not X, in number and gender, even though its real referent is X, or in this case cows. For further disc. see Brereton's "Tat tvam asi in Context."

VI.28.6: This vs., like 5c, has an echo from the 2nd Maṇḍala: the final pāda *bṛhád vo váya ucyate sabhāsu* "Your vigor is declared loftily in the assemblies" strikingly resembles the Gṛtsamāda Triṣṭubh refrain *bṛhád vadema vidáthe suvîrāḥ* "May we speak loftily at the ritual distribution, in possession of good heroes." Both begin with adverbial *bṛhát* and contain a verb of speaking -- a passive in our case -- and a loc. of the place where the speech is spoken: *vidáthe* 'at the ceremony of distribution', *sabhāsu* 'in assemblies', with *sabhā-* probably inhabiting a lower register, as might be appropriate for cows.

Kulikov (-ya-pres., 214) denies a passive value for *ucyate* here and tr. "Your energy sounds loudly in the assemblies" for reasons that don't seem sufficient to me.

VI.28.7: Note that *sūyávasam* echoes (*gāvau* ...) *sūyavasyū* in the preceding hymn (VI.27.7).

On *īśata* see comm. ad I.23.9.

VI.28.8: The usual tr. of this vs. tend towards the euphemistic -- e.g., Ge “Dieses Befruchtungsmittel soll ... sich fruchtbar zeigen”; Kulikov (-ya-pres., 153 with nn. 373, 374) “Let this increase increase in these cows.” But \sqrt{prc} means ‘fill, engorge, mingle’, and with *úpa*, the preverb of intimacy, it takes on a distinctly sexual sense. I take it as ‘inseminate’ in this passage, especially because of the bull’s semen in c. See disc. also ad I.40.9. Moreover, the -ana-suffix on *upapárcana-* is one that ordinarily signals a transitive sense and often has a close connection to a transitive -áya-formation (though not in this case). Unlike the standard tr. I take pāda a as a nominal sentence and *prcyatām* in b as an impersonal. In my interpr. *upapárcana-* is the ‘inseminator’ -- either the bull or the bull’s penis or semen, whose match is found in the hyper-virile Indra in d. My interpr. requires that the two locc. in the 2nd hemistich (*rétasi, vīryè*) have a different usage and appear in different clauses from *gósu* in b.

VI.29 Indra

VI.29.1: Three of the four pādas begin with a form of *máh-*, incl. the curious acc. sg. masc. *mahām* in d.

sepuḥ is the only perfect form attested to the root \sqrt{sap} in all of Sanskrit. Ge tr. it with present value (“Den Indra ehren die Herren”) without comment, and the publ. tr. follows suit. Kü (547) argues strenuously -- and plausibly -- against this interpr. on historical grounds and takes it as “kontinuativ”: “Indra haben (seit jeher) die Männer ... geehrt (and ehren ihn jetzt noch).” This interpr. might fit well with the curious double participle in pāda b: *yántaḥ ... cakānāḥ*. Although both Ge (“voll Verlangen nach der Gunst des Grossen kommen”) and Kü (“indem die [au ihm] gehen, um die Gunst des Grossen [zu erlangen], begierig”) take the two participles as independent and with their full lexical value, Ge suggests (n. 1b) that they could form a periphrastic construction, which is in fact reflected in the publ. tr.’s “as they go on finding pleasure in the great one,” with *yánt-* supplying a continuative sense. The participial periphrasis might be an attempt to signal the continuative value of the perfect in pāda a, which that form cannot do on its own. The nearest thing to such a continuative in English would be “The men have (always) kept honoring Indra ...” or (less clumsily) just “have (always) honored,” and I would now substitute one of these tr.

Ge construes *sumatāye* with *cakānāḥ* (see tr. cited above), but forms of the root $\sqrt{kā}$ *lkan* regularly take the acc. or loc., never the dative. Note that Kü supplies a verb to govern *sumatāye* and takes *cakānāḥ* absolutely. I suggest rather that *sumatāye* is parallel to *sakhyāya* in pāda a. Since $\sqrt{kā}$ *lkan* can also occasionally take the gen. (cf. VII.27.1 *śávasaś cakānāḥ* “taking pleasure in your strength”), I take *mahāḥ* with *cakānāḥ*, though a tr. like Kü’s would also be possible: “for the sake of the partnership and benevolence of the great one, taking pleasure/desiring (it/him).”

I do not understand why *ásti* is found in pāda c, since there is no need for an overt copula, and it is difficult to interpret the verb as an existential. It is true, however, that overt copulas are more common in subordinate than in main clauses. Or perhaps *ásti* is part of the effort to express present continuative.

VI.29.3: As in I.37.14 (see comm. ad loc.), *dúvaḥ* here must be a nom. pl., not the usual sg. neut., nor the acc. pl. identified by Gr. On the somewhat aberrant syntax of this

construction, see disc. by Kü (386–87). The juxtaposition of du. *pādā* and *dúva(h)* suggests that the latter is also meant to evoke *d"vé*, the neut. du. ‘two’ with ‘feet’.

Ge couches b in the 3rd ps. (see tr. cited below), but since this nominal clause is positioned between two clauses with undoubted 2nd ps. ref. to Indra (pāda a: *te*, d *babhūtha*) and itself contains no overt indications of 3rd ps., there is no reason to switch person and then switch back.

