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The Vedic Causative \textit{saṃkhyāpāyati} / \textit{saṃksāpāyati} Reconsidered\(^*\)

Leonid Kulikov

(Leiden University)

1. \textit{saṃ-khyāpāya-} / \textit{saṃ-kśāpāya-}: ‘cause to look at’?

The Middle Vedic causative \textit{sam-khyāpāya-} / \textit{sam-kśāpāya-} is derived from the root \textit{khyā} / \textit{kśā}.\(^1\) The basic meaning of the simplex root (attested only in passives and causatives in Sanskrit) is tentatively defined as ‘see, look’ by Böhtlingk/Roth (PW II, 620: “Die Grundbedeutung scheint \textit{schauen} zu sein”). This definition is not supported by the meanings of the corresponding (simplex) passives and causatives (‘bekannt sein’; ‘bekannt machen’). The meaning ‘see, look, consider’ is, however, attested for the secondary root \textit{cakśā}, which supplies the forms of the present (lacking in the paradigm of \textit{khyā} // \textit{kśā}). Historically, \textit{cakśā} must go back to the weak stem of the reduplicated present made from the root \textit{kāś} ‘appear, become visible’,\(^2\) which, in turn, is related to \textit{kśā} // \textit{khyā}.

The causative of the compound \textit{sāṃ-khyā} / \textit{sāṃ-kśā} first appears in the Vedic prose, in the Brāhmaṇas and Śūtras. It is employed in a technical sense, denoting a particular event during the sattra (a kind of Soma sacrifice), when the sacrificer’s wife participates in the performance together with the Udgātar priest, for the sake of progeny.\(^3\) Quite surprisingly, here we also observe a remarkable discrepancy between the meanings of the non-derived (base) verb and its causative. For the relatively scarcely attested (RV\(^1\), AV, VS\(^1\), ŚB, JB) non-causative \textit{sāṃ-khyā} PW II, 624 registers two meanings, “1) med. \textit{in Verbindung mit etw. erscheinen},

\(^*\) I am much indebted to W. Knobl, A. Lubotsky and R. Ryan for valuable comments on earlier drafts of this paper.

\(^1\) \textit{khyā} is likely to result from the secondary development of \textit{kśā}, which is preserved in the Maitrāyaṇī and Kāthaka traditions (see, in particular, Charpentier 1932-33: 168, fn. 4; Lubotsky 1983: 176; Witzel 1989: 163ff.). Less plausible is Wackernagel’s (1896 [AiG I]: 209) explanation of these roots as going back to different sources. Synchronically they clearly represent one single root in Vedic prose, with no difference in use between the compounds \textit{sāṃ-khyā} and \textit{sāṃ-kśā}.

\(^2\) Pace Mayrhofer, EWAia I, 523. Mayrhofer’s hesitant explanation of this root as based on a \textit{s}-present (\textit{k̥e:k-s-} (?)) is much less likely.

\(^3\) For this rite, see, in particular, Hillebrandt 1897: 154–159; Jamison 1996: 136ff.
zusammengehören mit”; and “2) zusammenzählen, berechnen”. By contrast, the well-attested causative of this compound is translated by all scholars with ‘be-trachten lassen durch (instr.)’ (PW, ibid.), ‘to cause to be looked at or observed by (instr.)’ (Monier-Williams, p. 1128), ‘cause to look at’ or ‘cause to exchange looks with’ (see below). According to Gonda’s (1969: 21) explanation of the technical meaning of this causative compound, the Udgātā is identified with Prajāpati in the sacrifice, and looking at the sacrificer’s wife symbolically represents impregnating her (cf. also Bodewitz 1990: 269, note 3 ad JB 1.173).

