

Dedicated to my two grandmothers Rukminammal and Indirammal,
in deep admiration of your strength, wisdom and grace



DECLARATION BY THE CANDIDATE

I declare that this thesis, submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy to Manipal University, is my original work, conducted under the supervision of my guide Dr. Rajesh Kasturirangan. I also wish to inform that no part of the research has been submitted for a degree, diploma, fellowship or examination at any university. References, help and material obtained from other sources have been duly acknowledged.

Place: Bangalore

Date: _____

Naresh Keerthi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis has been many years in the making. One of the pleasures of seeing it done is the opportunity to acknowledge and thanks all the individuals and institutions that supported it. The National Institute of Advanced Studies is a unique institute that encourages students to undertake the most eclectic and unusual topics for research. It would have been impossible for someone with my credentials to work on a topic such as mine in most other institutions in the country. I am grateful to NIAS as well as Manipal University for supporting me in my journey through less trodden paths. I also acknowledge the University Grants Commission for a five year research fellowship that supported me through my years of doctoral research.

Embodying the spirit of interdisciplinarity as it were, is my guide Rajesh Kasturirangan – mathematician and cognitive scientist. He has encouraged me to explore my interests without ever imposing his tastes on my work. His astute attention to detail, academic integrity and generosity of spirit are things I hope to imbibe someday. Anindya Sinha recognised my unconventional research interests and encouraged me to come to NIAS, and has always been supportive. Sameer Karmakar

has been patient, and insightful – he pointed to connections made in my work between figures as far apart as Mammattabhaṭṭa and Roman Jakobson, and saw value and potential in my work that I did not. He also taught me the importance of choosing a research problem of the right size – neither too big, nor too small. I am grateful for his detailed, positive, insightful feedback and warm encouragement. Other faculty members at NIAS who have been encouraging include A.R.Vasavi, M.G.Narasimhan, Smriti Haricharan, N.Ramani and Shivali Tukdeo. Thanks for your friendship and help. I thank Prof Rajan Gurukkal who reminded me that a thesis may be about *mahākāvya-s*, but should not take as long in the writing. I thank the various Coordinators of the PhD Programme at NIAS – Solomon Benjamin, Sindhu Radhakrishna, Gopi Rethinaraj and Sundar Sarukkai, all of who have supported my work through the student colloquia presentations and by keeping track of academic progress.

My thesis is a library thesis, and I have relied mostly on the goodwill and generosity of librarians all over the country and elsewhere for my textual resources – at NIAS, Hamsa Kalyani, Krishnamurthy, Hamsa, Vijayalakshmi, Rajesh and Bhaskar – were long-suffering victims, as I squatted in their territory and appropriating space and

books for inordinately long periods. Hamsa has been amazingly resourceful in getting hold of books and papers for me, sometimes writing to her fellow-librarians in other institutes to access obscure journal articles. I thank those other good samaritans - the librarians from CIIL Mysore, the IFP Pondicherry, International Society for Dravidian Studies Trivandrum, and the Sahitya Akademi Library Bangalore for their matchless help.

My cohort at NIAS - Rolla, Lakshmi, Jafar, Binoy - I almost forgot that I don't have siblings; other colleagues - Sartaj, Maithreyi, Meera, Subho, Neesha and Samiksha, Sailen, Sowjanya and Rashmi. I am sure I did very little to deserve your friendship; nonetheless you chose to support me with warmth and encouragement. *Dhanyo'smi*. Shankar Rajaraman – many many insights in my work emerged from those long conversations with you. Thank you in a deep shade of *māñjīśthī*.

At NIAS, I also wish to thank J.N.Sandhya, whose guidance through the paerwork and timely reminders have been a godsent. You went beyond the call of duty to help me get everything done, and all I can say is thank you for your genuine concern.

I remember with affection and gratitude my friends – Senthil Babu (IFP Pondicherry), Venkata Raghavan (University of Hyderabad), G.J.Lingaraj (McGill University), Andrei Klebanov (Hamburg) and Hugo David (EFEO Pondicherry) , who have been most generous in taking the trouble to personally scan and share articles. Similarly, several members of the Indology listserv have overwhelmed me with their generosity and collegiality by sharing research material with a perfect stranger.

N.S.Suresh – my Sanskrit teacher from high school – while we may disagree on a million matters, I am inestimably in your debt for the remarkable first lessons in Sanskrit that you gave me. Your commitment and obvious love for the language and its manifold intellectual spheres are most infectious, and I don't plan to recover anytime in a hurry.

My deepest thanks go to my long-suffering parents who have supported me in everything I ever tried my hands at, putting up with my unsociable ways. Finally, my two grandmothers, the lodestars of my life – exemplars of grace, dignity and profound humanism, and the earliest sources of my interest into linguistics. The litmus test of my learning has been explaining Cognitive Semantics to you in Kannada and Tamil.

TABLE OF CONTENTS		
Certificate.....		
Declaration.....		
Acknowledgements.....		iii
Table of Contents		vi
List of Tables		ix
Transliteration scheme		x
Abbreviations		xii
Abstract		xiii
1.	INTRODUCTION	1-11
	1.0 Introduction and Background	2
	1.1 Sensory Vocabulary and Embodied Cognition	3
	1.2 Scope, background and objectives	5
	1.3 Cognitive Linguistics and Indian Languages	7
2.	SANSKRIT SEMANTICS AND COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS	12-36
	2.0 The importance of <i>upamā</i>	13
	2.1 The anatomy of a metaphor	14
	2.2 <i>Upamā</i> and <i>Upamāna</i> – or what is metaphor an analogy for	18
	2.3 <i>Aupamyā</i> and CMT – conceptual blend or mixed metaphors?	21
	2.4 Conceptual Metaphor Theory and Sanskrit Literature	25
	2.5 Metaphor studies – a review of the literature	29
	2.6 Metaphor studies and Text Corpora	33
	2.7 Summary	35
3.	METHODS AND DATA	37-50
	3.0 Corpus Linguistics and Cognitive Linguistics	38

	3.1 Corpus Cognitive Linguistics and Lexicography	40
	3.2 Metaphor, Figurative Language and the Corpus	42
	3.3 Limitations of the Corpus	42
	3.4 Text Corpus and Periodisation	45
	3.5 Sources for Sanskrit e-texts – Text and Lexical Corpora	47
	3.6 The Philological Element	48
	3.7 Summary.....	49
4.	THE ADJECTIVE IN SANSKRIT	51-60
	4.0 Introduction	52
	4.1 Adjective and <i>Viśeṣaṇa</i> – a nomenclatural clarification	53
	4.2 The two lives of a Sanskrit colour term – universal and adjective	54
	4.3 Adjective and Adverb - engendering difference	56
	4.4 Agreement and <i>Sāmānādhikarāṇya</i>	57
	4.5 Summary	60
5.	COLOUR METAPHORS IN SANSKRIT POETICS	61-80
	5.0 Studies in Colour term semantics in Premodern languages	62
	5.1 Polychromy or polysemy - Materiality of Visual Vocabulary	63
	5.2 The world through passion-tinted glasses – the polysemy of <i>raga</i>	65
	5.3 Colours of the soul – the <i>leśyā-s</i>	68
	5.4 Colour Semantics in the Mahābhāṣya	70
	5.5 The Treatment of Colour in Treatises of Poetics	71
	5.6 Poetic conventions related to colours in Sanskrit	72
	5.7 Synonyms in the poets' palette	75
	5.8 Synonyms for colour lexemes in the <i>kośa-s</i>	76
	5.9 Dyed fast (and loose) in love – the pigments of passion	78
	5.10 Discussion.....	80
6.	MAPPING THE SEMANTICS OF A COLOUR ADJECTIVE- <i>ARUṆA</i>	81-100
	6.0 Introduction	82
	6.1 The adjective <i>aruṇa</i> – an introduction	83

	6.2 <i>Aruṇa</i> in the lexicons	83
	6.3 <i>Aruna</i> in the epic stage.....	84
	6.4 A synchronous consideration of <i>aruna</i> in the epic stage	85
	6.5 The material collocates of <i>aruna</i> in the Literary Corpus	89
	6.6 Semantic shift of <i>aruna</i> – some text-critical consequences	91
	6.7 <i>Avyaktarāga</i> – a ghost word in modern Sanskrit dictionaries	93
	6.8 Summary.....	98
7.	SYNTHESIS	101
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	110
	APPENDIX I - Attestations of <i>rāga</i>	124
	APPENDIX II - Attestations of <i>aruna</i>	137

LIST OF TABLES

Table no.	Title	Page no.
3.1.	Periodisation of selected Sanskrit Texts	46
5.1.	Attestations of <i>rāga</i> in different denotations	67
6.1.	Occurrences of <i>aruṇa</i> in Sanskrit Literature	90
6.2.	Occurrences of <i>aruṇa</i> in Sanskrit kośa-s	94

NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION

The transliteration of Sanskrit in this document, follows the updated version of the IAST (International Alphabet of Sanskrit Transliteration) according to 'ISO 15919:2001 Information and documentation—Transliteration of Devanagari and related Indic scripts into Latin characters'¹. A key is appended below. Further, to ease the reader to interpret passages in Sanskrit, I have occasionally separated terms in a samāsa compound to facilitate reading.

Devanāgarī	Transcription	
अ	a	A
आ	ā	Ā
इ	i	I
ई	ī	Ī
उ	u	U
ऊ	ū	Ū
ऋ	ṛ	Ṛ
ॠ	ṝ	Ṝ
ऌ	ḷ	Ḹ
ॡ	ḹ	Ḹ̄
ए	e	E

1

See www.iso.org

ऐ	ai	Ai
ओ	o	O
औ	au	Au
अं	ṁ	Ṁ
अः	ḥ	Ḥ
ऽ	'	'

velars	palatals	retroflexes	dentals	labials
क k K	च c C	ट ṭ Ṭ	त t T	प p P
ख kh Kh	छ ch Ch	ठ ṭh Ṭh	थ th Th	फ ph Ph
ग g G	ज j J	ड ḍ Ḍ	द d D	ब b B
घ gh Gh	झ jh Jh	ढ ḍh Ḍh	ध dh Dh	भ bh Bh
ङ ṅ Ṇ	ञ ñ Ñ	ण ṇ Ṇ	न n N	म m M
ह h H	य y Y	र r R	ल l L	व v V
	श ś Ś	ष ṣ Ṣ	स s S	

ABBREVIATIONS

- BC – Buddhacarita of Asvaghosa. Edited by E.H. Johnston. Motilal Banarsidass Publishers. New Delhi. 1998.
- DKC – The Daśakumāracarita of Daṇḍin. Edited by M.R.Kale. Motilal Banarasidas. New Delhi. 1966.
- KC – The Kumārasaṃbhava of Kālidāsa. Edited by M.R.Kale. Motilal Banarasidas. New Delhi. 1981.
- Mbh – The Mahābhārata: Critical Edition. Edited by V.S.Sukthankar et al. 19 volumes. Pune. 1933-1960.
- MS - The Pūrva Mīmāṃsā Sūtras of Jaimini. Translated with a commentary by Ganganatha Jha. Allahabad: Panini Office. 1916.
- Ram – The Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa: Critical Edition. Edited by G.H. Bhatt and U.P. Shah. Oriental Institute, Baroda. 1960.
- SisV– The Śisūpālavadhā of Māgha. Edited by Pandit Sivadatta and Durgaprasad. Tukaram Javaji; Bombay; 1905

THE COGNITIVE POLYSEMY OF SENSORY TERMS IN SANSKRIT

ABSTRACT

A snātaka (graduate) Sanskrit scholar in traditional India, was called a pada-vākya-pramāṇa-jñā - a scholar of words, sentences and epistemes, trained in three disciplines that roughly correspond to the Latin *trivium* of grammar, rhetoric and logic.² It has been argued that the early disciplines were all deeply imbued with a linguistic-literary elements and discursive style. One conceptual device that runs through these three śāstra-s, is the device of metaphor - meaning extension through analogy or bisociation.

In this thesis I study the nature of polysemy in Sanskrit, and its relation with metaphor as a device for meaning extension. Metaphor here is taken not merely as a literary trope, but in the wider sense as discussed in the Cognitive Linguistic framework as a conceptual device for understanding one domain in terms of another. A discussion of Metaphor in the Cognitive Linguistics framework as well as in the Sanskrit poetological tradition follows, and I point to some superior features in the conceptualisation of metaphor in the framework presented by the 11th century Sanskrit poetician Rājānaka Mammattabhaṭṭa. The differences between the Cognitive account of

2

Vyākaraṇa (Grammar), in the Sanskrit tradition included memorizing general and specialised lexicons, as well an awareness of the texts discussing philosophy of language/ linguistic philosophy; rhetoric is replaced by *Mīmāṃsā*, a discipline of ritual hermeneusis, which was concerned with the 'correct' interpretation of the injunctions presented in Vedic statements, and the third tine of this disciplinary fork was *Tarka* or *Nyāya*, with its careful examination of *pramāna*-s (epistemes).

