



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

The Vedic causative samkhyāpáyati / samksāpáyati reconsidered

Kulikov, L.I.; Kulikov L., Rusanov M.

Citation

Kulikov, L. I. (2008). The Vedic causative samkhyāpáyati / samksāpáyati reconsidered. *Indologica. T. Ya. Elizarenkova Memorial Volume*, 245-261. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/15667>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/15667>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

● *Orientalia*
et Classica
XX

Indologica

Russian
State University
for the Humanities

● **Orientalia**
et **Classica**
**Papers of the Institute of Oriental
and Classical Studies**

Issue XX

INDOLOGICA

T. Ya. Elizarenkova
Memorial Volume

Book 1

*Compiled and edited by
L. Kulikov, M. Rusanov*

Moscow
2008

Российский
государственный гуманитарный
университет

● **Orientalia**
etClassica

Труды Института восточных культур
и античности

Выпуск XX

INDOLOGICA

Сборник статей памяти
Т. Я. Елизаренковой

Книга 1

Составители:
Л. Куликов, М. Русанов

Москва
2008

The Vedic Causative *saṃkhyāpáyati* / *saṃkśāpáyati* Reconsidered*

Leonid Kulikov
(Leiden University)

1. *saṃ-khyāpáya*-^{ti} / *saṃ-kśāpáya*-^{ti}: ‘cause to look at’?

The Middle Vedic causative *saṃ-khyāpáya*-^{ti} / *saṃ-kśāpáya*-^{ti} is derived from the root *khyā* / *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 *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 *caḥṣ*, which supplies the forms of the present (lacking in the paradigm of *khyā* // *kśā*). Historically, *caḥṣ* must go back to the weak stem of the reduplicated present made from the root *kāś* ‘appear, become visible’,² which, in turn, is related to *kśā* // *khyā*.

The causative of the compound *sám-khyā* / *sám-kśā* first appears in the Vedic prose, in the Brāhmaṇas and Sūtras. 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^{1x}, AV, VS^{1x}, ŚB, JB) non-causative *sám-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 Maitrāyaṇī and Kāṭhaka 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 *sám-khyā* and *sám-kśā*.

² Pace Mayrhofer, EWAia I, 523. Mayrhofer’s hesitant explanation of this root as based on a *s*-present (**k^hek-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 ‘*betrachten 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 Udgātar 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:

(MS^P 3.7.7:84.8)

yāt somakráyaṇyā pátnīṁ +saṁkśāpáyati ...

‘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)

udgātrā sám khyāpayati. prajāpatir vá eṣá yád udgātā. prajānām prajānāya

‘He [sc. the Neṣṭṛ] causes the Udgātr to look (at the wife); the Udgātr is Prajāpati; (verily it serves) for the production of offspring.’ (Keith 1914: 544; likewise Gonda 1989a: 27)

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

‘(Der Neṣṭṛ) veranlaßt (die Gattin des Opfernden), mit dem Udgātr Blicke zu wechseln.’ (Narten 1965: 57 [= Kl.Schr. 1, 47])

(ŚB 3.3.1.11)

tásmād enāṁ somakráyaṇyā sám khyāpayati

‘... this is why he [sc. the Neshtri] causes her [sc. the sacrificer’s wife] to be looked at by the Soma-cow.’ (Eggeling 1885: 61)

(ŚB 4.4.2.17)

neṣṭaḥ pátnīm udānayaodgātrā sám khyāpaya

‘Neshtri, lead up the lady, and make her exchange looks with the Udgātri!’ (Eggeling 1885: 368)

(PB 8.7.12)

udgātrā patnīḥ saṁkhyāpayanti retodheyāya

‘They [sc. the Adhvaryus] cause her [*recte*: them] to be looked at by the Udgātr, for impregnation’s sake.’ (Caland 1931: 182)

(PB 8.7.13)