Below, I give a representative selection of such passages, with suggested translations:

(MS² 3.7.7:84.8)  
yáti somakrāyaṅayā páṁīṅhṃ sāmkiṃpāyati…  
‘In that he makes the Wife exchange views [sic!] with the Soma-cow.’  
(Hock 1991: 89, note 2)⁴

(TS 6.5.8.6 = KS 26.1:122.4–5 = KpS 40.4:228.5–7)  
udgātṛā sām khyāpayati. prajāpatitār vā eṣā yād udgātā. prajānāṃ prajānapāṇāya  
‘He [sc. the Neṣṭṛ] causes the Udgāt to look (at the wife); the Udgāt is Prajāpati; (verily it serves) for the production of offspring.’ (Keith 1914: 544; likewise Gonda 1989a: 27)

(BPB 8.7.12)  
udgātārā patniḥ samkhyāpayanti retodheyāya  
‘They [sc. the Adhvaryus] cause her [recte: them] to be looked at by the Udgāt, for impregnation’s sake.’ (Caland 1931: 182)

(BPB 8.7.13)  
hīṇkāraṇ prati samkhyāpayantī hīṇkṣād dhi reto ‘dhīyata’⁵

---

⁴ “Or: ‘In that he makes the Soma-cow look at the Wife …’ (?)’ (Hock, ibid.)

⁵ Read probably ‘dhīyate (pres.) or ‘dhīyeta (opt.) (W. Knobl, p.c.).
They make (him) look (at her) at the him-cry, for after the him-cry semen is deposited.’ (Jamison 1996: 141)

(JB 1.173:11–12)

\[\text{tām sanabhīṣpayanti retodheyāya} \]

‘They cause her to be looked at (by the Udgāt) for the sake of impregnation.’ (Bodewitz 1990: 98; cf. also ibid., 269, note 3 ad loc.)

(JB 1.173:12)

\[\text{āvā etat } \text{ṣatī } \text{udgāṭh prajām } \text{“dhāte” yad viṣṭe sāman sanabhīṣpayanti} \]

‘In that they cause (the wife) to be looked at (by the Udgāt-priest) when the Sāman is partly sung thereby the wife takes for herself offspring from the Udgāt-priest.’ (Oertel 1926: 329)

‘The wife thereby conceives offspring from the Udgāt when they make (him) look at her when there is a break in the chanting of the Sāman.’ (Bodewitz 1990: 98; cf. also ibid., 269, note 5 ad loc.)

(ĀpŚŚ 13.14.11)

\[\text{udgāṭā patnīṃ sam khyāpayā} \]

‘… lasse die Herrin des Hauses mit dem Udgāṭ Blicke wechseln …’ (Ca- land 1924: 342)

(ĀpŚŚ 13.15.8)

\[\text{hiḥkāram anudgāṭā patnīṃ sam khyāpayati} \]

‘Following the (Udgāṭar’s) him-cry, (the Neṣṭar) makes the Udgāṭar look at the wife.’ (Jamison 1996: 140)

Furthermore, the indigenous commentary by Rudradatta explains this sentence with neṣṭrocita udgāṭa patnīṃ paśyati ‘Impelled by the Neṣṭar, the Udgāṭar looks at the wife.’

(BaudhŚŚ 8.14:254.14–15)

\[\text{neṣṭar patnīṃ adānyodgāṭā sanbhīṣpayāṛa upapraśavatayāt} \]

‘Neṣṭar, lead up the wife. Having had her looked at by the Udgāṭar, have her then pour water…’ (Jamison 1996: 136)

‘O Neṣṭar, do thou lead the sacrificer’s wife here, cause the Udgāṭ to gaze at the sacrificer’s wife, (O sacrificer’s wife) do thou let the water flow…’

(Kashikar 2003: 455)

(BaudhŚŚ 8.14:255.4-5)

\[\text{prastute sāmni neṣṭā patnīṃ udgāṭā sanabhīṣpayā vācayati } \]

‘[Neṣṭar, amène l’épouse:] après l’avoir soumise à l’examen de l’udgāṭar…’ (Caland & Henry 1906: 367)

‘… nachdem der Neṣṭ die Gattin veranlaßt hat, mit dem Udgāṭ Blicke zu wechseln, läßt er sie sprechen.’ (Narten 1965: 57f. [= KL.Schr. 1, 47f.])