Metaphor and the account of metaphor as a semantic mode in Indian Semantics (*lakṣaṇā*) are discussed, and the merits and lacunae of the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) in the study of figurative language in Sanskrit literature has been covered.

The traditional Sanskrit lexicons pay particular attention to the disambiguation of homonyms or polysemes (*nānārtha-s*) and there are certain lexicons exclusively dedicated to furnishing catalogues of the different connotations of select lexemes.

By using the example of a colour adjective *aruṇa*, and making a detailed diachronic and synchronic study of attestations of this term in Sanskrit literature, I plot the variation that has occurred over time in the semantic domain of this term. The study of the semantics of colour terms has long been at the centre of several debates in linguistics and linguistic philosophy, with repercussions in topics such as linguistic relativism. My work on the polysemy of Sanskrit terms for colour demonstrates how the study of colour terms is much more complex than eliciting responses to Munsell chips from 'native speakers'. A richer understanding of the semantics of colour lexemes will entail taking into account all the various associative senses and significations, that have accrued over times through cultural memory, and are represented in literary usage. Since the language under study is Sanskrit, a historical language, the data has been collated from belletristic literary sources alone, and other media such as spoken language are not represented. Through this work, a novel method for the study of colour terms

This thesis also uses the traditional lexicons as a source for semantic information and triangulates it against the attestations from literature. The work embodied in this thesis points to the need for developing a more sophisticated diachronic lexicographic resource for Sanskrit, along with systematic registries of metaphorical mappings and a historical thesaurus of colour for Sanskrit, which records all sorts of associative meanings and literary conventions.

Key Words: Cognitive Linguistics, Polysemy, Sanskrit Lexicography, Adjective, Colour Terms, Lexical Semantics

Chapter 1. Introduction

Chapter 1. Introduction

1.0. Introduction and Background

Cognitive Semantics, initiated by Ron Langacker and George Lakoff (among others), has been very influential in semantic research over the last several decades. The conceptual metaphor theory (CMT), prototype theory and the attention warranted to polysemy have all been of significant explanatory value in linguistics research. While prototype theory has been used extensively in the study of focal colours (e.g. Tribushinina 2008), the other aspects of cognitive semantics haven't been used as much in the study of colour vocabulary. This thesis is concerned primarily with mapping the semantic behaviour of colour adjectives, as seen in the Sanskrit language.

While the classical languages are in many ways similar to and contiguous with extant languages, there are some significant challenges to the linguistic study of classical languages. This thesis aims to draw attention to some of those challenges. There has been great interest in including Sanskrit into the fold of the digital revolution, by preparing text corpora, and great strides have been taken in the area of Sanskrit Computational Linguistics. The research questions undertaken in this thesis,

though, are of a more fine-grained scale. While the automated compilation of data from usage corpora is helpful, the interpretative eye and palate trained in linguistic, literary and semantic detail is crucial for the semantic analysis of classical belletristic literature.

1.1. Sensory Vocabulary and Embodied Cognition

Sensory experience is taken seriously in cognitive linguistics, as is all bodily experience, which is considered to be a source of perceptual as well conceptual categories and knowledge (Shapiro 2013:15). The facile manner in which we are able to use terms alluding to one sensory domain to describe the experiences of another sensory [or aesthetic or affective] domain has been noticed by cognitivists, and is characterized as 'verbal synaesthesia'¹.

¹Verbal synaesthesia (Popova, 2005) is the commonplace event when we use one sensory term to refer to a different sensory experience. E.g. sharp which is predominantly a term referring to the experience of touch can also be used to refer to tastes, sounds and images. This term is coined along the well-known but rare neurological phenomenon of synaesthesia, wherein the stimulation of one sensory modality creates another distinct sensory impression. For more on the synaesthetic use of colour terms in premodern cultures, see Mark Bradley(2013): Colour as Synaesthetic experience in Antiquity.

This thesis tries to bring together the semantic data gleaned from the Sanskrit literary and lexicographic corpus, along with insights from the Sanskrit philological tradition on one hand; and the cognitive approaches to polysemy and lexical semantics on the other. I propose a slightly different approach for studying lexical semantics, particularly in a historical language, based on the insights gathered in the course of this research.

For reasons of practicability, I restrict my analysis here to visual adjectives, and a limited subset of the very abundant body of visual terms found in Sanskrit, at that. The semantic features revealed in my case studies of colour adjectives affirm the utility of a cognitive approach to polysemy and lexicography as well as the literary and lexical corpus of Sanskrit in a systematic fashion; to be able to develop richer, near-encyclopaedic semantic descriptions/ annotations for vocables in a classical language.

In sum, my work will have a two-fold implication – one is to develop a method for lexicographic work (both general-purpose and domain-specific) in the digital era using electronic text corpora and devices to mine them for lexical data. The other is to bring in the literary and linguistic disciplines of the South Asian languages (and the

historical languages in particular), in conversation with corpus-based cognitive semantic research.

1.2. Scope, background and objectives

Cognitive Linguistics has been a prominent current in the study of semantics in the last several years. However it has not percolated into the studies of the South Asian languages to an appreciable degree. In chapter 2, I review a few studies of Sanskrit literature influenced by Cognitive Linguistics. The theoretical and methodological developments that have informed linguistic research in other (extant) languages, have been slow to percolate into Sanskrit studies, with an honourable exception in the case of Computational Linguistics. Further, while the premodern tradition of grammar in Sanskrit has been discovered, celebrated and incorporated (in part) into theoretical and philosophical discussions of language all over the world, we are yet to see a full fruitful interaction of the Sanskrit tradition's approaches to semantics and lexicography with that of mainstream linguistics.

Mark Turner's (1996) proclamation that "Language is the child of the literary mind" is yet to gain full acceptance from scholars of literature as well as linguistics,

but Cognitive Linguistics has made it possible to try and bridge the rift. Ironically enough, in the study of historical linguistics, i.e. linguistic explorations in classical languages or historical forms of prevalent languages; literary, rhetorical and poetological studies on one hand, and semantic, lexical and grammatical studies on the other hand have been tightly enmeshed. And this enmesh is possible in the philological approach to language, which was once the bedrock of all scholarly enterprise, but now has somewhat diminished scholarly clout. As Pollock (2015) discusses in the introduction to a new volume discussing philological traditions all over the world, is it a near-impossible challenge to speak of all the various philological traditions in one breath. Every classical linguistic culture has forged unique conceptual and intellectual universes of philological praxis, and each must be discussed on its own terms.

This thesis aims to restate the 'philological' method natural to the Sanskrit lexical-semantic traditions as a relevant and rigorous scheme, and as having striking resonances with the methods of tracking meaning employed in Cognitive studies of semantics, as illustrated by a discussion of the historical semantics of a few Sanskrit sensory adjectives. It is important that I qualify the use of 'historical semantics' here.

Historical semantics isn't used as a synonym for diachronic semantics here. This project looks at diachronic as well as synchronic patterns of semantic change². Historical here refers to the nature of the material studied i.e. historical languages³ [Biggam, 2012], and thereby the methods of investigation it warrants⁴. However, the thesis draws upon the philological and interpretative style innate to the classical scholarly traditions associated with Sanskrit as well as key elements of the Cognitive approach to meaning and polysemy.

1.3. Cognitive Linguistics and Indian Languages

Cognitive linguistics has shed much light on the preeminence of metaphor as a conceptual hyper-category, and the importance of corporeal experience in framing linguistic-conceptual categories (Lakoff and Johnson 1999). While an impressive body of scholarly literature has accumulated drawing upon this theoretical framework;

²Synchronic variation of meaning [corresponding to synonymy] while important is arguably less important than longitudinal changes in meaning in the study of Classical Languages. Studies in Historical Semantics privilege diachronic change while modern and premodern lexicographers of Sanskrit have mostly paid attention to synchronic variation in meaning.

³'[historical] describes a form of language that is no longer spoken as anyone's native language' Biggam, 2012. p 109.

⁴More on this in Chapter 3

there is a serious under-representation of the South Asian languages in these studies, as noted by Vineeta Chand (2008). Similarly, the Classical languages too, are under-represented in contemporary linguistic studies barring a few exceptions⁵.

Cognitive Semantics has much in common with the traditional (emic) linguistic theories of Sanskrit and their approach to semantics – the attention paid to processes of secondary meaning extension - particularly metaphor [*lakṣaṇā*], the treatment of linguistic terms not merely as lexemes, but as anchors into a wider gallery of conceptual categories, and the joint reception of semantic and encyclopaedic meaning (Houben 2003, Patton 2008).

The current project is therefore an attempt to triangulate (or rather pentangulate) the literary material of Sanskrit *kāvya* belles lettres and the lexicographic information from the *kośa-s* against the methods of *kāvya-mīmāṃsā* (poetology-philology), those of cognitive lexical semantics, and corpus linguistics.

The secondary, incidental objective of the project is to describe the architecture of the Sanskrit lexicons, as reflecting the mental organization of the

⁵ Stolova (2015) covers the sweep from Latin to Romance languages, van DeWalle's (1993) project uses a contemporary model of pragmatics to study politeness in Classical Sanskrit, and Yu's research covers old Chinese (2008)

concepts underlying the lexemes that are arrayed in the kośa. patterns The Sanskrit lexicons reflect an onomasiological design that makes for richer and detailed lexical-semantic access, and represent a certain model of polysemy, synonymy and near-synonymy that is most instructive.

There are a few recent studies in the former vein – Trynkowska’s (2013) analysis of the KINGDOM IS A BODY metaphor in Māgha’s mahākāvya Śisupālavadha, Covill’s (2009) study of the metaphorical *topoi* in the Saundarananda of Aśvaghoṣa and Joanna Jurewicz’s (2004,2008,2014) extensive work on Conceptual Metaphors in the Ṛgveda. While such explorations are welcome, and enrich Sanskrit Studies as well as Cognitive Linguistics; they are not concerned with semantic change. The current project aims to study semantic behaviour over time, and such a study cannot limit itself by the choice of text or conceptual metaphor; albeit it restricts itself to the study of a single semantic field [Lehrer,1985]. By concentrating on a particular semantic field – that of sensory adjectives in this case, the investigation will be able to detail the semantic-conceptual histories of some sensory lexemes, call attention to any patterns of meaning extension, and also assess the principles of semantic regularities related to the sensorium proposed in studies such as Williams

(1975) and Viberg (1983). That leads us to one set/suite of questions that this thesis seeks to address – How are the senses presented in Sanskrit? What is the nature of semantic versatility demonstrated by sensory terms? Does the polysemy of sensory terms in Sanskrit conform to the hierarchy suggested by Williams (1975) or the metaphorical mappings discussed by Sweetser(1990)⁶? What is the semiotic constellation occupied by the sensorium in the Sanskrit literary universe? And, the larger question of which my thesis questions are sub-questions – what is the nature of polysemy in Sanskrit, and what are the various levels at which it operates?

In this thesis, I will discuss the Cognitive Linguistic approach to polysemy, by projecting it to the field of lexical semantics. I suggest that the philological method which considers literary-poetic, meta-literary or poetological and (traditional) lexicographic material is most illuminating to understanding word meanings. It shifts the balance of meaning studies from a word-centric semasiological approach, to an onomasiological one that is motivated by the study of the cultural concepts that underlying the word and therefore situate and determine its semantic space.

⁶Sweetser, E., 1990. From etymology to pragmatics: The mind-body metaphor in semantic structure and semantic change. p 37-38

The study involves a detailed analyses of attestations of a colour adjective *in situ*, as it occurs in its literary and linguistic context, to track the diachronic and synchronic progression of the semantics of each term. In light of the semantic and literary-rhetorical conventions of Sanskrit, these will then be identified as literal or metaphorical. Further, the statistical distribution of distinct connotations over each phase of classical Sanskrit Literature – the epic, classical and late periods, are noted. This allows us to get a three dimensional account of the terms semantic career.

Chapter 2. Sanskrit Semantics and Cognitive Linguistics

Chapter 2. Sanskrit Semantics and Cognitive Linguistics

"The forms of the simplest and severest kinds of art, the synoptic kind of art that we call "primitive," are the natural language of all traditional philosophy; and it is for this very reason that Plato's dialectic makes continual use of figures of speech, which are really figures of thought."

[Ananda K.Coomaraswamy, Figures of speech or Figures of Thought]

*tad'idam citram viśvam
brahma-jñānād'iv'opamā- jñānād |
jñātam bhavatīty'ādau
nirūpyate nikhila-bheda-sahitā sā ||*

As this entire diverse world is known
Through the knowledge of *Brahman*,
so is the poetic universe grasped
through the knowledge of *upamā*.
Hence, it is detailed,
with all its varieties,
Right at the beginning.