*hiṅkāraṁ prati saṁkhyāpayanti hiṅkṛtād 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 *hiṃ*-cry, for after the *hiṃ*-cry semen is deposited.’ (Jamison 1996: 141)

(JB 1.173:11–12)

tām saṃkhyāpayanti retodheyāya

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

(JB 1.173:12)

ā vā etat +patny udgātuḥ prajāṃ +dhatte⁶ yad vigīte sāman saṃkhyāpayanti
‘In that they cause (the wife) to be looked at (by the Udgāṭṛ-priest) when the Sāman is partly sung thereby the wife takes for herself offspring from the Udgāṭṛ-priest.’ (Oertel 1926: 329)

‘The wife thereby conceives offspring from the Udgāṭṛ 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.)

(ĀpŚS 13.14.11)

udgātrā patnīm saṃ khyāpaya

‘... lasse die Herrin des Hauses mit dem Udgāṭṛ Blicke wechseln ...’ (Caland 1924: 342)⁷

(ĀpŚS 13.15.8)

hiṅkāram anūdgātrā patnīm saṃ khyāpayati

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

Furthermore, the indigenous commentary by Rudradatta explains this sentence with *neṣṭṛcodita udgātā patnīm paśyati* ‘Impelled by the Neṣṭar, the Udgāṭṛ looks at the wife.’

(BaudhŚS 8.14:254.14–15)

neṣṭaḥ patnīm udānayo dgātrā saṃkhyāpyāpa upapravartayatāt

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

‘O Neṣṭṛ, do thou lead the sacrificer’s wife here, cause the Udgāṭṛ to gaze at the sacrificer’s wife, (O sacrificer’s wife) do thou let the water flow...’ (Kashikar 2003: 455)

(BaudhŚS 8.14:255.4-5)

prastute sāmni neṣṭā patnīm udgātrā saṃkhyāpya vācayati ...

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

‘... nachdem der Neṣṭṛ die Gattin veranlaßt hat, mit dem Udgāṭṛ 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 *saṃ khyāpaya* with *saṃ ikṣaya* ‘make look’.

‘When the sāman has been sung, the Neṣṭar, having made the Udgātar look at the wife, makes (her) say ...’ (Jamison 1996: 139)

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

The Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā attests the only Vedic occurrence of the passive derived from the causative *saṃ-kṣāpāya-*ⁱⁱ, the participle *saṃkṣāpyāmāna-*:

(MS^P 4.5.4:68.5)

⁺*saṃkṣāpyāmāno*⁸ *vā udgātā pātmyā rétā á dhatte*⁹

In accordance with the interpretation of the causative *saṃ-khyāpāya-*ⁱⁱ / *saṃ-kṣāpāya-*ⁱⁱ as ‘cause to look at’, this passage should be translated as follows:

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

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

(KātyŚS 7.6.26)

somakrayanyā ca samīkṣyamānām samakhye iti

‘And while she is being looked at by the Soma-purchasing (-cow), (the Neṣṭr 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 *saṃ-khyāpāya-*ⁱⁱ / *saṃ-kṣāpāya-*ⁱⁱ 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 ^o*khyāpyā*^o, ^o*kṣāpyā*^o, ^o*kṣyāpyā*^o, ^o*k(ṣ)yāpyā*^o.

⁹ The reading *á dhatte* is attested in one of the mss.; ed. Schroeder reads *á datte*. Unlikely is Oertel’s (1926: 329; see also Mittwede 1986: 170) hesitantly suggested reading of the passage, which requires as many as five (!) emendations: ⁺*saṃkṣāpyāmānā vā +udgātrā +pātmy +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 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, 163f., 175f.), cf. *darśāyati* 'makes appear, reveals' (not 'makes see') – *dadṛśé* 'appears, is seen', *ceṭāyati* 'makes appear, reveals' – *cikīṭé* 'appears, is seen', *vedāyati* '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 undistinguishable from) the passives such as perf. *dadṛśé*, pres. *dṛśyá-te* 'be seen' → 'be visible; appear'; *śrūyá-te*, *śṛṇvé* '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. *caḥ* and *kāś* (see section 1), are both based on the intransitive usages of these roots: *saṃ kāśaya-ti* 'make (be) seen' is once attested in the AV (14.2.12); *caḥśaya-ti* '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. *śrāvāyati-ti* '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 *sāṃ-khyā* / *sāṃ-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-khyāpāyati-ti* / *saṃ-kṣāpāyati-ti* ('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. *-yá*-passives derived from *-āya*-causatives