6 Emendation suggested by W. Knobl (p.c.); mss. read datte.

7 The indigenous commentary by Rudradatta glosses san khyāpaya with sam iksaya ‘make look’.
‘When the sāman has been sung, the Neṣṭṛ, having made the Udgāt look at the wife, makes (her) say …’ (Jamison 1996: 139)

‘When the Sāman-chanting is commenced, the Neṣṭṛ, having caused the sacrificer’s wife to be gazed at by the Udgāt, causes her to recite the formula …’ (Kashikar 2003: 455)

The Mātrāyaṇī Śamhitā attests the only Vedic occurrence of the passive derived from the causative sāmkśāpyāmāna-:

(ŚMS 4.5.4:68.5)

'sāmkśāpyāmanā' vā udgātā pāṇyā rētā ā dhatte 8

In accordance with the interpretation of the causative sāmkśāpyāya- as 'cause to look at', this passage should be translated as follows:

‘The Udgāt, being caused to be looked at by the wife, places his semen [into her].’

Apart from this MS attestation, causative passives of sām-khyāya (-kśā) do not occur within the Vedic corpus. However, KātyŚS 7.6.26 attests the passive participle samikṣayāmāna- in a similar context:

(KātyŚS 7.6.26)

somakraya ca samikṣayāmānān samakhye iti

‘And while she is being looked at by the Soma-purchasing (-cow), (the Neṣṭṛ makes her recite) samakhye … (VS IV.23) 10.’ (Thite; see KātyŚS, ed. Thite, p. 283)

In what follows, I will concentrate on purely linguistic aspects of the verb under discussion, abstaining from a discussion of the ritual ceremony in question. However unanimous the analysis of this causative (shared by all translators) might appear, there are a number of linguistic considerations that make the interpretation of sām-khyāya- as ‘cause to look at’ or ‘make exchange looks with’ quite dubious. In section 2, I will focus on the system-related features of the causative and passive constructions which do not favour this analysis. In section 3, I will demonstrate that the causative meaning ‘cause to

8 Thus emended in ed. Schroeder (see Schroeder 1879: 689; ed. Schroeder, Einleitung, p. XI); mss. read ‘khyāya-', ‘kśāpyā-', ‘kṣyāya-', ‘kṣyāpya-’.  
9 The reading ādhatte is attested in one of the mss.; ed. Schroeder reads ādatte. Unlikely is Oertel’s (1926: 329; see also Mittwede 1986: 170) hesitantly suggested reading of the passage, which requires as many as five (!) emendations: ‘sāmkśāpyāmānā vā uḍgārā’ pāṇyā ā ‘rēto datte. — I have greatly benefited from discussing this and several other relevant Vedic passages with W. Knobl. Of course all responsibility for possible mistakes and misinterpretations is mine.  
10 For this VS passage, see below, section 3.
look at’ or ‘cause to exchange looks with’ cannot be based on the attested usages of the corresponding non-causative verb(s).

2. Some relevant features of Vedic causatives and passives

2.1. Causatives of intransitive and transitive verbs
First, let it be recalled that in early Vedic, that is, in the language of the Ṛgveda and Atharvaveda, -āya-causatives are almost exclusively derived from intransitive verbal roots. Causatives derived from transitives first appear from Vedic prose onwards (see Thieme 1929; Jamison 1983: 24). This implies, in particular, that the -āya-causatives derived from verbs of perception and knowledge, such as dṛś ‘see’, śru ‘hear’, or vid ‘know’ are predominantly based on their intransitive usages (see, in particular, Jamison 1983: 125, 163ff., 175ff.), cf. darśāyatī ‘makes appear, reveals’ (not ‘makes see’) – dadṛśé ‘appears, is seen’, cetāyatī ‘makes appear, reveals’ – cikité ‘appears, is seen’, vedāyatī ‘makes known’ – vidé ‘is known’, etc.; see Jamison 1983: 38, 125, 160ff. These intransitive non-passive usages easily develop on the basis of (and are often virtually indistinguishable from) the passives such as perf. dadṛśé, pres. dṛśyā-te ‘be seen’ → ‘be visible; appear’; śrūyá-te, śṛṇvē ‘be heard’ → ‘be famous’; see Kulikov 2001: 521f. It is important to note that the early Vedic -āya-causatives derived from the two roots (historically) related to khyā // kṣā, i.e. cakṣ and kāś (see section 1), are both based on the intransitive usages of these roots: saṃ kāśaya-a ‘make (be) seen’ is once attested in the AV (14.2.12); cakṣaya-a ‘reveals’ occurs three times in the RV (see Jamison 1983: 125).