[Appayya Dīkṣita, Citra mīmāṃsā I.3]

2.0. The importance of *upamā*

The above verse from Appaya Dīkṣita, is strongly reminiscent of the Venerable Bede's view on metaphor as 'a genus of which all the other tropes are species'.

While there is no gainsaying the importance of tropes of similitude in the premodern intellectual cultures of Sanskrit and Greek, as well as current

paradigms such as that of cognitive semantics; it is important that we note the differences in the use of these devices in the Sanskrit and the cognitivist traditions.

Notions of similarity and analogy are of central importance in the Sanskrit philosophical and literary traditions. And it is often seen that similar (and occasionally the same) terms are used to signify these concepts.

2.1. The anatomy of a metaphor

To meaningfully compare the treatment of metaphor (and other allied devices) in cognitive semantics and the Sanskrit poetological tradition, it is useful to start with the traditional understanding of the constituents of metaphor in the two approaches. Since the simile (*upamā*) is taken as the fundamental device of metaphorisation [see epigraph verse], it is discussed here, as a prototype of all metaphor-like devices.

Typically an *upamā* is said to consist of four elements, the subject of comparison (*upameya*), the object of comparison (*upamāna*)⁷, the field of

7I.A. Richards refers to the *upamāna* and *upameya* as tenor and vehicle respectively; Lakoff and the Cognitive Linguists use the terms target domain and source domain respectively. An older terminology

similitude (differently called the common ground, *tertium comparitionis*, *sādhāraṇa dharma*, *upamāna dharma*) and a linking particle that establishes the act of comparison (*upamā-vācaka*)⁸. When the latter is dropped, the trope is termed metaphor (*rūpaka*) instead of simile (*upamā*). This notion of the *upamā* appears to tally with the ‘metaphor of three terms’ in Aristotle’s four-fold classification of metaphors [Eco 1984: 92-93]. If we consider a stock example from Sanskrit literature –

‘kamalam iva sundaram mukham’

The face (is) pretty as a lotus

Here *kamalam* is the *upamāna* [tenor, source domain], *iva* is the *upamā-vācaka* particle, *sundaram* is the *sādhāraṇa-dharma* (common ground) and *mukham* is the *upameya* (vehicle or target domain). However upon reflection, it is clear that all similes aren’t equal; and the correspondences between the parts of a metaphor too, will come in question.

is that of the *primum comparandum* and the *secundum comparatum*.

⁸Upamā-vācaka-s include indeclineables such as (*san*)*nibha*, *sankāśa*, *upama*, *iva*, *samāna* in Sanskrit, and terms such as ‘like’, ‘as’ and verbs such as ‘resemble’ in English.

The *upamā* or simile is considered to be the most fundamental trope of establishing likeness. It finds mention in the early sources including the *Maitrayāṇī upaniṣad*, Pāṇini, Patañjali, Yāska and Bharata, while some sources locate it even in the *Ṛg Veda* [S.K.De 1948, Sowani 1920]. However, these early sources do not make a distinction between the metaphorising device of *upamā* and the analogizing device of *upamāna*. The latter is treated as a *pramāṇa* – a valid episteme by the Naiyāyika-s and Mīmāṃsaka-s.

If we examine our example of the ‘face pretty as a lotus’, it is possible to problematise the common property – beauty. Surely a face is not beautiful in the same way that a face is beautiful. The conventional criteria for beauty in a lotus may be freshness or colour, while there are other aesthetic considerations that make a face beautiful such as symmetry and the mutual positioning of the various parts of the face. Here we may recollect the rhetorician Vāmana, who says that similitude is imputed [āropita]⁹. Vāmana’s interpretation of the present simile would be to say that the *upamā* is not a comparison of the face to the lotus, since they don’t have any ‘real’ common

⁹*Upamānenopameyasya guṇasāmyāttattvāropo rūpakam // Kāvyaśāhikārasūtravṛtti 4,3.6 /*

property, but is a result of the metaphorical similarity we posit between the beauty of a face and the beauty of a lotus (Bhattacharya 1982: p 23). Now this and such examples, properly belong to Aristotle's metaphor by analogy [also called the metaphor of four terms], wherein an analogy is drawn between a feature x of one domain A and a feature y of another domain B.

Consider the following example of a Sanskrit metaphor - *nāga-veṇī* – one whose braid is like a snake. Now this is a true example of an Aristotelian three-term metaphor, wherein the braid of hair and the snake share the same features such as being long and black and so on. In my view, such examples of three pointed metaphors have a certain literality, and are limited in their discursive potential unlike the four-term metaphors. All the primary metaphors identified in the Lakovian tradition of Conceptual metaphor theory are bound to be four-term metaphors, or metaphors-by-analogy.

The discussion of the Sanskrit treatment of metaphors and kindred devices vis-à-vis the conceptual metaphors is only possible if we clarify whether they are similar processes, and if they perform similar functions. As discussed in further sections, the meaning-making capacity of effective

metaphors is because of the versatility of the metaphorical blend and the presence of a large number of natural correspondences between the two domains. A metaphorical blend will be ineffectual in two circumstances – in the case of a three-term metaphor, wherein there is only a correspondence of one feature, and therefore the correspondence between the two domains is limited to that trait, as seen in the example of *nāga-veṇī*; or in the instances of a forced metaphor, wherein the correspondences are contrived and strained.

2.2. Upamā and Upamāna – or what is metaphor an analogy for?

As stated earlier, the term *upamāna* has two distinct connotations – *upamāna* as a constituent of the simile is the source domain or the tenor, and *upamāna* is also a term for an analogical *pramāṇa* (episteme) recognized by the Naiyāyika-s and Mīmāmsaka-s. From Vātsyāyana's commentary on the Nyāya sūtra-s, it is known that the naiyāyika-s take the very statement of a similitude [say between the familiar cow and a hitherto unseen creature called a *gavaya*] to be an *upamāna*¹⁰, while the Mimāmsaka-s hold that it is the

¹⁰*upamānaṃ sāmīpyajñānaṃ, yathā gaur evaṃ gavaya iti* (Nyaya-Tarkatirtha 1936: p 90)

moment of recognition of the likeness between a new unfamiliar object (*gavaya*) with the well-known object (cow)¹¹.

It is evident that at a some disciplines have taken a liberal interpretation of *upamā* and *upamāna* as being congeneric devices, as we can see from Abhinavagupta's use of the stock example of the latter to explain the former. In Bharata's discussion of *lakṣaṇa*-s (figures of speech) – *upamā* is the first, foiled by *rūpaka* - metaphor [NS – XVI.42 – *yat' kiñcit kāvyabandheṣu sādṛśyen'opamīyate*] and it is significant that Abhinavaguptācārya in his commentary on this device, cites the standard example used in the discussion of the *pramāṇā upamāna* – *kāvyabandheṣu kāvya-lakṣaṇeṣu satsu ity'anena gaur'iva gavaya iti nāyam alaṃkāra iti darśitam* (p 308).

In another place Abhinavagupta expatiates on an important two-fold function of the metaphorical or secondary level of semantic signification, quoting his *Upādhyāya*¹² [*upādhyāya-matan'tu lakṣaṇabalāt alaṃkāraṇāṃ vaicitryam*

11This is a classical exemplar for *upamāna* – The forester describes a wild creature known as *gavaya* as being similar to the cow. This analogy allows the listener to identify a *gavaya* correctly when she encounters it for the first time in the woods.

12Upādhyāya refers to Bhaṭṭa Tauta, the author of the now lost *Kāvya-kautuka*.

āgacchatī]; where *vaicitrya* refers to one hand to variegated-ness, multivalence or polysemy, and on the other to attractiveness. Thus Abhinava (inadvertently) offers an important historical corrective to a long held dominant view on the nature of metaphor as being a prettifying device. The other function of a metaphorical device – as an engine generating novel semantic content is hereby established in the *kāvya* tradition.

It is therefore possible, even desirable, to distinguish between the *upamā*, which is most often a three-term Aristotelian metaphor and the *upamāna* – which is an analogizing trope – a four-termed metaphor. The former usually presupposes a knowledge of both source and target domains, and also of the common property shared by them. The *upamāna*, on the other hand, is a device that uses one familiar domain to illuminate a second, lesser known domain. This knowledge is brought about by positing an analogy or a correspondence between the two.

Elsewhere (Keerthi and Raghavan forthcoming) I have argued for how the most apposite cognate of the Aristotelian *and* the Lakovian Metaphor is neither the *upamā*, nor *upamāna*, nor even *rūpaka*; but the semantic mode (*vr̥tti*)

called *lakṣaṇā*. *Lakṣaṇā* is a feature of words, extensible to larger strings, and is the true equivalent for the metaphor, since it encompasses both the devices of metaphor (under *gauṇī*) and metonym (under *śuddhā*).

2.3. *Aupamyā* and CMT – conceptual blend or mixed metaphors?

From the previous discussion, it is clear that the conceptual metaphor is closer to the episteme *upamāna*, rather than rhetorical devices such as *upamā* (simile) or *rūpaka* (metaphor) in the Sanskrit poetological tradition. However there is still some ambiguity in juxtaposing the conceptual metaphor against either the Aristotelian or *Kāvya Mīmāṃsā* accounts of metaphor and analogy.

The function of metaphors in Sanskrit, and their discursive versatility and almost generative quality, with regard to semantic-pragmatic signification is noteworthy. Here the study of metaphorical expressions is better organized along the diverse use of the same source domains, as well as the same property of the source to illustrate a wide range of target domains, some of which are even mutually contrary.

The source domain in question is that of water drops on a lotus leaf.

Due to the waxy surface of the lotus leaf, water drops fallen on the leaf neither wet it, nor do they easily coalesce into a pool – instead the drops remain separate as droplets, and quiver around on the hydrophobic nature of the waxy lotus leaf. Now the same domain and the same feature(s) – water droplets on a lotus leaf, and their quality of not adhering to the leaf surface; are used as metaphors for two strikingly different phenomena, in a set of examples all taken from the Mahābhārata. On the one hand, they are used to describe the state of being detached and dispassionate –

The soul abides in the body like a water-drop on a lotus leaf ----- [A1]¹³

Sulabhā will inhere Janaka's body like a drop on a lotus leaf ----- [A2]¹⁴

The detached person is like a drop of water on a lotus leaf----- [A3]¹⁵

13devo yaḥ saṁsthitas tasminn abbindur iva puṣkare | kṣetrajñam taṁ vijānīhi nityam
tyāgajitātmakam || 03203031 ||

14yathā puṣkarapaṇastham jalam tatparṇasaṁsthitam | tiṣṭhaty aspr̥ṣatī tadvat tvayi vatsyāmi maithila
|| 12308173 ||

15jalabindur yathā lolaḥ padminī-patra-saṁsthiṭaḥ | evam evāpy'asaṁsaktah puruṣaḥ syān'na
samsāyaḥ || 14049012 ||

One the other hand, the same source domain is used to characterise things that are unstable, fickle or ephemeral -

Enmity won't last for long like a drop of water on a lotus leaf ----- [B1]¹⁶

Sin doesn't stick to a wise one, as water doesn't wet a lotus leaf.----- [B2]¹⁷

The mind is restless during meditation, like a droplet on a lotus leaf----- [B3]¹⁸

From the above illustrations, we see a case of the same source domain being used to indicate dispassion and detachment or instability or fickleness, by relying on almost the same features of the source. Examples A3 and B3 even have near-identical wording for the upamāna – *jala-bindur yathā lolaḥ* etc.

This case offers an interesting alternative method for the study of metaphorical and analogic devices, especially in the classical languages, which

16anyonyakṛtavairāṇām saṃvāsān mṛdutām gatam | naiva tiṣṭhati tad vairam puṣkarastham ivodakam ||12137037 ||

17nādharmāḥ śliṣyate prājñam āpaḥ puṣkaraparṇavat | aprājñam adhikam pāpam śliṣyate jatu kāṣṭhavat||12287007 ||

18jala-bindur yathā lolaḥ parṇasthaḥ sarvataś'calaḥ | evam evāsyā tac'cittam bhavati dhyānavartmani || ||12188012 ||

often rely on a well-known stock of imagery and metaphors, nonetheless deploy the metaphors for novel poetic and discursive purposes. This also goes against Bhadriraju Krishnamurthy's (1998) hasty observation that abstract-to-concrete mappings are characteristic of the Greater (literate, classical) tradition and concrete-to-abstract mappings being the hallmark of the folk or lesser (non-literate) traditions.