The first attestations of *-yá*-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-te* VS+ 'be caused to swell', *-vartyá-te* MS^p, ŚB-KB^{m+} 'be caused to turn', *sādyá-te* YV^{m+} '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 *upapāyyamāna-* (ĀpŚS 9.18.11) ‘being caused to drink’ (of the sacrificial animal);¹³ *yājyamāna-* (VādhS 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 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 *saṃ-khyāpāya-^{ti} / saṃ-kśāpāya-^{ti}* ‘cause to look at, cause to consider’ based on the transitive usages of *sám-khya / sám-kśā* (‘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 absolutives?

Jamison’s translation of the construction *udgātrā saṃkhyāpya* (BaudhŚS 8.14:254.14) as ‘having had her looked at by the Udgātar’ suggests that the absolute *saṃkhyāpya* (derived from the causative stem *saṃkhyāp(āya)-*) is based on the passive made from this causative (*saṃ-khyāpyá-^{te}* ‘be caused to look at’).¹⁶

¹² *aśvapādaṃ lakṣaṇe nidhāpyamānaṃ sam adhvarāyety anu mantrayate* ‘Along with (*anu*) the horse’s foot which is being caused to be put down on the (demarcation) line [of the āhavanīya-fire] he (sc. the adhvaryu-priest) pronounces the mantra *sam adhvarāya* ... “To the sacrifice ...” (AV 3.16.6).’

¹³ *yady upapāyyamāno na piben 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 ...” (TS^m 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 evamvidādhvaryuṇā yājyamāno yajamāno na rdhnoti* ‘if the institutor of the sacrifice (*yajamāna*), though being caused by the thus-knowing adhvaryu to perform a sacrifice, does not succeed...’

¹⁵ *dadyād dātā vācyamānaḥ* ‘... 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 (*sám-khyāpaya-^{ti}* ‘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 Saṃhitās and very rare even in later Vedic texts.¹⁷

2.4. Reciprocal interpretations of compounds with *sám*

The reciprocal interpretation of the compound *sám-khyā* / *sám-kśā* as ‘exchange looks with’ is not supported by the meanings typically attested for reciprocals with the preverb *sám*. This preverb is normally used for the derivation of spatial reciprocals of the type *i* ‘go’: *sám-i* ‘come together’, *dhṛ* ‘keep, hold’: *sám-dhṛ* ‘keep together’ or sociatives such as *tṛp* ‘rejoice’: *sám-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 *sám-khyā* / *sám-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 *sám*-reciprocals (and *sám*-sociatives) are commonly constructed with sociative instrumentals.¹⁹

In the following section, I will argue that the interpretation of *sám-khyāpāya*^{ti} as ‘cause to look at’ or ‘cause to exchange looks with’ is not supported by the usage of the non-causative *sám-khyā*.

3. The non-causative usages of *sám-khyā* and *sám-cakṣ*

3.1. *sám-khyā*

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

(α) The middle thematic aorist *sám-ákhya*^{ta} 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 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 *sám*. From the end of the early Vedic period onwards, we also find canonical reciprocal constructions with the pronoun *anyó* ‘nyá- ‘one another’.

