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The Vedic Causative saṃkhyāpāyati / saṃksāpāyati
Reconsidered*

Leonid Kulikov
(Leiden University)

1. saṃ-khyāpāya- / saṃ-kśāpāya-: ‘cause to look at’?

The Middle Vedic causative saṃ-khyāpāya- / saṃ-kśāpāya- is derived from the root khyā / kśā. 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 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 cakṣ, which supplies the forms of the present (lacking in the paradigm of khyā / kśā). Historically, cakṣ must go back to the weak stem of the reduplicated present made from the root kāś ‘appear, become visible’, which, in turn, is related to kśā // khyā.

The causative of the compound sām-khyā / sām-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 Udātar priest, for the sake of progeny. 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 (RV16, AV, VS19, ŚB, JB) non-causative sām-khyā PW II, 624 registers two meanings, “1) med. 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 khyā is likely to result from the secondary development of kśā, which is preserved in the Maitrāyani 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. Synchronously they clearly represent one single root in Vedic prose, with no difference in use between the compounds sām-khyā and sām-kśā.
2 Pace Mayrhofer, EWAia I, 523. Mayrhofer’s hesitant explanation of this root as based on a s-present (*k’ek-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:

(MS⁸ 3.7.7:84.8)
\[yāt somakrāyangā pāṁiḥ *saṁkāpāyati \ldots\]
‘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)
\[udgātā śaṁ khyāpayati. prajāpatir vā eṣā yād udgātā. prajānāṁ prajāpanāya\]
‘He [sc. the Neshtri] 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)

‘He makes the Udgātā look at (her). The Udgātar is really Prajāpati. (The looking is) for the procreation of offspring.’ (Jamison 1996: 140)

(ŚB 4.4.2.17)
\[nēṣṭḥ pāṁiṁ udānayodgātā śaṁ khyāpaya\]
‘Neshtri, lead up the lady, and make her exchange looks with the Udgātrī!’
(Eggeling 1885: 368)

(PB 8.7.12)
\[udgātā patiḥ saṁkhyāpayantī retodheyāṣu\]
‘They [sc. the Adhvaryus] cause her [recte: them] to be looked at by the Udgātā, for impregnation’s sake.’ (Caland 1931: 182)

(PB 8.7.13)
\[hiṁkāraṇ prati saṁkhyāpayantī hiṁkṣād dhi reto ‘dhiyata⁵\]

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

⁵ Read probably ‘dhiyate (pres.) or ‘dhiyeta (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)

\begin{quote}
\textit{tām samkhyāpayanti retodheyāya}

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

(JB 1.173:12)

\begin{quote}
\textit{ā vā etat “patny udgāṭh prajām “dhatē” yad viṣṭe sāman samkhyāpayanti}

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

‘The wife thereby conceives offspring from the Udgāṭ 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.)
\end{quote}

(ĀpŚŚ 13.14.11)

\begin{quote}
\textit{udgāṭrā patnīm sam khyāpaya}

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

(ĀpŚŚ 13.15.8)

\begin{quote}
\textit{hihāram anudgāṭrā patnīm sam khyāpaya}

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

Furthermore, the indigenous commentary by Rudradatta explains this sentence with neṣṭṛcodita udgāṭa patnīm paśyatī ‘Impelled by the Neṣṭar, the Udgāṭar looks at the wife.’

(BaudhŚŚ 8.14:254.14–15)

\begin{quote}
\textit{neṣṭṛ patnīm udānayodgāṭrā samkhyāpyāpa upapravaratayatāt}

‘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)
\end{quote}

(BaudhŚŚ 8.14:255.4-5)

\begin{quote}
\textit{prastute sāmni neṣṭā patnīm udgāṭa samkhyāpya vācayati …}

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

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

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

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

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

The Maitrāyaṇī Śāhitrā attests the only Vedic occurrence of the passive derived from the causative saṃkṣāpyāna-.

(MS\(^8\) 4.5.4:68.5)

'saṃkṣāpyānānā\(^8\) vā udgātā pāṇyā rétā á ḍhatte\(^9\)

In accordance with the interpretation of the causative saṃ-khyāpyāna\(^a\) / saṃkṣāpyāna\(^a\) as ‘cause to look at’, this passage should be translated as follows:

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

Apart from this MS attestation, causative passives of sáṃ-khyā (-kṣā) do not occur within the Vedic corpus. However, KāṭyāŚŚ 7.6.26 attests the passive participle samikṣyamāna- in a similar context:

(KāṭyāŚŚ 7.6.26)

'samakrayā ca samikṣyamānāḥ 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 KāṭyāŚŚ, 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 saṃ-khyāpyāna\(^a\) / saṃkṣāpyāna\(^a\) 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 ‘khyāpyā\(^a\), ‘ksāpyā\(^a\), ‘ksųyāpyā\(^a\), ‘ks̱yāpya\(^a\).