Sanskrit metaphors are much more complex, they encompass all combinations of 'abstract' and 'concrete' domains, with mappings that run in both directions. Yes, it would certainly be useful to track the frequency of each type, across texts and over a diachronic scale. This is a major possibility for studying the effective deployment of metaphors in different kinds of discursive and explicatory contexts. Such an analysis will only be possible through the use of temporally spread out text corpora, and by collecting data for a metaphor or metaphor-type across different cross-sections of the corpus.

2.4. Conceptual Metaphor Theory and Sanskrit Literature¹⁹

The idea of conceptual metaphors is crucial to the Cognitive Linguistics framework. A conceptual metaphor is claimed to be a tool of thought, not merely a literary embellishment. Further it is a general cognitive schema that is capable of instantiations through many actual examples in usage. A conceptual metaphor is of the form A IS B where A is typically a more abstract concept and B is a more concrete one. For example, LOVE IS A JOURNEY, LIFE IS A GAME etc. According to Kövecses, a conceptual metaphor is 'defined as understanding one conceptual domain in terms of another conceptual domain' (Kövecses, 2010:4) By "understands" it is meant that hearer is able to identify 'a set of systematic correspondences between the source and the target in the sense that constituent conceptual elements of B correspond to constituent elements of A.'(Kövecses, 2010: 7). He says that the term may be substituted by "construe" i.e one domain in construed through (a more concrete) domain

19 Parts of this section were presented in the International Conference on New Paradigms in Indian Linguistics held at the Indian Institute of Advanced Studies, Shimla in October-November 2017. Keerthi and Raghavan (forthcoming).

(or concept). The mappings between the two conceptual domains is typically unidirectional. To know a cognitive metaphor is then to know ‘... the systematic mappings between a source and a target.’ Linguistic metaphors on the other hand are ‘...are words or other linguistic expressions that come from the language or terminology of the more concrete conceptual domain (i.e., domain B).’ Thus, CMT holds that linguistic metaphors "make explicit" or manifest the conceptual metaphors (Kövecses, 2010: 7). Or, such metaphors provide the *conceptual basis* for the corresponding linguistic metaphors²⁰. For example, linguistic expressions like “Our love is two way street”, “We have progressed a lot in our relationship”, “Our meeting was an accident” are all based on the conceptual metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY.

Here is an example from Sanskrit to further illustrate the idea of the conceptual metaphor. Consider the following passage from the *Praśnopaniṣad*

tvaṁ hi naḥ pitā yo’smākaṁ vidyāyāḥ param pāraṁ tārayiṣyasi iti |

“Thou art our father, who will take us across the other shore of learning.”

20‘[a conceptual metaphor] underlies conceptually all the metaphorical expressions listed underneath it.’ (Kövecses, 2010:4)

This passage ‘*vidyāyāḥ...pāram tārāyīṣyasī*’ can be taken to illustrate the conceptual metaphor ‘KNOWLEDGE IS A LARGE WATER BODY’. This conceptual metaphor is well represented by several examples in Sanskrit and other Indian languages – the below expressions are all substantiations of the same Conceptual Metaphor.

nadīṣṇa (lit. immersed in a river; fig. Erudite)

niśnāta (lit. immersed/steeped; fig. Expert)

pāraṅgataḥ (lit. one who has waded across; fig. expert/scholar),

avagāḍha (lit. immersed/bather; fig. knowledgeable)

gabhīra pāṅḍitya, (lit. deep scholarship) and

ananta-pāram kila śabda-śāstram (Pañcatantra 1.5)

‘The science of grammar is infinitely (hard to) cross’

It is probable that the word *snātaka*²¹, meaning graduate is also connected to this conceptual metaphor KNOWLEDGE IS A LARGE WATER BODY, rather than being connected to the ritual bath taken by a scholar at the end of his period of study.

According to CMT, it is not only the existing similarities that are highlighted by blending the source and target domains, but the mapping of the source is said to structure the target domain anew. The theory as given by Lakoff and Johnson focuses on cross-domain mapping, but there are alternate models that however share a theoretical common ground.²² As can be seen from Macha(2016) and Myer's (1996) criticisms of CMT, this model pays short shrift to convention, and subjects novel and conventional-driven metaphors to the same kind of abstraction. Conventional metaphorical motifs are not the same as frozen expressions such as idioms and 'dead metaphors'. Furthermore, metaphorical motifs that rely on the strength of convention are

²¹I am grateful to Ramakrishna Pejathaya for pointing me to some of these examples.

²²For a detailed account of four major models of Conceptual Metaphor, see Steen (2008) 48-55.

not required to lay claim to an experiential basis, which is another limitation of the CMT.

2.5. Metaphor studies in South Asian philology – a review of the literature

This section discusses the nature of previous literature that has studied metaphorical constructions in Sanskrit literature. The study of metaphor in Sanskrit can be roughly divided up into three major stages. The first stage saw the early Orientalists recommending and initiating inventories of the various kinds of figurative language in the Sanskrit, Prakrit and Pali canon [Emeneau 1944, Rhys-Davids 1906]. This was an effort towards understanding the premodern poetic *weltanschauung* as a whole, or the poetic imaginaire as Patton (1985) puts it. Jan Gonda's (1949) study is an interesting example from this stage that did not catalogue similes but rather studied the various discursive and rhetorical functions it was used for. However, the study operated with a rigid definition of simile and only analysed similes with the *upamā-vācaka* intact, leaving out metaphors, metonyms and other allied figures.

The next stage is marked by a theory-naïve compilation of metaphor data or simile data, often from a single text – this stage is marked by a modest number of studies that usually restricted themselves to a single text or author, made elaborate lists of similes and metaphors, and studied the inter-textual borrowings of tropes. Research of this kind includes the studies on imagery in the Rāmāyaṇa by Brockington (1977), Iyer (2003) and Pathak (1968); and Ram Karan Sharma (1964/1988) and Sudhishankar Bhattacharya's (1971) books on the Mahābhārata. Such studies, while very useful, have often ignoring the presence of complex metaphors or sustained metaphors that recur in the text. These studies constitute a positive step towards a detailed cataloguing of imagery in each text or author. However, there can't be seen any attempt to identify persistent metaphorical motifs in individual treatises or writers, rather literary appreciation of the aptness of certain imagery, or occasionally the identification of some intertextual borrowings of a metaphorical motif. A logical next step would be a systematic metaphorology – a statistically conscious compilation of the imagery of important sources such as the Upaniṣad-s, Rāmāyaṇa and Mahābhārata, the early sūtra and smṛti literature, with suitable

encoding of the metaphors employed, with identification of the source and target domains, and other relevant features such as extended or complex metaphor.

The third stage is informed by more recent theoretical developments, and demonstrates rigor and sensitivity in the identification of metaphor and its allied tropes. Jurewicz's several studies on the Ṛg Veda (2004, 2008, 2014) analyse the recurring use of common target domains, to identify the metaphorical usage of expressions such as cow or bull, to highlight different target domains. This is a good solution to the limitation of CMT observed by M.W.Myers(1995) – CMT aims to explain metaphorical expressions on the strength of *ad hoc* 'Conceptual Metaphors' fashioned by the researcher, rather than identifying and interpreting them on the grounds of linguistic and literary traditions that already exist. As he succinctly puts it, "conventional metaphors are grounded in common usage i.e., convention not invention". Myers goes on to analyse the metaphorical language and imagery of certain texts of Advaita Vedanta and the Vedic corpus itself, to understand the conceptual 'world-view' represented therein.

Trynkowska's (2013) study of the *Śiśupālavadhā* using a Lakoff-type metaphor, Jackmuth's (2002) analysis of the *Kumārasambhava* using Weinrich's model of semantic distance, Coville's (2009) investigation of a few recurrent conceptual metaphors in Āśvaghoṣa's poem *Saundarananda*, Kragh's study of the *hamsa* (goose) imagery in reference to the Buddha in Candrakīrti's texts and McMahon's (2013) researches of metaphors of vision for wisdom in other Buddhist literature using the cognitive linguistics paradigm are illustrations of recent work that has sought to abstract out the conceptual metaphors undergirding the language and imagery of the texts they study.

These studies aiming to identify recurrent metaphorical frames in individual texts are noteworthy, and mark a significant incursion of the cognitivist approach to humanities into the South Asian philological studies. However, they still resemble the method employed by Lakoff and Johnson in the early years – idiosyncratic data collected from popular media or solicited through correspondence. The next sections discuss this lacuna in certain approaches to the study of metaphorical language.

2.6. Metaphor Studies and Text Corpora

The availability of a large corpus of annotated and searchable e-texts has made it possible to collect and analyse metaphor data from the literary canon, in a much more systematic and thorough manner. We are now better positioned to map and compute the recurrence of particular metaphorical motifs within the same text as well as across texts and authors. Empirical information regarding temporal trends, frequency, cross-linguistic influences can be collected, analysed and studied with greater ease. Further, studies of the sort exemplified in section 2.2, wherein the multifarious configurations of the same source domain are examined can be done on a larger scale, and across texts.

Also, the use of metaphorical significations and its relation to polysemy, semantic change and meaning extension are facilitated by the availability of these text repositories, along with simple tools such as *grep* that can mine these texts with great efficiency. However, while these texts are amenable for the identification of individual lexemes, it is still a question if it will be possible

to automate the identification of metaphor and kindred imagery. As we (Keerthi and Raghavan, forthcoming) have suggested, the first step towards extracting metaphors from larger text corpora will entail a satisfactory algorithm for the 'identification problem'. Hitherto, groups focusing on literary metaphor (as opposed to the Lakovian conceptual metaphor) have come up with adequate assays for the identification of conventional metaphors. The CMT framework has dealt with novel metaphors by clustering together allied figurative expressions under a hypothetical conceptual metaphor. However a model or theory that is equally adept in the identification of novel as well as conventional metaphors is yet to be seen.

Alice Deignan (2005) makes a strong case for the utilisation of corpus linguistics as an effective tool in the many branches of Metaphor studies, and Arppe et al (2010) discuss the need for and the pitfalls in the use of the corpus in Cognitive linguistics. One of the fundamental challenges connected to the use of the corpus in Metaphor studies, is the identification problem. While the search for individual lexemes or pairs or strings of lexemes can be located by

applying simple search programmes, identifying the 'literal' and 'metaphorical' instances has to be done by hand, i.e. by inspection.

2.7. Summary

In this chapter, the centrality of the simile-metaphor-metonym family in Sanskrit literature was discussed in its various forms such as the tropes *upamā* (simile), *rūpaka* (metaphor) and *upamāna* (analogy) and the semantic mode *lakṣaṇā* (non-literal/ figurative sense). As Appayya Dīkṣita claims, all tropes can be seen as modifications of the simile/metaphor which is based on similitude. The traditional description of metaphor in Sanskrit semantic theories does not have the rigid unidirectional mapping from concrete to abstract described in the Lakovian theory of metaphor²³. This was illustrated using the metaphorical motif of 'WATER DROPLET ON LOTUS LEAF', which is used as a source domain to index the mutually contrasting qualities of transience, mundane existence and fickleness on the one hand and austerity, renunciation and dispassionateness on the other.

²³This is described as the invariance principle. (Lakoff 1990: p 39-41)

A short description of the technical features of a metaphor in the *kāvyaśāstra* and Conceptual Metaphor theory were discussed. The latter was illustrated using extant Sanskrit examples for a conceptual metaphor KNOWLEDGE IS A LARGE WATER BODY. The limitations of the CMT in explaining conventional metaphors was discussed; followed by an audit of studies of imagery in Sanskrit literature using the philological-literary framework as well as studies analysing figurative language in Sanskrit from the Cognitive Linguistic approach was undertaken. The last section speaks about the challenges of identifying metaphor even if one has a large electronic text corpus at hand.

Chapter 3. Methods and Data

Chapter 3. Methods and Data

3.0. Corpus Linguistics and Cognitive Linguistics

The cognitive linguistics programme in its earliest phase (in the 1970s) differed markedly from other prevalent approaches in linguistic studies— the subject matters chosen for study was seen as being peripheral to ‘proper’ linguistic investigations – meaning, figurative language and the like. There was also a considerable difference in the theoretical premises of the Cognitive Linguistics (CL) programme from those of the other dominant approaches. An enduring feature of this enterprise has been the usage-centric approach, which has valued the collection and analysis of linguistic data from natural usage contexts, rather than elicited responses. Despite the inclusiveness towards the creative and non-syntactic features of language, the methods used by cognitive linguists continued to be those used by other traditional [read structuralist and generative] linguists. The first stage saw researchers collecting somewhat arbitrary data - instances of metaphorical language compiled from

introspective reflection, and from correspondences [See Lakoff and Johnson 2003, Lakoff 1987] ; all of which were analysed qualitatively.