Besides, we find rare examples of causatives based on transitive usages (or intransitive/transitive [= I/T] verbs, in Jamison’s terms), cf. śrūyāya-a ‘make heard, famous’ (attested 9 times in the RV and AV); ‘make hear’ (4× in the RV) (see Jamison 1983: 176).

Thus, in principle, one might expect the causative of the verb saṃ-khyā / saṃ-kṣā to be employed in either of the two usages, i.e. (1) ‘cause to be considered, make appear’, or, more rarely, (2) ‘cause to look, cause to consider’. The rarity of the latter type does not of course rule out the transitive-based analysis of the causative saṃ-khyāya-a / sam-kṣāpaya-a (‘cause to look at’). In order to evaluate the plausibility of this interpretation, we have to address other linguistic features that are relevant to our understanding of causative constructions in Vedic.

2.2. -yā-passives derived from -āya-causatives
The first attestations of -yā-passives derived from -āya-causatives appear as early as in the Yajurvedic mantras.11 However, until the very end of the Vedic period

11 These include: -pyāyāya-a VS+ ‘be caused to swell’, -vṛtyāya-a MS⁸, ŚB-KB⁹+ ‘be caused to turn’, sādyāya-a YV⁸+ ‘be caused to sit down’. For details, see Kulikov 2001: 522ff.
only causatives built from intransitives can form -yá-passives. -yá-passives of
causatives derived from transitive verbs are not attested before the Sūtra period.
The earliest attested examples of -ya-passives derived from -aya-causatives of
transitive verbs include: nidhāpyamāna- (VaitS 5.17) ‘being caused to be put
down’ (of the horse-foot);12 upapāyamāna- (ĀpŚS 9.18.11) ‘being caused to
drink’ (of the sacrificial animal);13 vāyjamāna- (Vādhś 4.101.9; see Caland 1928:
222 [= Kl.Schr., 522]) ‘being caused to perform a sacrifice’, said of the institutor
of a sacrifice (yajamāna);14 and vācyamāna- (KauŚS 63.20) ‘being caused to pro-
nounce (the ritual words)’.15 For details, see Kulikov 2001: 522ff.; 2006: 76f.

In accordance with this constraint, we can rule out the existence of a passive
derived from the hypothetical causative sam-khyāpya-5 / sam-kṣāpya,16 ‘cause
to look at, cause to consider’ based on the transitive usages of sām-khyā / sām-kṣā
(‘look at, consider’). In middle Vedic, the derivation of a -yá-passive was only
possible from causatives based on the intransitive (quasi-passive) usages of the
type ‘be considered, appear, be counted’ (for which see below)—that is, from
causatives such as ‘cause to be considered, make appear, cause to be counted’.

2.3. Passive absolutes?
Jamison’s translation of the construction udgātrā samkhyāpya (BaudhŚŚ
8.14:254.14) as ‘having had her looked at by the Udgātar’ suggests that the abso-
lutive samkhyāpya (derived from the causative stem samkhyāp(ā)a-) is based on
the passive made from this causative (sam-khyāpyā-26 ‘be caused to look at’).16
However, examples of passive absolutives are practically unknown in the Samhitās and very rare even in later Vedic texts.¹⁷

2.4. Reciprocal interpretations of compounds with sām

The reciprocal interpretation of the compound sām-khyā / sām-kśā as ‘exchange looks with’ is not supported by the meanings typically attested for reciprocals with the preverb sām. This preverb is normally used for the derivation of spatial reciprocals of the type i ‘go’: sām-i ‘come together’, dhṛ ‘keep, hold’; sām-dhṛ ‘keep together’ or sociatives such as tṛp ‘rejoice’: sām-tṛp ‘rejoice together’. However, it does not form canonical reciprocals of the type ‘kill each other’, ‘hate each other’¹⁸ (for details, see Kulikov 2007: 723–726). Accordingly, one might expect the reciprocal sām-khyā / sām-kśā to be employed in the sense ‘see smb. together (with smb.), consider together (with smb. / with each other)’ and, for passives, ‘be seen together (with smb. / with each other), be considered together’, rather than ‘look at each other, consider each other’. Such sām-reciprocals (and sām-sociatives) are commonly constructed with sociative instrumentals.¹⁹

In the following section, I will argue that the interpretation of sām-khyāpāyati as ‘cause to look at’ or ‘cause to exchange looks with’ is not supported by the usage of the non-causative sām-khyā.