\(^9\) The reading áḍhatte is attested in one of the mss.; ed. Schroeder reads áḍatte. Unlikely is Oertel’s (1926: 329; see also Mittwede 1986: 170) hesitantly suggested reading of the passage, which requires as many as five (!) emendations: ‘saṃkṣāpyānānā vā ‘udgārā’ pāṇyā á ‘réto 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 transitive 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, 163f., 175f.), cf. darśāyati ‘makes appear, reveals’ (not ‘makes see’) – dadṛśé ‘appears, is seen’, cetāyati ‘makes appear, reveals’ – cikité ‘appears, is seen’, vedāyati ‘makes known’ – vīdē ‘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. dṛśāy- ‘be seen’ → ‘be visible; appear’; śrūyā- ‘be heard’ → ‘be famous’. It is important to note that the early Vedic -āya-causatives derived from the two roots (historically) related to khyā // kśā, i.e. cakṣa and kāś (see section 1), are both based on the intransitive usages of these roots: sam kāśāyā- ‘make (be) seen’ is once attested in the AV (14.2.12); cakṣāyā- ‘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. śrūvāy- ‘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 sām-khyā / sām-kśā 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 sam-khyāpāyā- / sam-kśāpāyā- (‘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: -pyāyā- VS+ ‘be caused to swell’, -vṛtyā- MS³, ŚB-KB⁴+ ‘be caused to turn’, sādyā- YV⁵+ ‘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 Śūtra period. The earliest attested examples of -ya-passives derived from -aya-causatives of transitive verbs include: nīdhāpyamāna- (VaitŚ 5.17) ‘being caused to be put down’ (of the horse-foot);12 upapāyyamāna- (ĀpŚS 9.18.11) ‘being caused to drink’ (of the sacrificial animal);13 yājyamāna- (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- (KauŚ 63.20) ‘being caused to pronounce (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-khyāpāya- l sam-kṣāpya-16 ‘cause to look at, cause to consider’ based on the transitive usages of sām-khyā l 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 absolute samkhyāpya (derived from the causative stem samkhyāp(āya)-) is based on the passive made from this causative (sam-khyāpyā-16 ‘be caused to look at’).

12 aśvapādam lakṣane nīdhāpyamānam sam adhvāryety anu mantrayate ‘Along with (anu) the horse’s foot which is being caused to be put down on the (demarcation) line [of the āhāvariya-fire] he (sc. the adhvaryu-priest) pronounces the mantra sam adhvārya … “To the sacrifice …” (AV 3.16.6).’
13 yady upapāyyamāno na pibena na vā uv etan mriyasa iti upa pāyayet ‘If [the sacrificial animal], though being [respectfully?] caused to drink, does not drink, he (sc. the adhvaryu-priest) should cause it to drink [by pronouncing the mantra]: na vā uv etan mriyase “Verily, you do not die here …”’ (TSIII 4.6.9.4 ~ RV 1.162.21 etc.) ‘I follow the interpretation of this passage suggested by W. Knobl (p.c.).’
14 sa yo ha vā evaṃvidādhvaryunā yājyamāno yajamāno na rdhnoi ‘if the institutor of the sacrifice (yajamāna), though being caused by the thus-knowing adhvaryu to perform a sacrifice, does not succeed…’
15 dadvād dātā vācyamānah ‘… the giver who is made pronounce (the ritual words) should give (the oblation’ (Gonda 1965: 88, 228).
16 The meaning of the absolute based on the causative proper (sām-khyāpuya- ‘cause to look at’) would be ‘having looked at …’ – which would leave the instrumental udgātrā (‘with the Udgātar?’) syntactically isolated.
However, examples of passive absolutes are practically unknown in the Śāṁhitās and very rare even in later Vedic texts.17

2.4. Reciprocal interpretations of compounds with sām

The reciprocal interpretation of the compound sāṁ-khyā / sāṁ-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 tṛṇ ‘rejoice’: sāṁ-tṛṇ ‘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 sāṁ-khyā / sāṁ-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 sāṁ-reciprocals (and sāṁ-sociatives) are commonly constructed with sociative instrumentals.19

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

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

3.1. sāṁ-khyā

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

(a) The middle thematic aorist sam-ákhya-ii 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 absolutes (gerunds) of the type lekho lākhitvā [mayā tubhyam datah] ‘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 vi, 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 pitṛbhīḥ 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. *sám-ākhye*-u
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)

\[ sám ādityēbhir akhyata \]

‘[Soma] has appeared together (and, by virtue of that, has become associ-
ated) with the Ādityas.’