¹⁹ Cf. e.g. RV *pitṛbhiḥ saṃvidāná-* ‘uniting with the fathers’ (Thieme (1952: 45ff.): ‘sich vereinigen [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-ākhyā*²⁰ 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 ādityébhir akhyata

'[Soma] has appeared together (and, by virtue of that, has become associated) with the Ādityas.'²⁰

(KS^P 2.5:11.7 = KpS^P 1.18:13.14)

*sám devī devyórvásyākhyata*²¹

'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))

sám akhye devyā dhiyā 'sám dakṣiṇayorúcakṣasā

mā ma āyuh prá moṣīr mó ahám táva

vīrām videya táva devi samdṛṣi

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 Dakṣiṇā: 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 Dakṣiṇā; 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.²² Yet, in my view, the meaning of *sám akhye* in this passage can be ade-

²⁰ Cf. Geldner (III, 42): 'Er wurde den Āditya's gleich gerechnet'; Renou (1961 [EVP VIII]: 31, 89): 'on l'a compté au nombre des Āditya'; Elizarenkova (1999: 42): 'On byl pričíslen k Adit'jam.' Cf. also Gonda 1979: 21, with fn. 55.

²¹ = *devyā-urvásyā-akhyata*, erroneously segmented by Simon (1912: 99, 176) as *devyór vāsýā-akhyata*.

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 *sám 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 *sám-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 *sám-khyāya* (found in two Brāhmaṇas, ŚB and JB), cf.:

(ŚB 5.4.5.4)

dása pitāmahānt somapānt samkhyāya prá 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 *sám-khyāta*- ‘counted, numbered’ (cf. AV 4.16.5, 4.25.2, 12.3.28) and the present passive participle *samkhyāyamāna*- ‘being counted’ at ŚĀ 2.17:

(ŚĀ 2.17 (= ŚŚS 18.21.1))

tad etat sakṛcchastāyām sūdadohasi [...] samkhyāyamānāyām [...]

bṛhatīśahasraṃ sampadyate

‘[If] this Sūdadohas [stanza], which is recited once, is counted together [with others] [...], it is equal to a thousand of Bṛhatīs.’²³

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 Bṛhatīs.”

3.2. *sām-cakṣ*

An inquiry into the meanings and usages of the non-causative counterparts *sām-khyāpāya-*ⁱⁱ / *sām-kśāpāya-*ⁱⁱ would be incomplete without a critical reference to the verbal compound *sām-cakṣ*, since the root *cakṣ* is, as I have mentioned above, etymologically related to *khyā/ksā* and supplies the present paradigm of this verb.

The compound *sām-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 *sām-khyā*:

(RV 7.60.3d)

sām yó yūthéva jánimāni cáṣṭe

‘[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)

pūṣá [...] saṃcákṣāṇo bhúvanā devá īyate

‘The heavenly Pūṣan drives, surveying (all) creatures (together).’

The transitive construction attested with the dative infinitive *saṃcákṣe* 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 *sām-khyā* (see section 3.1).²⁵

(RV 7.18.20ab)

ná ta indra sumatáyo ná ráyaḥ ' saṃcákṣe púrvā uśáso ná nūtnāḥ

‘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 *saṃ-cákṣīta*).

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

²⁴ See Nedjalkov 2007: 34.

²⁵ See also Renou’s (EVP X, 116) remarks on the meaning ‘computer’ attested both for *sām-khyā* and *sām-cakṣ*.

(RV 1.165.12cd)

saṃcákṣyā marutaś candrávarṇā ' áchānta me chadáyāthā ca nūnám
 '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 *saṃcákṣe*²⁷) may be based on the same intransitive usage (ii), thus being synonymous with the morphological causative *cakṣaya-*ⁱⁱ 'reveal' (3× in the RV; see Jamison 1983: 125):

(RV 1.127.11de)

máhi śaviṣṭha nas kṛdhi ' saṃcákṣe bhujé asyái
 '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 *saṃcákṣi* 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)

agnír [...] yásya trásanti śávasaḥ saṃcákṣi śátravo bhíyá
 '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 *sám-khyā*, the compound *sám-cakṣ* 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 (*sám-*)*cakṣ* must be in complementary distribution with the intransitive-based causative *cakṣaya-*ⁱⁱ '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 *saṃcákṣi* 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 *sám-khyā* (α and β), *sám-cakṣ* (i and ii) and the meanings of the corresponding roots. The primary meaning of the roots *kāś*, *khyā* (*// kśā*) and *cakṣ* can probably be determined as ‘look, watch, consider’. This yields ‘be watched, be considered’ in the passive, which can easily depassivize (‘appear’).