The next stage saw the incursion of psycholinguistic experimental paradigms to address CL research questions. The work of scholars such as Gibbs (1994) and Eleanor Rosch was instrumental in this movement. The incorporation of such empirical methods into CL garnered great popularity, and CL research using psycholinguistic methods is featured prominently in CL conferences, and such work was published in journals dedicated to psychology and cognitive science.

Given the usage-based conception of language favoured by Cognitive Linguistics, one would expect that it take to corpus-based approaches with enthusiasm. While scholars such as Geeraerts took to it early on, [lexicographers are adequately primed for corpus-based work], corpus-based approaches have been slow in making inroads into CL research (Gries 2006: p3).

For a truly usage-based model of language, it is imperative that we collect empirical data, based on a sampling methodology, rather than relying on idiosyncratic data collected by observations. Phenomena such as polysemy and entrenchment of

meaning can only be meaningfully studied by observing the synchronic and diachronic expanse of semantic behaviour of a term.

Thus, there is strange tension in the discipline of Cognitive Linguistics –on the one hand it takes pride in being based on usage, in collecting and analysing natural linguistic examples, as opposed to other (read structuralist and generativist) paradigms that separate the study of *langue* from *parole*; on the other hand it has for a long time been reluctant to test its theoretical claims by taking a quantitatively grounded and corpus-based approach. This could be due to the self-description of Cognitive Linguistics as a non-objectivist theory, and the use of corpora and statistics may be seen as giving an objective basis for linguistic knowledge (Grondelaers et al. 2007 p 149). However as Dylan Glynn (2014) argues, corpus-driven data collection in the is not a revolution but a natural extension of the Cognitive paradigm's natural inclination towards the study of polysemy and synonymy.

3.1. Corpus Cognitive Linguistics and Lexicography

Geeraerts (2010: 42-46) notes that 'current developments in lexical semantics constitute' in large part a 'return to the concerns of historical-philological semantics'.

Because of an engagement with the dynamic nature of meaning, and the various shades and nuances of semantic content; the lexicological approach of classicists has a happy overlap with cognitive approaches to semantic change.

While machine-readable text corpora have been used by linguists for a few decades now, they have been put to other use, to study stylistics, grammar discourse analysis, sociolinguistics etc. However the corpus presents an invaluable resource for the lexicographer to offer semantic details backed by observational data in a way that was not possible, or at least was not as easy earlier. However it must be noted that while the first two steps of data collection and statistical analyses of collocations can be automated, the final and most crucial step in corpus-based lexicography is the interpretation of the data. And this step requires a conscious human agent. It is this step that sets apart Corpus Linguistics from Computational Linguistics (Teubert 2001: p128-129). However, to determine features such as salience, the statistical data is indispensable.

3.2. Metaphor, Figurative Language and the Corpus

In the case of conventional metaphors and idioms, the corpus can be a great aid, as it is possible to identify the common collocates of a word in its literal and figurative senses. For instance, occurrences of the lexeme 'green' in the context of 'jealousy' or 'envy' can be easily tagged as an idiomatic (and thereby figurative) usage. Gill Phillip (2011: p 29-33) points to the rich range of associative meanings colour terms have, and how these can be understood by their collocations. He suggests the use of corpora to study the figurative uses of colour terms (and by extension of any class of lexemes) as this will truly reflect language as seen in usage, rather than semantic analyses based on etymologies, and will incorporate more of the 'bigger picture' - the context into the analysis, by taking into consideration collocations.

3.3. Limitations of the Corpus

Certain sociolinguistic concerns will naturally rise over a partial corpus (and the corpus used in this thesis is most certainly selective). What does the selection

'represent'? Does the register of language presented in metrically bound, belletristic poems and plays at all reflect the social exchanges of any people? Was the Sanskrit language spoken at all? And so on.

Just as J.J. Lowe (2015 p 3) argues for the Ṛgveda, the texts in my selection too (*Rāmāyaṇa* or *Buddhacarita* or *Śākuntala*) may not be the 'natural spoken register' of any people, in any period. Nonetheless, each of these texts represents *some* register – written or spoken, conversational or literary, of *some* populace. The texts of Kālidāsa in the second slot represent a classical stage – a period when Sanskrit was probably used in the least stylised, most natural form. The prose romances of Bāṇa and the *mahākāvya*-s of Māgha and Śrīharṣa are taken to represent a later, more ornate style that is often described as 'court poetry.' So, it must be worthwhile to study and document the lexical-semantic modifications that must have taken place over the three phases.

As this thesis studies Sanskrit - a classical language, there are a few limitations regarding access to, and the nature of the data used here. As is well known, Sanskrit is marked by a rich and varied body of literature spanning time, region, genre and discipline. And it is impracticable for the researcher to aim for any

kind of exhaustive coverage. Therefore, she is forced to limit her source texts to a particular period, genre or domain. This was particularly true in the past, when semantic data had to be collected manually, by reading through the texts and preparing index card with entries for each occurrence of a lemma in a text, along with its collocation and a tentative translation. The large scale efforts in Sanskrit lexicography such as those of Böhtlingk and Roth²⁴, Radhakanta Deva Bahadur²⁵ and the editors of the Encyclopedic Dictionary of Sanskrit at the Deccan College²⁶, must have all relied on such massive, labour-intensive techniques to collect lexical-semantic information. A detailed account of Sanskrit Lexicographic efforts in the last two centuries can be found in Karambelkar (2014).

While this thesis is not part of any such comprehensive dictionary project, it aims to suggest innovative ways of enriching the Sanskrit lexical entries by utilizing

24The bilingual Sanskrit-German dictionary - *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*, popularly known as the St. Petersburg Dictionary (7 volumes), was compiled by Otto von Bohtlingk and Rudolf Roth, and was released in instalments between 1853 and 1875.

25The Śabda-kalpadruma of Rādhākānta Deva Bahadur is a monolingual Sanskrit dictionary with copious citations, which are however handicapped by not having adequate references traceable to their primary sources. Prodigious in dimensions [7 +1 volumes], and prepared over 40 years (1822-1858); it was freely utilized greatly by as a resource by editors of other bilingual Sanskrit dictionaries.

26The 'Encyclopedic Dictionary of Sanskrit on Historical Principles' is an ongoing lexicographic project of the Deccan College Pune, started in 1976. Utilizing 1500 texts, and a scriptorium of 100,00,000 index cards, it promises to be one of the largest such efforts for any classical language.

insights from Cognitive theories as well as from Sanskrit poetology. The focus here is on a subset of visual adjectives, and the attempt is to use insights from traditional kośa lexicon entries, as well as from ideas from the cognitive semantics approach – systematic polysemy, the place of metaphor in lexical semantics to explicate the semantic behaviour of Sanskrit colour adjectives. Hence, a restricted selection of texts has been chosen.

3.4. Text Corpus and Periodisation

The texts selected have been roughly classified into three categories, following prevalent mores of Sanskrit literary history. The first (epic) phase, is represented by the Rāmāyaṇā, the Mahābhārata and Aśvaghōṣa's Buddhacarita. The second (classical) phase has the kāvya-s and nāṭaka-s of Kālidāsa, the Śīsupālavadhā of Māgha and Bāṇa's prose kāvya – the Kādambarī.

Phase	Texts considered
Epic 500 BCE - 200 CE	Rāmāyaṇa, Mahābhārata, Aśvaghōṣa - Saundarananda and Buddhacarita
Classical 250 CE – 700 CE	Kālidāsa – Kumārasaṃbhava, Raghuvamśa, Abhijñānaśākuntala, Meghadūta Bāṇa – Harṣacarita and Kādambari, Māgha - Śīsupālavadha
Late 800 CE – 1200 CE	Śrīharṣa – Naiṣadha, Jayadeva - Gītagovinda

Table 3.1. Periodisation of Selected Sanskrit Texts

While the searchable e-texts make it very convenient to locate instances of the occurrence of a lexeme, the texts are not always free of error, and the correct text is ascertained by using the *grep* search results as a guide to locating the usage instances from a reliable edition of the text.

3.5. Sources for Sanskrit e-texts – Text and Lexical Corpora

Sanskrit textual scholarship has benefited a great deal from the proliferation of machine-readable electronic texts (e-texts)²⁷ as part of the TEI (Text Encoding Initiative). Some of the major resources used for the current project are listed here.

A large number of instances were also noted from personal readings.

GRETEL- Göttingen Register of Electronic Texts in Indian Languages²⁸, is an important source with several texts across various genres. The Digital Corpus of Sanskrit²⁹ (**DCS**) maintained and developed by Oliver Hellwig is another searchable collection of lemmatized Sanskrit texts. It is an invaluable resource for lexical, morphological and semantic data. Other notable repositories include the **Pandanus**³⁰ collection of Sanskrit texts maintained by the Charles University, Prague and the **Muktabodha** Indological Text Collection³¹. The former includes uncommon kāvya-s such as the Jānakīharana of Kumāradāsa and the immense anthology – the

27For non-exhaustive reviews of Sanskrit e-corpora and online resources, see Kulkarni 2016 and Duda 2011.

28http://www.sub.uni-goettingen.de/ebene_1/fiindolo/gretel.htm

29 <http://kjc-sv013.kjc.uni-heidelberg.de/dcs/>

30<http://iu.ff.cuni.cz/pandanus/electronictexts/>

31 http://muktalib5.org/digital_library_secure_entry.htm

Mahāsubhāṣitasāṅgraha. The latter includes a large number of tantra and āgama texts.

3.6. The Philological Element

Semantic studies in Sanskrit have been of two kinds – the first is the lexicographer’s approach, which involves collecting attestations from as wide a range of texts of different genres, and carefully unraveling the semantic complexity of a term. The outcome of such studies is seen in the entries of the various monolingual and bilingual dictionaries of Sanskrit.

The former assumes the timeless monolith of Sanskrit, and entails a two-dimensional inventory of all and any senses in which a lexeme is attested from reliable sources. Such an approach doesn’t make distinctions of variation in salience or diachronic trends. It can be said that the premodern lexicographers such as Yāska (author of the Nighaṅṭu) Amarasimha (author of the Amarakośa/ Nāmalingānuśasanam) belong to this category, as do the nineteenth century lexicographers Monier-Williams or Radhakantadeb Bahadur.

The second kind, practiced by the philologist is an exercise in mapping the contours and connotations of a term across texts, disciplinary contexts and time. Examples of this kind of analysis include Satyavrat Shastri's (1970, 1977) detailed discussions of near-synonyms in Sanskrit, or Patrick Olivelle's fine-grained biographies of terms such as *sam̐nyāsa* (Olivelle, 1981) *ānanda* (1997) or *dharma* (2004).

3.7. Summary

This chapter discussed the methods and resources used in Corpus Linguistics, along with the advantages and challenges of applying it to a classical language such as Sanskrit. There is great promise in the application of Corpus studies to identify figurative language as well. It merits remembering that any available corpus of Sanskrit will be incomplete, and can not be 'representative' of any period or community's idiolect or register. Further, while machine-searchable corpora can be used to compile attestations and collocations, the all-important role of interpreting the lexemes in the context still lies with the researcher.

CHAPTER 4. The adjective in Sanskrit

CHAPTER 4. The adjective in Sanskrit

4.0. Introduction

The adjective has a crepuscular existence in Sanskrit. It is neither recognized as a part of speech by the Vedic hermeneut Yāska in his four-fold classification of *nāma*, *ākhyāta*, *upasarga* and *nipāta*; nor in Pāṇinī's more minimalist classification of words into *subanta*-s (words with case terminations) and *tiṅanta*-s (words with conjugation/verb terminations). According to Pāṇinī, particles (*nipāta*), pronouns (*sarvanāma*) adjectives (*guṇavacana*) and adverbs (*kriyāviśeṣaṇā*) all fit into the category of nominal stems (*nāman* or *prātipadika*). This is purely a syntactic classification, ignoring any semantic aspects of these many classes.

It is worthwhile to note that among the mīmāṃsaka-s, Jaimini's classification resembles that of Pāṇinī, but Śābara's elucidation of *nāman* includes words that name objects (*dravya*) and words that name qualities (*guṇa*)³². This classification is continued by Bhartṛhari, who groups pronouns and adjectives under “nouns” (*nāman*). As Joshi (1966: p 4) observes, adjectives, adverbs and pronouns are not

³²*tāni nāmāni te dravyaguṇaśabdāḥ* | Śābara Bhāṣya p. 387

assigned separate status as separate “parts of speech” because they are inflected like nouns. In Sanskrit, as in Greek, the uninflected adjective is identical to an uninflected substantive on purely grammatical grounds (Speyer 1886: p 179).

It is not a problem unique to Sanskrit, that the category "adjective" doesn't have syntactic or even functional consistency, and includes several different types of word classes. The two functions of modification (qualification) and predication index two mutually exclusives features of adjectives as a category – modifying adjectives tend to behave like nouns, and predicating adjectives tend to behave like verbs. As Bhat (1994: p 6) notes, Sanskrit doesn't demonstrate any morphosyntactic distinction between adjectives and nouns. However, there are clues given in the grammatical tradition to distinguish the use of a lexeme as a noun and an adjective.