3. The non-causative usages of sāṃ-khyā and sāṃ-cakṣ

3.1. sāṃ-khyā

As noticed already in PW II, 624, the non-causative sāṃ-khyā occurs in the following two usages:

(a) The middle thematic aorist sāṃ-ákhya- is attested in an intransitive usage, meaning ‘appear together (with smb./smth.),’ in some contexts with the additional semantic nuance ‘appear together, and, by virtue of that, be considered / become associated (with smb./smth.).’ This intransitive usage can only be based

¹⁷ The existence of passive absolutives (gerunds) of the type lekho likhitvā [mayā tubhyam dattaḥ] ‘a letter, having been written (by me), [was given to you by me]’ was denied, for instance, by Keith (1906; 1907). For a discussion, see Tikkanen 1987: 134ff., with bibliography.

¹⁸ Canonical reciprocals (i.e. verbs which suggest the reciprocal relation between the referents of the subject and direct object) are normally derived by means of the preverb ví, rather than sām. From the end of the early Vedic period onwards, we also find canonical reciprocal constructions with the pronoun anyo ‘nyā- ‘one another’.

¹⁹ Cf. e.g. RV pitřbhīḥ samvidānā- ‘uniting with the fathers’ (Thieme (1952: 45ff.): ‘sich vereinigend [mit seinen Vätern]’).
on the original agentless passive (‘be considered together (with smb./smth.)’), and this semantics still shimmers through the actually attested meanings. *sam-ākhyata* typically denotes a particular spiritual (sacral) contact or connection between deities or between a deity and his/her adepts. This meaning is attested for the following two occurrences:

(RV 9.61.7c)

sāṃ ṛddihēbhīr ākhyata
‘[Soma] has appeared together (and, by virtue of that, has become associated) with the Ṛddihas.’

(KŚ 2.5:11.7 = KpŚ 1.18:13.14)

sāṃ devī dvīvārāvāyākhyata
‘The heavenly [cow] has appeared together (and, by virtue of that, has become associated) with heavenly Urvaśī.’

The third occurrence, in the VS, attests, at first glance, a different meaning:

(VS 4.23 (~ŚB 3.3.1.12))

sāṃ akhye devī dvīyā dhiyā
mā ma āyuḥ prā moṣīr mō āhāṃ tāva
vīrāṃ videya tāva devī samāfśi

Eggeling (1885: 61f.) translates the quotation of this passage in ŚB 3.3.1.12 as follows:

‘I have seen eye to eye with the divine intelligence, with the far-seeing Dakshinā: take not my life from me, neither will I take thine; may I obtain a hero in thy sight.’ [emphasis mine.—L.K.]

Gonda (1963: 238; 1989b: 24) suggests a similar translation:

‘I have been in touch eye to eye with the divine Dhī, with the far-seeing Dakshinā; do not rob my (complete) life-time from me; I will not thine; may I, o goddess, in thy sight obtain a hero (son).’ [emphasis mine.—L.K.]

Both translations suggest that the compound *sām akhye* has a meaning which, unlike the meaning of the two other occurrences of this middle thematic aorist quoted above (‘appear together’), is not directly connected with the semantics of seeing. Yet, in my view, the meaning of *sām akhye* in this passage can be ade-

---


21 = ṛvyā-urvāśī-ākhyata, erroneously segmented by Simon (1912: 99, 176) as ṛvyōr vāśī-ākhyata.

22 This also holds for Eggeling’s idiomatic translation: see eye to eye = ‘be in agreement (with smb.), be of the same opinion (with smb.).’
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quately captured in the same terms as the occurrences of *sāṃ akhyata* in the RV and KS–KpS and, eventually, should be directly related to the primary meaning of *khyā* ‘look, consider’. It seems that, like in the two occurrences quoted above, this compound refers to a sacral link between deities and adepts, established by virtue of their joint appearance—which should guarantee the adepts from life-shortening and help them to obtain a son. Accordingly, the initial pāda of the VS passage should probably be understood as:

‘I have appeared together / have been considered together / (~ I have become associated) with the heavenly insight...’