(KS* 2.5:11.7 = Kp*S 1.18:13.14)

\[ sám devī devyōrvāśyākhyata\]

‘The heavenly [cow] has appeared together (and, by virtue of that, has be-
come 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))

\[ sám akhye ḍeyoṛā dhiyē été dākṣinayorācākṣasā \]

\[ mā ma āyuḥ prā moṣīr mō ahāṁ tāva \]

\[ vīrāṁ videyā tāva devī sanḍīśī \]

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
Dakṣinā; 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 *sám 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 *sám akhye* in this passage can be ade-

---


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.)’. 
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 sāṃ-khāya (found in two Brāhmaṇas, ŚB and JB), cf.:

(SB 5.4.5.4)

dāśa pitāmahānt somapānt samkhāya prā 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 saṃkhāyamāna- ‘being counted’ at ŚĀ 2.17:

(ŚĀ 2.17 (= ŚŚS 18.21.1))

tad etat sakṛchastāyām sūdadohasi […] saṃkhāyamānāyām […]

bhṛfatāsahasrāṃ sampadyate

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

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 *sām-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 Brṛfatīs.”
3.2. sāṁ-cakṣ

An inquiry into the meanings and usages of the non-causative counterparts sāṁ-
khya-pāya\(^2\) / sāṁ-ksāpāya\(^2\) would be incomplete without a critical reference to
the verbal compound sāṁ-cakṣ, since the root cakṣ is, as I have mentioned above,
etymologically related to khyā/kṣā and supplies the present paradigm of this verb.

The compound sāṁ-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. -caśte) is attested in the transi-
tive usage, which might be qualified as ‘object-oriented sociative’,\(^2\) meaning
‘survey, supervise, watch over’ (with the plural accusative object), thus being
parallel with the usage (β) of sāṁ-khyā:

\[(RV \text{ 7.60.3d)}\]
\[\text{sāṁ yō yāthēva jānimāni caśte}\]
\[\text{‘[Sūrya] who watches over the generations [of men], like [a herdsman]}
\text{over] herds.’}\]

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

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

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 sāṁ-khyā (see section
3.1):

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

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

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

\(^2\) See Nedjalkov 2007: 34.
\(^2\) See also Renou’s (EVP X, 116) remarks on the meaning ‘computer’ attested both for
sāṁ-khyā and sāṁ-cakṣ.
The periphrastic causative construction at RV 1.127.11 (consisting of the semi-auxiliary verb kr 'make' and the dative infinitive sam$cak$e) may be based on the same intransitive usage (ii), thus being synonymous with the morphological causative cak$aya$-'reveal' (3× in the RV; see Jamison 1983: 125):

(RV 1.127.11de)

mo$hi$ savi$sha$ na$ s$rdhi$ sam$cak$e bhuj$e$ asya$i$

'Of the most powerful one, reveal (= make appear) the great one / greatness to us,27 for the enjoyment of this (lit.: for this enjoyment)'.

The locative infinitive sam$caki$ in RV 6.14.4 is rendered by most translators as an objectless transitive ('look at').28 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)

a$gni$[...] yas$ya$ tr$asanti$ sa$vasa$h sam$caki$ s$atravo$ bhiy$a

'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 s$am$khy$a, the compound s$am$cak$ 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 (s$am$-cak$) must be in complementary distribution with the intransitive-based causative cak$aya$-'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 sam$caki$ with words that are ambiguous between the meanings 'appearance, aspect' (cf. Russ. vid) and 'look, gaze' (cf. Russ. vz$g$ljad). 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 sām-khyā (α and β), sām-cakṣ (i and ii) and the meanings of the corresponding roots. The primary meaning of the roots kāś, khyā (ǐl kāś) 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’ (sām) to this verb, we can figure out the following semantic development for the compound with sām: ‘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 sām-compounds of another verb of seeing, dṛś, cf. indreṇa sām hī dṛkṣase ’samjagmānō ábibhyuṣā (RV 1.6.7ab) ‘For you will appear together with Indra, having come together with the fearless one.’

The meaning ‘count, number’, attested for sām-khyā (usage (β)) and sām-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 sām-khyāpāya-ī / sām-kshāpāya-ī

Back to the causative sām-khyāpāya-ī / sām-kshāpāya-ī. Apparently, one of the usages attested for sām-khyā and/or sām-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 Udgār’?). 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 sām-khyāpāya-ī / sām-kshāpāya-ī. In accordance with “the common pattern of verbs of perception” (Jamison 1983: 163), the analysis based on the intransitive usage of sām-khyā / sām-kśā is most likely: ‘he causes the wife to appear (to be considered) together with the Udgātar’ = ‘he establishes a (sacral) connection between the wife and the Udgātar’; ‘he associates the wife with the Udgātar’, 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)

‘samkṣāpyāmāno vā uḍgātā pātnyā…
‘The Udgātar, being caused to appear together (~ be considered / become associated) with the wife …’

(TS 6.5.8.6)

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

(BaudhŚŚS 8.14:254.14)

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

To conclude, one should emphasize that the revised interpretation of sam-khyāpayati/ saṃ-ksāpāya 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 sam-khyāpayati/ saṃ-ksāpāya could have been secondarily reinterpreted as ‘make look at’ or ‘make exchange looks with’ – which accounts for secondary replacements and glosses of the type samikṣayāma- (KātyŚŚS), sam khyāpaya // sam ikṣaya (ĀpŚŚS 13.14.11) or anuḍgātrā paṇīm samkhyāpayati // nesṛcoḍita uḍgātā paṇīm paśyati (ĀpŚŚS 13.15.8) in the indigenous commentaries. Apparently, by the time when the exegetical texts were written, sām-khyā was largely understood as ‘look at’, ‘exchange looks with’ or, perhaps, ‘exchange [amorous] glances with’.
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