4.1. Adjective and *Viśeṣaṇa* – a nomenclatural clarification

The various terms used to refer to adjectives in the Pāṇinian grammatical tradition - *guṇavacana*, *prakāravacana*, *bhāṣitapuṃska* and *viśeṣaṇa* are discussed in Pataskar (2006), of which *viśeṣaṇa* and *guṇavacana/guṇavācaka* are of the most interest to us. While all the features of the pair of allied categories *viśeṣaṇa-viśeṣya* do not

exactly map on to the terms qualifier-qualificand or adjective-substantive; they are satisfactory approximations. One difference is that the category *viśeṣaṇa* is very wide and can accommodate several parts of speech within itself. In this thesis, the term adjective is used to signify the *guṇavacana* type of *viśeṣaṇa*, and the terms substantive and qualificand are both used for the *viśeṣya*. All our examples of colour (and other visual) adjectives fit well within the remit of *guṇavacana* or *viśeṣaṇa*.

4.2. The two lives of a Sanskrit colour term – universal and adjective

Two uses of a colour term are described in the Sanskrit lexicon *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsanam*³³ – one wherein the monolexemic term refers to the colour as a category, it connotes the colour-space(s) of redness or yellowness, as the case may be. According to Amarasimha '*guṇāḥ śuklādayaḥ puṃsi*' colour terms such as *śukla* (white) take the masculine gender while signifying this generalised category, a colour universal.

The second use for a colour term is as an adjective, wherein the colour term is used as a qualifier for another object. In such cases, colour adjectives follow the

33The last hemistich of the dhīvarga, first kāṇḍa: *guṇe śuklādayaḥ puṃsi guṇiṅgāstu tadvati* (Nāmaliṅgānuśāsanam 1.5.351)

principle '*guṇilinge tu tadvati*' - the adjective takes the gender of its qualificand. To illustrate, the adjective *śukla* – will take the following forms in agreement with their respective qualificands *kambala*, *śāṭī* and *vastram*, which are in the masculine, feminine and neuter genders respectively. The below examples are from the Mahābhāṣya³⁴, Patañjali's 'great commentary' on the Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇinī.

śuklaḥ kambalaḥ (a white blanket)

śuklā śāṭī (a white saree)

śuklam vastram (a white garment)

In each of these examples, the adjective *śukla* modifies into the masculine *śuklaḥ*, the feminine *śuklā* and the neuter *śuklam* so as to be in concord with the gender of its qualificand. This is attested in the Mahābhāṣya (on 1.2.52) '*guṇavacanānām śabdānām' āśrayato liṅgavacanāni bhavanti*' - the gender of adjectives are determined by those of their qualificands³⁵.

³⁴Mahābhāṣya (on 1.2.52) *guṇavacanavat vā liṅgavacanāni bhaviṣyanti* .

tat yathā guṇavacanānām śabdānām āśrayataḥ liṅgavacanāni bhavanti : śuklam vastram , śuklā śāṭī śuklaḥ kambalaḥ , śuklau kambalau śuklāḥ kambalāḥ iti.(P_1,2.64.10) KA_1,245.6-247.16)

³⁵For more on concord between adjective and subjunctive, see Dash (1986) Chapter 2

4.3. Adjective and Adverb - engendering difference

Amarasiṃha's lexicon, the Nāmalingānuśāsanam has another hemistich concerning the gender of adjectives, this time in the context of lexemes connoting speed - '*klībe śīghrādyasattve syāt triṣveṣāṃ sattvagāmi yaś* (1.1.156)³⁶. This means 'terms such as *śīghra* take the neuter gender while used to qualify non-substances (such as actions); and can take either of the three genders (in agreement) with the substances they describe.'

This passage warrants explanation. *Sattva* here is a substance or individual object in an ontological sense. The term is coextensive with *vyakti* and *dravya*. A *sattva* is the substratum of actions (*kriyā*) and attributes (*guṇa*). Here are examples for the first and second rules respectively -

sā śīghram gacchati (She goes quickly)

śīghraḥ aśvaḥ (The horse is fleet)

nadyāḥ śīghrā gatiḥ (The river's current is swift)

³⁶From http://gretil.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretil/1_sanskrit/6_sastra/2_lex/amar1hu.htm accessed January 20 2018

śīghram vayah (Old age is quick)

As Bhanuji the commentator of the Amarakośa points out, in the first case śīghram is an adverb describing the act of going; and is hence unaffected by the gender of the agent. In this adverbial form, the term is an *avyaya* – an indeclinable, and the default gender for the adverbial form of such terms is the neuter. However, in the latter three examples, it is clear how the adjectival form is modified in agreement with the gender of the qualificand (Paṇaśīkar 1914 /1985).

4.4. Agreement and Sāmānādhikaraṇya

As seen from the previous two sections, in Sanskrit, an adjective-substantive pair can be identified based on the agreement of their grammatical gender, even if the two terms are not in immediate proximity. However, the agreement relation is not restricted to the gender of the adjective and the substantive. There has to be

agreement of gender (*liṅga*), number (*vacana*) and case (*vibhakti*) between the substantive and its adjective³⁷.

However the agreement of syntactic features is only a surface phenomenon. According to the Sanskrit grammatical tradition, the true mark of the *viśeṣaṇa-viśeṣya* relationship is the property of *sāmānādhikaraṇya* or co-referentiality. Consider the following example -

‘kṛśṇāḥ tilāḥ’

black [masc. plu. nom.] sesame seeds [masc. plu. nom.]

Here, both the words *kṛśṇāḥ* and *tilāḥ* are in agreement vis-a-vis gender, case and number, but how do they both have *sāmānādhikaraṇya*? While the two terms have different connotations, they both index the same locus, i.e. they have the same referent. One word signifies the blackness of the substance and the other word signifies the sesame-seed-ness, nonetheless, they both have the same referent, and hence have *sāmānādhikaraṇya*.

It is interesting how many premodern texts of *Vyākaraṇa* and *Mīmāṃsā* use examples of colour terms to illustrate concepts related to adjectives and substantives.

37 yalliṅgaṃ yadvacanaṃ yā ca vibhaktir’ viśeṣyasya |

talliṅgaṃ tadvacanaṃ saiva vibhaktir’viśeṣaṇasya ca bhavati ||

The following passage from the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* is the stock example used to discuss co-referentiality. The statement is in the context of the *jyotiṣṭhoma* sacrifice -

‘aruṇayā piṅgākśyā ekahāyanyā somaṃ krīṇāti’³⁸

(He) buys *soma* by (selling/ bartering) the red, brown-eyed, year-old (heifer).

Now, in this Vedic injunction, the agent (*kartṛ*) is elided, and is assumed from the context, as it has to be a sentient human agent that can transact the action of buying (*krīṇāti*). However, it is curious to note that the patient (*karma*) too, is not indicated directly. The patient (in this case *gavā* – cow f.instr. sing.) has to be inferred from the string of adjectives qualifying it – *aruṇayā* (red f.instr. sing.) *piṅgākśyā* (brown-eyed f.instr. sing.) and *ekahāyanyā* (year-old f.instr. sing.). It is through the relationship of co-referentiality that these adjectives are understood to signify the absent ‘cow’ in the statement, and further it is understood that three adjectives have a single referent; i.e., one cow with these three attributes is to be exchanged for the soma, not three cows each with one of the attributes³⁹.

38In the commentary on the sūtra *arthaikatve dravyaguṇayor aikakarmyān niyamaḥ syāt* // MS_3,1.12 (Jha 1979: p 296)

39For a detailed grammatical account of coreferentiality, see Joshi (2015)

4.5. Summary

To summarise, the relevant features of adjectives (including colour adjectives) in Sanskrit pertinent to our discussion are the following – 1. In a sentence, an adjective-qualificand pair can only be identified in the context of a sentence, by examining the mutual semantic expectancy (*ākāṅkṣā*) of the words, and also through the syntactic indicators of concord or coreferentiality (*sāmānādhikaraṇya*). The adjective and the qualificand can be distinguished by their relative dominance or subordination (*guṇa-pradhāna-bhāva*) in the sentence; and the degree of relation with the verb. 2. A colour term, when used as a substantive referring to a particular colour is in the male gender (*puṅgava*) and when used as an adjective, takes the gender (and case and number) of its qualificand. Similarly, terms such as *śīghraṃ* are used in the neuter as adverbs, and in the gender of the qualificand as adjectives. 3. Sometimes, an adjective is used in place of its qualificand, and we have to rely on the context, and the previously mentioned features such as *ākāṅkṣā* to decrypt its role in an expression.

5. Colour Metaphors in Sanskrit Poetics

5. Colour Metaphors in Sanskrit Poetics

5.0. Studies in Colour term semantics in Premodern languages

Colour terms have been in the eyes of several stormy battles – anthropologists, linguists and biologists have lead the vanguard, with historians, psychologists and philosophers joining in every now and then. As John MacLaury put it, ‘The relativity of language has become a crusade, with colour as its banner’ (1997: 20). However, many these disagreements are over contemporary languages. Our concern is with the colour vocabularies⁴⁰ of the ancient world and the puzzles they pose.

The most famous (and the most controversial) study of colour terms in an ancient culture must be W.E. Gladstone’s (1858) analysis of Homer’s visual vocabulary. Opinion is divided as to whether Gladstone says that the ancient Greeks had a poor sense of colour (i.e. poor visual acuity) or if he merely felt that they had a ‘primitive’ colour vocabulary that was inexact and ambiguous with respect to its list of

40 A more accurate characterisation would be visual vocabulary, since all cultures do not neatly partition hue-based terms from terms that signify other visual elements such as texture, spots and stripes.

referents. What be the case, the ancient Greeks were neither colour blind nor synaesthetic in the true neurological sense (Bradley 2013: 127).

5.1. Polychromy or polysemy - Materiality of Visual Vocabulary

Why is it that the colour terms from premodern cultures are so difficult to translate?

Why do they invariably have connotations that flout the neat boundary of the palette?

To understand this, it is important to set aside the lenses of our modern visual

repertoire that is primed by seeing saturated monochromatic objects, and to

understand the classical colour terms and colour concepts on their own terms. It is

often noted that the visual terms indicate aspects of luminosity, as Hopkins (1883)

notes in the colour vocabulary of the Ṛgveda. Clarke (2004) and Bradley (2013) offer

important signposts through their studies of colour vocabulary in Ancient Greece and

Rome respectively, wherein the colour terms are semantically parsed along with their

material collocates, to understand all the associative visual (and non-visual)

connotations of the terms.

A historical semantic study of colour can no longer be restricted to cataloguing the various hues and shades indexed by the colour terms of a particular language;

and must surely look at the non-colour, (even non-visual) domains in which these ostensible colour terms are used in the language at hand. If the aim of studying the semantics of colour terms in Sanskrit has to do with more than just recovering the colour system of Sanskrit, then one certainly has to track the extended, 'non-colour' associations of the colour vocables; thereby contributing to a better understanding of the cross-flow across various conceptual domains as embodied in the language at hand.

Biggam (2015: p 41-43) describing the methods to be adopted in studying the semantics of colour, dedicates a chapter speaks of the importance of studying instances of colour terms in metaphorical language, idioms - what she terms non-basic and non-standard uses of colour terms. It is indeed easier to map the semantics of a term if we are able to identify its contextual restriction – the specific sub-domains that it is used to index – for instance – swarthy in English is almost exclusively used to describe complexions, auburn is mostly used to describe hair colour; and even if terms are rarely used in other contexts, the former uses are more salient.

Discussing the role of metaphor in colour semantics (section 4.3), Biggam offers a tripartite classification of colour names found in paint and garment catalogues based on their semantic accessibility or transparency : logical (*canvas, vellum*), evocative (*lemon zest, Mediterranean sea*) and obscure (*homecoming, windswept*). However such a classification suffers from a quotidian expectation that the name somehow should match the colour swatch that it labels.

However, in our study of colour terms in a historical language, it is not possible to use such a framework that sniffs out well coined colour names from whimsical non-colour names for tints and shades, we do not have the luxury of judging the ‘fitness’ of colour terms that have had a historical existence and currency. As we will see, Sanskrit, (like other historical languages) often uses the same terms to index features of (seemingly) very different domains; and if our trail of a ‘colour term’ leads us beyond the domain of colour, or the visual domain even, we have to follow.