(β) In another, transitive, usage the verb *sāṃ-khyā* shows the meaning ‘consider together, survey, count’. It is typically employed with a plural object referring to a group of entities considered as a whole. In some contexts, the semantics of surveying or considering of a group of objects strongly imposes the idea of inventarisation or numbering (cf. also the meanings such as ‘sum up, enumerate, calculate’, which are attested for this compound in late Vedic and post-Vedic Sanskrit). This usage is attested for the absolutive *saṃ-khyāya* (found in two Brāhmaṇas, ŚB and JB), cf.:

(ŚB 5.4.5.4)

dāśa pitāmahānt somapānt sanākhyāya pra sarpet ...

‘May he walk stealthily forth after enumerating ten Soma-drinking ancestors [i.e. grandfather, great-grandfather, etc.] ...’

The same type must also underlie the passive -ta-participle *sāṃ-khyāta-* ‘counted, numbered’ (cf. AV 4.16.5, 4.25.2, 12.3.28) and the present passive participle *saṃkhyāyamāna-* ‘being counted’ at ŚĀ 2.17:

(ŚĀ 2.17 (= ŚŚS 18.21.1))

tad etat sakṛchastāyām sūdadohasi [...] sanākhyāyamānāyām [...] bṛhatīśahasraṃ sampadyate

‘[If] this Sūdadohas [stanza], which is recited once, is counted together [with others] [...] , it is equal to a thousand of Bṛhaṭīś.’

Although this transitive usage is not attested for finite forms, we can surmise that the meaning ‘consider together, survey, count’ could be expressed by active forms (aorist *sam-ākhyat* etc.). Obviously, this meaning represents a further development of the basic meaning of the root *khyā* ‘consider’.

---

23 Cf. Keith’s (1908: 13) translation: “Reckoning in the *[sūdadohas* verse, recited once, [...] there are a thousand of Bṛhaṭīś.”
3.2. sāṃ-cakṣ

An inquiry into the meanings and usages of the non-causative counterparts sam-khyāpāya\(^{2}\) / sam-kṣāpāya\(^{2}\) would be incomplete without a critical reference to the verbal compound sāṃ-cakṣ, since the root cakṣ is, as I have mentioned above, etymologically related to khyākṣa and supplies the present paradigm of this verb.

The compound sāṃ-cakṣ occurs six times in the RV, but becomes rare in later texts. It is attested only in middle finite and non-finite forms and appears in both transitive and intransitive usages.

(i) The only finite occurrence (3sg.med.pres. -caṣṭe) is attested in the transitive usage, which might be qualified as ‘object-oriented sociative’,\(^{24}\) meaning ‘survey, supervise, watch over’ (with the plural accusative object), thus being parallel with the usage (β) of sāṃ-khyā:

\[(RV\ 7.60.3d)\]
\[
sāṃ yō yāthēvā jānimāṇī caṣṭe
\]
\[\text{‘[Sūrya] who watches over the generations [of men], like [a herdsman over] herds.’}\]

The same usage is attested for the present participle at RV 6.58.2:

\[(RV\ 6.58.2)\]
\[
pūṇa […] sāmcāsāno bhūvanā devā yaṭate
\]
\[\text{‘The heavenly Pūṣan drives, surveying (all) creatures (together).’}\]

The transitive construction attested with the dative infinitive sāmcākṣe in RV 7.18.20 shows the semantic development which eventually arrives at the meaning ‘count’ — the same which is attested for the usage (β) of sāṃ-khyā (see section 3.1):\(^{25}\)

\[(RV\ 7.18.20ab)\]
\[
nā ta indra sumatāyo nā rávah ’sāmcākṣe pārvā uṣāso nā nānāḥ
\]
\[\text{‘O Indra, your favours and wealths are not to survey (= not to count), like the earlier and the present dawns.’}\]

The same usage is attested for two Brāhmaṇa occurrences (ŚB 13.3.5.2 = TB 3.9.15.1 sam-cāṣṭita).