Adding the meaning ‘together’ (*sám*) to this verb, we can figure out the following semantic development for the compound with *sám*: ‘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, KS^p 2.5:11.7 = KpS^p 1.18:13.14, as well as, most probably, in VS 4.23.

Note that similar semantic developments are possible for the *sám*-compounds of another verb of seeing, *drś*, cf. *índreṇa sám hí dṛkṣase* ‘*saṃjagmānó ábibhyusā* (RV 1.6.7ab) ‘For you will appear together with Indra, having come together with the fearless one.’

The meaning ‘count, number’, attested for *sám-khyā* (usage (β)) and *sám-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-khyāpáya*⁻ⁱⁱ / *saṃ-kśāpáya*⁻ⁱⁱ

Back to the causative *saṃ-khyāpáya*⁻ⁱⁱ / *saṃ-kśāpáya*⁻ⁱⁱ. Apparently, one of the usages attested for *sám-khyā* and/or *sám-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 Udgātar’?). 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-khyāpáya*⁻ⁱⁱ / *saṃ-kśāpáya*⁻ⁱⁱ. In accordance with “the common pattern of verbs of perception” (Jamison 1983: 163), the analysis based on the intransitive usage of *sám-khyā* / *sám-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 (*udgātrā* 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)

⁺*saṃkṣāpyāmāno vā udgātā pātnyā...*

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

(TS 6.5.8.6)

udgātrā saṃ khyāpayati...

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

(BaudhŚS 8.14:254.14)

udgātrā saṃkhyāpya...

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

To conclude, one should emphasize that the revised interpretation of *saṃkhyāpāya*-^{ti} / *saṃ-kṣāpāya*-^{ti} 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 Sūtra period, when the causative derivation from transitives became very productive, the causative *saṃ-khyāpāya*-^{ti} / *saṃ-kṣāpāya*-^{ti} could have been secondarily reinterpreted as ‘make look at’ or ‘make exchange looks with’ – which accounts for secondary replacements and glosses of the type *samīkṣyamāṇa*- (KātyŚS), *saṃ khyāpaya* // *saṃ īkṣaya* (ĀpŚS 13.14.11) or *anūdgātrā patnīm saṃkhyāpayati* // *neṣṭṛcodita udgātā patnīm paśyati* (ĀpŚS 13.15.8) in the indigenous commentaries. Apparently, by the time when the exegetical texts were written, *sāṃ-khyā* was largely understood as ‘look at’, ‘exchange looks with’ or, perhaps, ‘exchange [amorous] glances with’.

References

Text editions

- ĀpŚS *The Śrauta Sūtra of Āpastamba Belonging to the Taittirīya Saṃhitā with the Commentary of Rudradatta*, ed. R. Garbe. 3 vols. Calcutta, 1882–1902. (*Bibliotheca Indica* 92).
- AV *Atharva Veda Sanhita*. Herausgegeben von R. Roth und W. D. Whitney. Zweite verbesserte Auflage besorgt von Max Lindenau. Berlin: Ferd. Dümmler, 1924.