5.2. The world through passion-tinted glasses – the polysemy of *rāga*

The most common terms used for colour in Sanskrit are *rāga* and *varṇa*. Of these *rāga* has two prominent denotations – one of attachment, passion, or emotion in

general; and the other of colour. *Rāga* is used as a generic colour term, but is most commonly used to denote red. The term *rāga* is an abstract noun derived from the verb *rañj* – to colour, to excite, by adding the suffix *ghañ*. It is related to the term *rajas* which means energy and dust.⁴¹

There are later connotations of *rāga* – as a musical mode for example, but the first two are the most prominent and the most frequent. Table 5.1 summarises the data for the semantics of the lexeme *rāga* in the five texts consulted – three from the epic phase – *Rāmāyaṇa* (Ram), *Mahābhārata* (Mbh) and the *Buddhacarita* (BC), *Kumārasambhava* (KC) from the classical phase and the *Daśakumāracarita* (DKC) from the late phase. There is bound to be a difference in absolute numbers, the texts are not at all of comparable volume. The Mbh is over a hundred thousand verses long, and the Ram is just a little over twenty thousand verses. Of the BC, only fourteen cantos were available in a searchable format, amounting to a little over a thousand verses. The Kum (Cantos 1-8) are six hundred odd verses and the DKC is a hundred pages length of prose.

41 For more on the semantics of *rāga* in Buddhist literature, see Samtani (1993)

Text	Emotion/ Passion	Colour/ Redness	Both (pun)	Doubtful / Anomalous	Total
Rāmāyaṇa (Ram)	1	7	-	1	9
Mahābhārata (MBh)	108	5	-	3	116
Buddhacarita (BC)	18	-	1	-	19
Kumārasaṃbhava (Kum)	3	14	-	-	17
Daśakumāracarita (DKC)	42	5	2	2	52

Table 5.1. Distribution of the attestations of *rāga* in different denotations⁴²

The use of the term *rāga* in the connotation of passion preponderates in both the MBh and the BC, while the opposite is true of the Ram. This is counter-intuitive, given how scholars have often spoken of the stylistic and linguistic affinities between the Ram and Aśvaghōṣa's poetry. There is one instance of *rāga* in the BC, where the term is probably being used in both senses – passion and colour in an instance of *śleṣālaṅkāra* (pun or paronomasia).

In the Kum, more instances of *rāga* connoting colour are seen than instances of *rāga* meaning emotion or passion. This is consonant with the claim that Kālidāsa composed in the same classical *vaidarbhī* style seen in the Rāmāyaṇa. It is no

42 All the attestations in the selected five texts are appended in Appendices IA-IE

surprise that the DKC mostly has attestations in the connotation of passion, since the text narrates the tales of ten young men and their romantic (and martial) adventures.

This convergence of the semantics of the extreme emotions of fear, hate, anger, love and passion on a term connoting the red colour is neither surprising, nor unique to Sanskrit. This connection draws upon the psychosemiotics of the prototypical red substance – blood, and its connections to all said emotions. This semantic connection between passion/emotion and colour is further elaborated in the poetological literature of Sanskrit. As will be evident in subsequent sections, this association of colour with passion is embedded in the literary cultural codes of Sanskrit; and newer poetological principles and codes are built over it.

5.3. Colours of the soul – the *leśyā*-s

At least two South Asian religions speak of the concept of the *leśyā* -s - the Vedic and the jaina traditions. There is a passage in the Mahābhārata describing the *leśyā*-s. Set in a nested narrative, the passage features in a conversation between Yudhiṣṭhira and Bhīṣma, within which Sanatkumāra tells Vṛtra about the *leśyā*-s -

ṣaḍ jīva-varṇāḥ paramaṃ pramāṇaṃ kṛṣṇo dhūmro nīlam'athāsya madhyam |

raktaḥ punaḥ sahyataraḥ sukham tu hāridravarṇaṃ susukhaṃ ca śuklam ||33 ||

There are six colours to the soul, according to the highest authority – black and smoke- grey, with blue between them; red is tolerable, turmeric-yellow is happier, and white is the most felicitous.

[Mbh. 12. 271. 33]

The second quarter of the verse is a bit obscure, and this translation is based on Bedekar's (1968) correct interpretation of the verse, differing from Nīlakaṇṭha's commentary; as it gives the right progression of the *leśyā-s* as seen from verses 39-44 of the same section, as well as corresponding to the sequence seen in the Jaina sources.

According to the Jaina sources, the *leśyā-s* are affective by-products of the disturbances in the soul caused by the excessive 'flow' of the passions – *kaṣāya-niṣyanda*. While there is an infinite variety of *leśyā-s* corresponding to infinite possibilities of mental disturbances, a list of six is well known – *kṛṣṇa-* (black), *nīla-* (blue), *kāpota* (grey), *tejo-* (red), *padma-* (pink), and *śukla-* (white) *leśya-s*⁴³.

This metaphorical motif of associating 'colours' with souls of different temperaments; appears to extend into the association of mood, temper, emotion and mental states with colour in multifarious ways, in several stages. Similar associative

43 *kiṅhā nīlā ya kā'ū ya te'ū panhā taheva ya | sukkalesā ya chaṭṭā ya nāmā'i tu jahakkamam ||*
(Uttarādhyayanāsūtra 34.3) Quoted in Bedekar (1968) p336.

meanings of colours can be found in other disciplinary texts includes texts of grammar and poetics.

5.4. Colour Semantics in the Mahābhāṣya

There is a passage in the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali that refer to the special use of colour adjectives. Commenting upon the Aṣṭādhyāyī 2.2.29 -

tat yathā :

samāne rakte varṇe gauḥ lohitaḥ iti bhavati aśvaḥ śoṇaḥ iti.

samāne ca kāle varṇe gauḥ kṛṣṇaḥ iti bhavati aśvaḥ hemaḥ iti.

samāne ca śukle varṇe gauḥ śvetaḥ iti bhavati aśvaḥ karkaḥ iti .

That is as follows -

When both are of a similar reddish hue, a cow is described as *lohita* and a horse is described as *śoṇa*;

when both are of a similar dark hue, a cow is termed *kṛṣṇa*, and a horse *hema*,

when both are similarly white, a cow is termed *śveta* and a horse *karka*.

This is an important passage indicating the highly specialised use of certain colour adjectives in the time of Patañjali. However, it is unlikely that these specialised semantics of the terms persisted for long. By the time of Amarasimha's lexicon – the Amarakośa, these sets of terms are listed as coextensive synonyms, with some exceptions.

5.5. The Treatment of Colour in Treatises of Poetics

There is a complex code of the various poetic conventions or poetic commonplaces – (*kavi-prasiddhi* or *kavi-samaya*) associated with various colours. These are discussed in the poetological digests such as Rājaśekhara's *Kāvya mīmāṃsā* and Keśava Miśra's *Alaṅkāra śekhara*. These constitute an elaborate code of stylized literary tropes and *motifs* that pervade (and govern) *kāvya* literature. The codes of the *kavi-samayas*, add another semiotic dimension to the creative and figurative possibilities of Sanskrit *belles lettres*.

In the highly structured cosmos of Sanskrit poetry, poetic fancy too, is regulated and governed by the tradition, and good poets (*satkavi-s*) are expected to abide by these rules, just as knowledgeable connoisseurs (*sahṛdaya-s* or *sacetas*) are expected to know and deploy these tropes in understanding and appreciating poetry. For instance, peacocks are to be described as dancing only in the monsoon season, and cuckoos should be portrayed as cooing only in spring; even if they are known to perform these actions at other times. There are several such kavi-samaya-s associated with colours and colour terms, and a historical semantics of colour in Sanskrit cannot omit discussing them.

5.6. Foam, fame and chuckles – Poetic conventions related to colours in Sanskrit

Per the poetic conventions of Sanskrit, fame and laughter are white. The list of things that are white by kavi-samaya fiat is long – milk, seashells and conches, the nectar of immortality - amṛta, snake's slough, jasmine buds, camphor, a king's regal umbrella and yak-tail fans, geese (*hamsa* are geese not swans, see Vogel 1962) and cranes (*balākā*), the kumuda lotus, lightning flowers (unless otherwise specified) and pearls.

Now this set, and the indisputable whiteness of its members is part of the intersubjective background knowledge of the Sanskrit poet as well as his well-read rasika. It is only by being an insider to this mesh of codes does a passage like the below become intelligible.

kṣaṇena ca paurandarīm dishamanu tādṛśa-timiranikareṇa nīlīkṛte nabhasi,

*hara-hāsa-rāśiriva***** pāñcajanya iva janārdana-kare,*

nirmokapuñja iva kālīya-phaṇapañjare, phena-piṇḍa iva yamunājale,

mrgendra iva tamāla-kānane, hamsa iva kuvalayavane,

balāka iva navāmbhoda-vṛnde, jhagity'āvīrbabhūva tārāpatih

Like Śiva's guffaws (text missing), like the Pāñcajanya conch in Viṣṇu's hand,

Like a swirl of slough off the snake Kālīya's hood, like a head of froth in the waters of the river

Yamunā; Like a lion in forest of tamāla trees, like a swan in a lake full of (dark) *kuvalaya* lilies;

Like a crane flying past a group of rainclouds,

In the eastern horizon, inked blue, as if by a mass of darkness,

The Moon, lord of the star-maidens, appeared in a flash...

Now, while the whiteness of several upamānas (*prima comparanda*) in this passage is quite unquestionable, the whiteness of the laughter, of snake-slough, and of the lion is only available to us through the looking glass of the *kavi-samayas*. With the kavi-samaya laundry list of 'white' objects, we can now appreciate this passage as being a *māl'opamā*, a string of similes wherein dark objects (??, *Viṣṇu*, the *Kālīya* snake, the *Yamunā* river, a grove of *Tamāla* trees, a cluster of *kuvalaya* nulemboes, and a raincloud) serving as substrata for white ones (laughter, conch, snakeskin, foam, a lion, a goose and a flash of lighting) are compared to the dark sky with the newly risen moon.

While in this passage we have concentrated on explaining poetic *topoi* related to the white colour, this very set of interwoven similes relies on several other such kavi-samaya-s – the blue/blackness of the river *Yamunā*, of *kuvalaya* flowers and of *tamāla* trees (*Cinnamomum tamalae*). In a classical language such as Sanskrit, the prevalence and popularity of such poetic motifs, creates scope for another level of figurative creativity, potential for building novel metaphorical blends on the foundation

of these well-entrenched codes, which are available to the trained author as well as audience.

According to the popular lists of kavisamaya-s, fame is white; while sin, poison, clouds and infamy are always described as being black. Eyes can be describes as black, or white, or both, or red. Anger, courage, and shame are red, as are unspecified gems⁴⁴, nails, *bimba* (coccinea) berries, hibiscus or *japā* flowers.

5.7. Synonyms in the poets' palette

The terms *śukla*, *gaura* and *pāṇḍu* - can be treated as synonyms. The terms *pīta* (~yellow) and *rakta* (~red) can be used as synonyms, particularly while describing gold, pollen or fire. Similarly, *pīta* and *pāṭala* can be used as synonyms⁴⁵.

Śyāma can be used to signify *nīla* (dark blue), *kṛṣṇa* (black) and *harit* (dark green) equally⁴⁶. It becomes a hold-all qualifier term for several 'conventionally' dark things such as foliage, trees, sky, clouds, hills, and hair.

44 *guṇaniyamastu tadyathā-sāmānyopādāne māṇikyānām śoṇatā, puṣpāṇām śuklatā, meghānām śuklatā, meghānām kṛṣṇatā ca / Kāvyaṁīmāmsā 15th adhyāya.*

45 *Kāvyaikalpalatāvṛtti – pīta-pāṭalayoh / dvitīya pratāna*

46 *kṛṣṇanīlayoh, kṛṣṇaharīlayoh, kṛṣṇaśyāmayoh, pītaraktayoh, śuklagaurayorekatvena nibandhanam ca kavisamayaḥ / Kāvyaṁīmāmsā 15th adhyāya.*

5.8. Synonyms for Colour Lexemes in the Kośa-s

Sanskrit has a rich corpus of lexicographical texts – called kośa-s or *abhidhāna* -kośa-s (Name-books)⁴⁷. These texts were primarily intended for students, scholars and poets as aids in composition as well as comprehension, which is why they are composed in verse. The most important such word-book used in the Sanskrit tradition is the Amarakośa, also called the Nāmaṅgānuśāsanam.

A few details regarding the representation of metaphor and polysemy in the kośa literature may be apposite here. While the tradition considers the lexicons to be sources only for the 'literal meaning' - *mukhyārtha* or *abhidhā*, it is often noticed that the lexicons include secondary or metaphorical senses of the words which have attained the status of 'primary' meaning through usage - *rūḍhi*.