(ii) Another, intransitive, usage is comparable to the usage (α) of sāṃ-khyā (‘appear together (with smb./smth.)’). It is attested, in particular, for the absolutive -cāṣṭya-:

\[\text{See Nedjalkov 2007: 34.}\]
\[\text{See also Renou’s (EVP X, 116) remarks on the meaning ‘computer’ attested both for sāṃ-khyā and sāṃ-cakṣ.}\]
L. Kulikov, *The Vedic Causative* samkhyāpyati...

(RV 1.165.12cd)

*saṃcākṣyā marutaś candrārvānāḥ āchānta me chadāyāthā ca nānām*

‘O Maruts, having appeared (together) (as) golden-coloured, you have pleased me and you will please me from now on’.\(^{26}\)

The periphrastic causative construction at RV 1.127.11 (consisting of the semi-auxiliary verb *kṛ* ‘make’ and the dative infinitive *saṃcākṣe*\(^{27}\)) may be based on the same intransitive usage (ii), thus being synonymous with the morphological causative *cakṣaya-* ‘reveal’ (3× in the RV; see Jamison 1983: 125):

(RV 1.127.11de)

*māhi śavīṣha nas kṛdhi samcākṣe bhuje asyāi*

‘O most powerful one, reveal (= make appear) the great one / greatness to us,\(^{28}\) for the enjoyment of this (lit.: for this enjoyment)\(^{29}\)!’

The locative infinitive *saṃcāksi* in RV 6.14.4 is rendered by most translators as an objectless transitive (‘look at’).\(^{30}\) Here, an intransitive analysis (‘appear’) seems more likely. It is the very appearance of Agni, not his look, which causes the fear of enemies:

(RV 6.14.4)

*aṅgīr[...] yāsyā trāsanī śāvasaḥ saṃcāksi śātravo bhīyā*

‘Agni [....], at (the sight of) whose appearance the enemies tremble because of the fear of his power.’

To sum up, being employed in essentially the same types of usages as *sām-khyā*, the compound *sām-caks* does not attest clear examples of the meaning ‘look at’.

\(^{26}\) Note that this intransitive analysis yields a much better syntax than the “free translation” (“traduction libre”; see Renou, EVP X, 116) based on a transitive interpretation suggested by Renou (EVP X, 56): “O Marut’s à couleur d’or, (dès que je vous ai eu) considérés, vous m’avez plu et me plairez encore”.

\(^{27}\) On these constructions, see, in particular, Jamison 1983: 37-39.

\(^{28}\) A transitive-based interpretation (‘make us see something great’) is also possible; cf. Geldner (‘Laß uns [....] Großes schauen …’); Renou (EVP XII, 30: ‘Donne nous à contempler un grand (spectacle) …’); Jamison (1983: 38) (‘[m]ake us see and enjoy this’; as Jamison explains, this transitive-based morphological causative of (*sām-caks* must be in complementary distribution with the intransitive-based causative *cakṣaya-* ‘reveal’); Scarlata (1999: 118) (‘Mach [....] dass wir Grosses schauen …’).

\(^{29}\) Perhaps “an example of double attraction: the pronoun [is] first [....] attracted to the case of the noun it belongs to, and then to the gender of that noun” (W. Knobl, p.c.).

\(^{30}\) Note also that some translations render *saṃcāksi* with words that are ambiguous between the meanings ‘appearance, aspect’ (cf. Russ. *vid*) and ‘look, gaze’ (cf. Russ. *vzgljad*). Cf. e.g. Geldner: ‘Agni [....], bei dessen Anblick aus Furcht vor seiner Stärke die Feinde erbeben’ (similarly Scarlata 1999: 118); Renou (EVP XIII, 46: ‘… à la vue duquel les ennemis tremblent de crainte devant sa force’).
3.3. It remains to clarify the semantic relations between the attested usages of sáṃ-khyā (α and β), sáṃ-cakṣ (i and ii) and the meanings of the corresponding roots. The primary meaning of the roots kāś, khyā (ll kśā) and cakṣ can probably be determined as ‘look, watch, consider’. This yields ‘be watched, be considered’ in the passive, which can easily depassivise (‘appear’).