- BaudhŚS *The Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra Belonging to the Taittirīya Saṃhitā*, ed. W. Caland. 3 vols. Calcutta, 1904–1924. (*Bibliotheca Indica* 163).
The Baudhāyana Śrautasūtra. Critically edited and translated by C. G. Kashikar. 4 vols. Delhi: Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts—Motilal Banarsidass, 2003. (*Kalāmūlasāstragranthamālā* 35–38).
- JB Ed. Raghu Vira/Lokesh Chandra: *Jaiminīya-Brahmana of the Samaveda*, critically edited by Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra. 2nd rev. ed. Delhi, 1986.
- KātyŚS *The Ārautasūtra of Kātyāyana with Extracts from the Commentaries of Karaka and Yājñikadeva*, ed. A. Weber. Berlin–London: Ferd. Dümmler, 1859.
Kātyāyana-Śrautasūtra: text with English translation and notes by G. U. Thite. Delhi, 2006.
- KauśS Ed. Bloomfield, Maurice: *The Kāuṣhika-sūtra of the Atharva-veda*, with extracts from the commentaries of Dārila and Keçava. New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1890. (*Journal of the American Oriental Society* 14).
- KB Ed. E. R. Sreekrishna Sarma: *Kauṣhiki-Brāhmaṇa*. 1. Text. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1968. (*Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland*; Supplementband 9, 1).
- KpS Ed. Raghu Vira: *Kaṣiṭhala-Kaṭha-Saṃhitā. A text of the Black Yajurveda*. 1st ed. Lahore: Mehar Chand Lachhman Das, 1932. (*Mehar Chand Lachhman Das Sanskrit and Prakrit Series* 1).
- KS Ed. Schroeder, Leopold von: *Kāthakam. Die Saṃhitā der Kaṭha-Çākhā*. 3 Bde. Leipzig, 1900, 1909, 1910.
- MS *Māitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā*, hrsg. von L. von Schroeder. 4 Bde. Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1881–1886.
- PB Ed. A. Chinnaswami Śastri: *Tāṇḍyamahābrāhmaṇa* belonging to the Sāma Veda with the commentary of Sāyaṇāchārya. 2 vols. Benares, 1935, 1936. (*Kashi Sanskrit Series*; *Haridās Sanskrit Granthamālā* 105).
- RV Ed. Aufrecht, Theodor: *Die Hymnen des Rigveda*. 2 Bde. 2. Auflage. Bonn: Adolph Marcus, 1877.
- ŚĀ *Śāṅkhāyanāranyakam*, crit. ed. Bhim Dev. Hoshiarpur: Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research Institute, 1980. (*Vishveshvaranand Indological Series* 70).
- ŚB(M) *The Çatapatha-Brāhmaṇa in the Mādhyandina-Çākhā* with Extracts from the Commentaries of Sāyaṇa, Harisvāmin and Dvivedaganga, ed. A. Weber. Berlin–London: Ferd. Dümmler, 1885.
- ŚŚS *The Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra* together with the commentary of Varadattasuta Ānartīya. Ed. by A. Hillebrandt. Vol. I. Text of the Sūtra, critical notes, indices. Calcutta, 1888. (*Bibliotheca Indica* 99).
- TB Ed. A. Mahadeva Sastri (et al.): *The Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa with the Commentary of Bhaṭṭa Bhaskara Miśra*. Ed. by A. Mahadeva Sastri, R. Shama Sastri and L. Shrinivasacharya. 4 vols. Mysore, 1908–1921. (≈ Delhi, 1985).
- TS Ed. Weber, Albrecht: *Die Taittirīya-Saṃhitā*. 2 Bde. Leipzig, 1871, 1872. (*Indische Studien* 11–12).
- VādhS Vādhūla-Śrautasūtra; ed. W. Caland. See Caland 1928.
- VaitS Ed. Vishva Bandhu: *Vaitāna-Śrauta-Sūtra with the commentary called Ākṣepānuvidhi by Somāditya*. Edited, critically, ... by Vishva Bandhu in collaboration with Bhim Dev & Pitambar Datt. Hoshiarpur, 1967. (*Woolner Indological Series* 13).