The instr. *śávasā* was omitted in the publ. tr. Although Ge tr. it with *dákṣiṇāvān* (“ist durch seine Macht ein Lohnausteiler”), the close association between *dhṛṣṇú-* and *śávas-* elsewhere in the RV (e.g., I.54.2, 56.4, I.167.9, IV.16.7, VI.66.6; cf. I.54.2 (etc.) *dhṛṣṇúnā śávasā*) suggests a tr. “As the mace-bearer, bold with (your) vast power ...” As was just noted, in the publ. tr. *śávasā* was omitted entirely; the just suggested tr. should be substituted.

Note that pāda b is a lexically variant version of 1c, which contains *vájjrahastah* for our *vajrī* and *dātā* for our *dákṣiṇāvān*).

VI.29.4: Whatever the etymological facts -- the root affiliation of the pf. *mimikṣ-* (etc.) is disputed (see, e.g., Kü 385–89, who assigns it to $\sqrt{myakṣ}$, and EWA s.v. *MEKṢ*, esp. 374) -- the two forms of *mimikṣúh* in this passage (vss. 2, 3) are synchronically associated with *miśla-* /*miśrá-* here. As noted in the publ. intro., the three vss. form an omphalos with the theme of attachment, and the superlative *āmiślatama-* ‘most firmly attached / entwined / intermixed’ in pāda a provides the climax -- at least in my view. Not all interpr. see the contextual continuity and therefore do not tr. accordingly. E.g., Ge renders *āmiślatama-* as ‘der anziehendste’ (the most attractive), which captures neither its use in this context nor its probable connection with **meik* ‘mix’ (EWA s.v. *miśrá-*) (though the base verb ‘anziehen’ has a physical dimension closer to the sense I see). I am happy to say that Old’s interpr. is very close to mine, including supplying Indra with the adj.: “Der gepresste Soma soll der am besten (dem Indra) anhaftende [clinging] sein.”

The referent of the loc. *yásmīn* in b is unclear. The structure of the half-vs. suggests *sá* of a, namely soma, and this seems to be the standard interpr.: cf. Ge’s “Der gepresste Soma ist der anziehendste, zu dem Kochspeise gekocht wird ...”; also Kulikov (p. 403, p.c. from W. Knobl) “That Soma is pressed as most easily mixing, with which [, when being pressed,] cooked food is being cooked.” I don’t understand either of these tr., esp. the latter, and they do not make ritual sense: food is not cooked in/for/with soma (though grain can be mixed in it). Since, in my interpr., Indra is another, if unexpressed, participant in pāda a, I take *yásmīn* as referring to him. This identification is supported in the larger context by *yásmīn* in 2a, the beginning of the omphalos, where it refers to Indra’s hand (*yásmīn háste* “in which hand”), or as Ge suggests there (n. 2a), “*yásmīn* ist Attraktion für *yásya*” (referring to Indra directly). These two occurrences of *yásmīn* (2a, 4b) would frame the omphalos ring-compositionally. The suggested reference to Indra gets further support from passages like IV.24.7 *yá índrāya sunávat sómam adyá, pácāt paktīr utá bhṛjjāti dhānāḥ* “Whoever will press soma for Indra today, will cook the cooked foods, and will roast the grains ...”

The two pres. participles in cd, *stuvántaḥ* ... *śámsantaḥ*, must be predicated, substituting for a main verb.

VI.29.5: Kü (221) suggests that the pf. part. *tūtujāna-* may already be a lexicalized adj. meaning ‘sich bemügend, eilend, eifrig’ and tr. its occurrence in our passage quasi-adverbially, “mit Eifer,” an interpr. fld by Lowe (Participles, 216). But it seems to me to have its full lexical value, deriving from \sqrt{tuj} ‘thrust’, in this context, where the preceding pāda describes Indra forcing apart (*bābadhe*) the two world-halves and the following pāda compares him to a herdsman driving together (*samṭjamānaḥ*) his herds -- both actions requiring some amount of thrusting. In its other occurrences this part. either clearly or arguably has participial value; cf., e.g., I.61.12 ... *prā bharā tūtujānaḥ ... vājram* ... “bear down the mace, thrusting ...” In general, I see no reason to rob forms of lexical value unless they regularly appear in contexts in which such value would be semantically inappropriate. That a participle does not appear with a full panoply of complements does not mean that it has been semantically bleached beyond recognition -- a view that is at odds with, e.g., Lowe’s approach to the issue.

Ge sharply denies (n. 5d) that *ṭja-* can belong to \sqrt{aj} ‘drive’, but he was of course writing before the full flowering of laryngeal theory. For the derivation see EWA s.v. *AJ*, p. 51.

I tr. hemistich-final *ūtī* with pāda c, but the fact that that pāda has an exact repetition in VI.37.5d throws that interpr. into doubt. Nonetheless, I still think *ūtī* is to be construed with the preceding pāda, skipping over the simile that begins pāda d. It should really be Indra’s help that is in question, not that of the herdsman, an interpr. reinforced by the initial sequence in the 2nd pāda of the next vs., 6b *ūtī ānūtī*, also referring to Indra.

VI.29.6: The double *evā* (a, c) strongly marks this as an extra-hymnic summary vs.