Adding the meaning ‘together’ (sáṃ) to this verb, we can figure out the following semantic development for the compound with sáṃ: ‘watch (together), survey, consider together’ (with the plural object): (quasi-)passive ‘be considered together; appear (together)’ → ‘be counted together, be associated’ (typically constructed with the sociative instrumental). This meaning underlies the usages attested in RV 9.61.7, KS² 2.5:11.7 = KpS² 1.18:13.14, as well as, most probably, in VS 4.23.

Note that similar semantic developments are possible for the sáṃ-compounds of another verb of seeing, dṛṣṭa, cf. āndramya sām hi dṛksase ’samjagmānō ábijhyuśā (RV 1.6.7ab) ‘For you will appear together with Indra, having come together with the fearless one.’

The meaning ‘count, number’, attested for sáṃ-khyā (usage (β)) and sáṃ-cakṣ (usage (i)), as well as the corresponding passive must represent further development of the basic semantics of the compound (‘consider together’, ‘survey’, etc.).

4. The meaning of the causative saṃ-khyāpāya- / saṃ-kśāpāya-

Back to the causative saṃ-khyāpāya- / saṃ-kśāpāya-. Apparently, one of the usages attested for sáṃ-khyā and/or sáṃ-cakṣ (discussed in section 3) must underlie the semantics of the causative in question. The meanings described under (β) and (i) (‘consider together, survey, count’) make little sense in the contexts quoted in section 1 (‘he causes the wife to survey / count with (?) the Udgātā’). By contrast, the meaning ‘be considered together; appear (together); be reckoned together, be associated’ seems quite appropriate. As already noticed in 2.1, causatives of verbs of perception and knowledge are mostly based on intransitive, rather than on transitive usages. This is also probably the case with the causative saṃ-khyāpāya- / saṃ-kśāpāya-. In accordance with “the common pattern of verbs of perception” (Jamison 1983: 163), the analysis based on the intransitive usage of sāṃ-khyā / sāṃ-kśā is most likely: ‘he causes the wife to appear (to be considered) together with the Udgātā’ ≈ ‘he establishes a (sacral) connection between the wife and the Udgātā’; ‘he associates the wife with the Udgātā’, or the like. The instrumental nouns (udgātrē etc.) should accordingly be interpreted in the sociative sense, rather than as the agent of a caused event.

Thus, we have to reconsider the semantic analysis of the causative in question, and to render its meaning (at least in its earlier attestations, in the oldest Vedic
prose texts) as 'cause smb. to appear (/ to be considered together with smb.), make smb. associated with smb.' Accordingly, the passages quoted at the beginning of this paper can be tentatively translated as follows:

(MS 4.5.4)

‘saṁkhyāpayati…’

‘The Udgātār, being caused to appear together (~ be considered / become associated) with the wife …’

(TS 6.5.8.6)

udgārā sāṁ khyāpayati…

‘He causes [her] to appear together (~ be considered / become associated) with the Udgātār …’

(BaudhŚŚ 8.14:254.14)

udgārā saṁkhyāpya…

‘Having caused [her] to appear together (~ be considered / become associated) with the Udgātār …’

To conclude, one should emphasize that the revised interpretation of saṁ-khyāpayati/saṁ-kśāpayati as 'cause to appear, cause to be considered, make associated with' does not rule out possible erotic and sexual connotations implied by the traditional translations ('cause to be looked at' etc.), such as increasing fertility, rich progeny etc. These meanings may show similar developments ('he makes the wife reckoned / associated / (sexually) united with the Udgātar'; etc.), with similar or same symbolic and mythological implications. Furthermore, in the Śūtra period, when the causative derivation from transitives became very productive, the causative saṁ-khyāpayati/saṁ-kśāpayati could have been secondarily reinterpreted as 'make look at' or 'make exchange looks with' – which accounts for secondary replacements and glosses of the type saṁikṣyamāna- (KātyŚŚ), saṁ khyāpaya || saṁ ikṣaya (ĀpŚŚ 13.14.11) or anūdgātā patinīm saṁkhyāpayati || neṣṭrodrīta udgātā patinīm paśyati (ĀpŚŚ 13.15.8) in the indigenous commentaries. Apparently, by the time when the exegetical texts were written, saṁ-khyā was largely understood as 'look at', 'exchange looks with' or, perhaps, 'exchange [amorous] glances with'.
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