- Ed. Garbe, Richard: *Vaitāna Sūtra. The ritual of the Atharvaveda*. Edited with critical notes and indices by Richard Garbe. London: Trübner, 1878.
- VS Ed. Weber, Albrecht: *The Vājasaneyi-Saṁhitā in the Mādhyandina- and the Kāṇva-Çākhā with the Commentary of Mahīdhara*. Berlin–London: Ferd. Dümmler, 1852. (Repr.: *Chawkhamba Sanskrit Series* 103 (1972)).
- YV Yajurveda(-Saṁhitā) (= VS(K), MS, KS, KpS, TS).

Secondary Literature

- Bodewitz, Hendrik W. 1990. *The Jyotiṣoma ritual: Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa I, 66–364. Introduction, translation and commentary*. Leiden: Brill. (*Orientalia Rheno-Traiectina* 34).
- Böhtlingk, Otto & Roth, Rudolf. 1855–75. [PW] *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*. St. Petersburg: Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Caland, Willem. 1924. *Das Śrautasūtra des Āpastamba*. Bd. 2. Amsterdam: Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen. (*Verhandelingen der koninklijke Nederlandse akademie van wetenschappen. Afd. Letterkunde* 24/2).
- . 1928. Eine vierte Mitteilung über das Vādhūlasūtra. *Acta Orientalia* 6, 97–241. [= Kl.Schr., 397–541].
- . 1931. *Pañcaviṁśa-Brāhmaṇa. The Brāhmaṇa of Twenty Five Chapters*. Calcutta. (*Bibliotheca Indica* 255).
- Caland, Willem & Henry, Victor. 1906. *L'agniṣoma. Description complète de la forme normale du sacrifice de soma dans le culte védique*. T. 1. Paris: Leroux.
- Charpentier, Jarl. 1932–33 Beiträge zur indischen Wortkunde. *Le Monde Oriental* 26–27: 91-169.
- Eggeling, Julius. 1885. *The Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa. According to the text of the Mādhyandina school*. Part II. Oxford: Clarendon Press. (*Sacred books of the East* 26).
- Elizarenkova, Tat'jana Ja. 1999. *Rigveda. Mandaly IX–X*. Pervod i komentarii T. Ja. Elizarenkovej [R̥gveda. Maṇḍalas IX–X. Translation and commentaries by T. Ja. Elizarenkova]. Moskva: Nauka.
- Geldner, Karl Friedrich. 1951. *Der Rig-veda aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt...* Bd. 1–3. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (*Harvard Oriental Series* 33–35).
- Gonda, Jan. 1965. *The Savayajñas. (Kauśikasūtra 60-68. Translation, introduction, commentary)*. Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers maatschappij. (*Verhandelingen der koninklijke Nederlandse akademie van wetenschappen. Afd. Letterkunde* 71/2).
- . 1969. *Eye and gaze in the Veda*. Amsterdam: North-Holland. (*Verhandelingen der koninklijke Nederlandse akademie van wetenschappen. Afd. Letterkunde* 75/1).
- . 1979. *The medium in the R̥gveda*. Leiden: Brill. (*Orientalia Rheno-Traiectina* 24).
- . 1989a. *Prajāpati's relations with Brahman, Bṛhaspati and Brahmā*. Amsterdam: North-Holland. (*Verhandelingen der koninklijke Nederlandse akademie van wetenschappen. Afd. Letterkunde* 138).
- . 1989b. *Prayer and blessing: Ancient Indian ritual terminology*. Leiden: Brill. (*Orientalia Rheno-Traiectina* 33).
- Hillebrandt, Alfred. 1897. *Ritual-Litteratur: vedische Opfer und Zauber*. Strassburg: Trübner. (*Grundriss der indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde*; Bd. 3/2).
- Hock, Hans Henrich. 1991. Causees, passive agents, or instruments? Instrumental NPs with causatives in early and later Vedic Prose. In: H. H. Hock (ed.), *Studies in Sanskrit*

- syntax: A volume in honor of the centennial of Speijer's Sanskrit Syntax (1886–1986)*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 71–93.
- Jamison, Stephanie W. 1983. *Function and form in the -āya-formations of the Rig Veda and Atharva Veda*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. (KZ; Ergänzungsheft 31).
- . 1996. *Sacrificed wife / sacrificer's wife: women, ritual, and hospitality in ancient India*. Oxford etc.: Oxford University Press.
- Keith, Arthur B. 1906. The gerund as passive in Sanskrit. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1906): 693–695.
- . 1907. The use of the passive gerund in Sanskrit. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1907): 164–166.
- . 1908. *The Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka. With an appendix on the Mahāvratā*. London: Royal Asiatic Society. (Oriental Translation Fund; N.S.; 18).
- . 1914. *The Veda of the Black Yajus School entitled Taittiriya Saṁhitā*. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. (Harvard Oriental Series 18–19).
- Kulikov, Leonid. 2001. *The Vedic -ya-presents*. PhD Diss. Leiden University.
- . 2006. Passive and middle in Indo-European: Reconstructing the early Vedic passive paradigm. In: W. Abraham & L. Leisiö (eds), *Passivization and typology: form and function*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 62–81.
- . 2007. Reciprocal constructions in Vedic. In: V. Nedjalkov et al. (eds.), *Reciprocal constructions in Vedic*. Vol. 2. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 709–738.
- Lubotsky, Alexander. 1983. On the external sandhis of the Maitrāyaṇī Saṁhitā. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 25: 167–179.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1986-2001. [EWAia] *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoirischen*. Bd. I–III. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Mittwede, Martin. 1986. *Textkritische Bemerkungen zur Maitrāyaṇī Saṁhitā*. Stuttgart: Steiner. (Alt- und Neuindische Studien 31).
- Monier-Williams, Monier. 1899. *A Sanskrit-English dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Narten, Johanna. 1965. Über die vedischen Belege von *miv*. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 18 (= W. Wissmann zum 65. Geburtstag): 53-60. [= Kl. Schr. 1, 44–49].
- Nedjalkov, Vladimir. 2007. Overview of the research. Definitions of terms, framework, and related issues. In: Nedjalkov, V. et al. (eds), *Reciprocal constructions*. Vol. 1. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 3–114.
- Oertel, Hanns. 1926. *The syntax of cases in the narrative and descriptive prose of the Brāhmaṇas. I. The disjunct use of cases*. Heidelberg: Winter. (Indogermanische Bibliothek. I. Reihe: Grammatiken; Bd. 18).
- Renou, Louis. 1955–69. [EVP] *Études védiques et pāṇinéennes*. Paris: Boccard.
- Scarlata, Salvatore. 1999. *Die Wurzelkomposita im Rg-Veda*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Schroeder, Leopold von. 1879. Ueber die Māytrayani Saṁhitā, ihr Alter, ihr Verhältniss zu den verwandten Çākhā's, ihre sprachliche und historische Bedeutung. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 33: 177–207.
- Simon, Richard. 1912. *Index verborum zu Leopold von Schroeder's Kāthakam-Ausgabe*. Leipzig: Brockhaus.
- Thieme, Paul. 1929. *Das Plusquamperfektum im Veda*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. (KZ; Ergänzungsheft 7).
- . 1952. *Studien zur indogermanischen Wortkunde und Religionsgeschichte*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag. (Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philologisch-historische Klasse; Bd. 98, H. 5).

- Tikkanen, Bertil. 1987. *The Sanskrit gerund: A synchronic, diachronic and typological analysis*. Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society. (*Studia Orientalia* 62).
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1896. [AiG] *Altindische Grammatik*. Bd. I. *Lautlehre*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Witzel, Michael. 1989. Tracing the Vedic dialects. In: C. Caillat (ed.), *Dialectes dans les littératures indo-aryennes*. Paris: Collège de France, 97–265.