It appears that the polysemy exhibited by colour lexemes was already specialised to a degree that it merited mention in the lexicons. Beside listing synsets for individual colour terms in the first vargas, the Amarakośa has a few passages in the third chapter - *nānārthavarga* (the chapter on polysemous terms) that enumerate the

47 For detailed accounts and bibliographies of Sanskrit kośa literature, see Vogel 1979 and Patkar 1980.

polysemous use of certain colour terms. A couple of relevant examples of colour lexemes from the *nānārthavarga* are enumerated here -

śvetam rūpye 'pi rajatam hemni rūpye site triṣu || (3.3.505) ||

The term *śveta* is used for silvery as well (as white), and *rajata* is used for golden, silvery and white.

.... *raktam nīlyādi rāgi ca* || (3.3.506) ||

The term *rakta* is used to mean 'coloured by any hue such as blue' or to mean a red coloured object.

avadātaḥ site pīte śuddhe... || (3.3.507) ||

The lexeme *avadāta* can mean white, yellow or pure.

..... *śitī dhavalamecaku* || (3.3.512) ||

The (colour term) *śiti* can mean either white or variegated.

triṣu śyāmau haritkṛṣṇau || (3.3.647) ||

The lexeme *śyāma* can be used to mean either green or dark/ black.

gauro 'ruṇe site pīte ... || (3.3.739) ||

The term *gaura* can be used for red, white or yellow.

It must be noted that the above examples do not indicate some kind of arbitrary use of colour lexemes. On the contrary, these entries in the *kośa* attest perfectly well the semantic information that can be gleaned from the empirical material of the *kāvya* literature.

5.9. Dyed fast (and loose) in love – the pigments of passion

Building upon the overlapping semantics of *rāga* as emotion and *rāga* as colour, we see another set of conventions related to colour in the *kāvya śāstra* texts. In a discussion of different intensities of attachment or affection, the *ālankārika*-s use the names of different dyestuffs to indicate the ‘fastness’ or strength of the emotion. The *Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa* of Bhoja, Singhabhūpāla’s *Rasārṇavasudhākara*, the anonymous *Bhāvaprakāśa*, Viśvanātha’s *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* and Jīvagosvāmi’s *Ujvala-nīla-maṇi*, all use this motif – degrees of intensity of passion named for different colouring agents. *Rāga* is discussed as part of a hierarchy of affective states leading to *prema*, and the four kinds of *rāga* [colour/passion] – *nīlī*, *śyāma*, *kusumbha* and *māñjiṣṭha* *rāga*; denote a descending order of durability or resilience of the passion. While *māñjiṣṭhā* and *kusumbha* impart very bright colour, these dyes

are supposed to fade as quickly as they stain textile. Nīla and śyāma on the other hand, are slow on the uptake, needing a mordant to bind them, however these dyes bind fast, and persist.

Siṃha Bhūpāla's list only has three – *kusumbha*, *māñjiṣṭha* and *nīlī*; all of which [interesting] are named for dyestuffs, and the correlation between the title and the 'type' of rāga it signifies, is connected to the binding property of the colouring agent. According to Siṃha Bhūpāla, rāga is *sneha-prakarṣa* [an excess of affection/unctuousness], and is of three kinds: 1. *kusumbha* [safflower] rāga is the passion which impassions/colours the mind in a moment, and disappears as quickly, though it appears with great intensity. 2. *Nīlī* [indigo] rāga is the passion which neither increases nor decreases, 3, *Māñjiṣṭha* [madder] rāga is the passion which tinges the mind instantaneously, but remains 'fast' even after long, and is ever manifest in all intensity⁴⁸ (Venkatachari 1979: p223).

48 kusumbha-nīlī-māñjiṣṭha-rāgabhedena sa tridhā || 120 ||

kusumbharāgo sa jñeyo yaścitte rañjati kṣaṇāt | atiprakāśamāno'pi kṣaṇādeva vinasīyati || 121 ||

5.10. Discussion

The paronomastic-metaphorical frame of rāga as colour and passion relies in equal measure on the pun and the metaphorical blend; and the complex metaphorical frame is successful, because of the complementary convergence of several sets of features – the pun-based superposition of emotion and pigment; the brightness of colour is superposed over intensity of passion; and the fastness of dye is superposed over fastness or strength of the love.

As a consequence of this complex set of significations, it is challenging even to try and frame the primary metaphor(s) that underlies these conceptualizations. A Lakovian analysis would probably yield the conceptual metaphor EMOTION IS COLOUR. However, this abstraction is not sufficient to explain the details of either the metaphorical use of white or black in Sanskrit, or the metaphorical use of the dyes for subcategories of affective states.

Chapter 6. Mapping the semantics of a colour adjective - *aruṇa*

Chapter 6. Mapping the semantics of a colour adjective - *aruṇa*

6.0. Introduction

As stated in chapter two, this study is located in the Cognitive Linguistics enterprise, it values usage as well as meaning. In the following chapter, the cognitivist's commitment to both these goals are demonstrated. The first is achieved by charting out the various denotations of a lexeme, as a lexicographer would, by using the previous lexicographic material, as well as describing and theorising meaning extension and change by identifying the distinct connotations that emerge in the attestations collected from the corpus.

The second goal – that of tracking usage is assayed by looking at the diachronic change in the popularity of the lexeme in one or the other sense. Further, by looking at individual authors' use of the lexeme, it is also possible to get impressionistic synchronic images of the lexeme's usage in its various homonymous senses.

6.1. The adjective *aruṇa* – an introduction

The vocable *aruṇa* is attested in Sanskrit literature, from its earliest sources – the Rgveda. Elizarenkova’s brief discussion of colour terms in the Rg veda records the term aruna, but is confident in interpreting it as meaning one of the set - red, reddish-brown, tawny. This is the dominant sense we encounter in the dictionary, as well as in the later kavya texts. However the study fails to recognize the possibility of the so-called colour terms being inherently polysemous and instead attributes their puzzling semantics to their mythopoetic literary context - “This way, the semantics of the colour code in the RV is often determined by its mythology and therefore cannot be supposed to reflect the real state of things.” (Elizarenkova 1995: p 85).

6.2. Aruṇa in the lexicons

The lexical record for *aruṇa* is discussed in detail in the section [?] along with an allied ‘lexeme’ *avyaktarāga*. Here, it is discussed in brief, using the lexical entry from the *Medinikośa* as a guide -

avyakta-rage kapile sandhyā-rāge divākare

anūru-kuṣṭha-niśśabde aruno guṇiṣu triṣu ||

'*Aruṇa* is (used as a synonym) for *avyaktarāga*, tawny colour,

the colour of dawn, sun, the sun's herald – dawn, leprosy and silence.'

In the section that follows, it will be seen that attestations are found for *aruṇa* only in three senses – as a colour term, and for the sun, and dawn personified as a deity called *Aruṇa*, who is the sun's herald and charioteer.

6.3. Aruna in the epic stage

All illustrations are mined from the Digital Corpus of Sanskrit (DCS) lemmatized searchable archive. The sources used for the Epic stage are the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the *Mahābhārata* and *Aśvaghōṣa's* epic the *Buddhacarita*. *Aśvaghōṣa* *Asvaghosa* is dated to the 1st-2nd Centuries C.E., and his two texts the *Buddha-carita* and the *Saundara-nanda* are possibly the oldest available Sanskrit *Kāvya*s. The text of the *BC* is obtained from a single incomplete manuscript, and all editions are based on E.H.Johnston's edition, which he critically edited using the Chinese and Tibetan

translations. I have used the verses as found in Johnston and Olivelle, with occasional emendations of my own.

The Mahabharata and Ramayana at the DCS is John Smith's revision of Prof. Muneo Tokunaga's version of the text, and all sarga numbers and verse numbers refer to that edition. The former is based on the edition brought out by the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.

6.4. A synchronous consideration of aruna in the epic stage

Here are some instances of aruna from the Buddhacarita, that illustrate the range of denotations associated with the word in its adjectival form:

harituraga-turaṅgavat' turaṅgaḥ

sa tu vicaran manasīva¹ codyamānah ।

aruṇa-paruṣa- tāram² antarikṣam

sa ca subahūni jagāma yojanani ॥ BC. 5.87 ॥

This verse is from the context of Buddha's departure [*abhinīṣkramaṇa*] from his life as a prince and a householder.

*'That horse covered many miles, speeding along as if goaded by deep thought, just as the horses of the Sun traverse the skies speckled with faint stars.'*⁴⁹

aruṇa in this verse is interpreted as faint, which is an unconventional meaning of *aruṇa*, and doesn't feature either in the available nighantu-s nor in the contemporary Sanskrit-English dictionaries. One can notice how the translations of Cowell and Olivelle have a (forced) allusion of the dawn, because of an incorrect reading of *aruṇa*. This unusual semantic feature of *aruṇa* in the epic stage will be further illustrated below.

vilambakeśyo malināṃśukāmbarā

49Olivelle's translation: 'As that steed sped along like the steed of the sun, its mind as if spurred on, traveled many leagues, before the stars became faint in the sky at the coming of dawn.'

Cowell's translation : 'But he with his horse like the horse of Indra, the lord of bay horses, hurrying on as if spurred in his mind, went over the leagues full of many conflicting emotions - the sky all the while with its cloud-masses checkered with the light of dawn. '

nirañjanairbāṣṭhatekṣaṇairmukhaiḥ |

striyo na rejur mṛjayā vinākṛtā

divīva tārā rajanīkṣayāruṇāḥ ||8.21 ||

The verse is from the ‘*antahpura-vilāpa*’ – it is a description of the women in the royal household after they discover Siddhartha's departure.

‘ With their braid undone, and their robes unkempt,

with eyes mired by tears, unadorned with collyrium,

those women bare of all makeup failed to glow,

the stars in the sky that turn pale as the night abates.⁵⁰

This is a second illustration of *aruṇa* used in the context of stars, and pale stars at

that; pale by virtue of impending daybreak. While Olivelle’s translation reads *aruṇa*

correctly as dimmed [see footnote 6], Cowell has it as ‘like the stars in the sky, pale-

50E.B.Cowell - 21. With their dress hanging down, and their linen garments soiled, their faces untouched by collyrium and with eyes dimmed by tears; dark and discoloured and destitute of all painting, like the stars in the sky, pale-red with the ending of night;

P.Olivelle - Their hair was hanging loose /and their fine clothes were soiled/their faces without makeup, their eyes filled with tears,their toilet left undone, the women did not shine/like stars in the sky dimmed at the end of the night - [pp 219 Life of the Buddha]

red with the ending of night', which is an unlikely reading of *aruṇa*. The upama (simile) here is between stars that dim as day breaks, and the unadorned women who are desolate because of Siddhārtha's disappearance.

*bhasm'āruṇa*1 lohita-bindu-citrah*

khatvāṅga-hastā hari-dhūmra-keśāh |

lamba-srajo vāraṇa-lamba-karṇās-

carmāambarās'c'aiva nirambarās'ca || BC. 13.21 ||

This verse is a description of Māra's familiars, who gather to disrupt Buddha's meditation.

*'Some were **ashen** and some were blood spattered,*

some carried skull-topped cudgels, and some had smoke-like tawny manes,

some wore long trailing garlands, and some had floppy ears like an elephant,

some wore animal hides and some were in the buff.⁵¹

[BC-3]

51' Copper-red, covered with red spots, bearing clubs in their hands, with yellow or smoke-coloured hair, with wreaths dangling down,

Here again *aruṇa* is used as a collocate for the object whose visual semantics it carries. Much like the mordant required to make dye fast, aruna here serves to emphasise the visual aspect of the bhasma (ash) that is reflected in the appearance of some of *Māra*'s troops. A comparison with later data will highlight the singularity of Aśvaghoṣa's use of this lexeme.

6.5. Aruṇa in the Literary Corpus – the material collocates of colour terms

In this section, the occurrences of the lexeme *aruṇa* in various texts from the three phases of periodisation of Sanskrit literature are seen. All the examples are compiled in appendix II, within the context of the verse or at least the hemistich.

with long pendulous ears like elephants, clothed in leather or wearing no clothes at all;' –
Cowell

Olivelle – 'some having the colour of ash, some with blood-red spots,
some carrying ascetic staves with skulls at the top, some with hair smoke-coloured like a
monkey's,
some with hanging garlands, some with ears as big as an elephant's, some wearing animal
skins, some completely naked; [pp 381]

	Red/ Orange	Grey/ Brown	Sun	Dawn	Other/ anomalous	Total occurrences
Rāmāyaṇa	3	8 +1*	1*	-	2	14*
Mahābhārata	7	7	-	-	4	18
Buddhacarita	-	3	-	-	-	3
Kālidāsa	8+ 1*	-	4 +1*	5	-	19
Māgha	16	-	1	-	-	17

Table 6.1. Occurrences of *aruṇa* in Sanskrit Literature

As can be seen from the data compiled in this table, the epic period is characterised by the use of *aruṇa* to signify a different part of the chromosphere. In the Rāmāyaṇa it is used mostly in descriptions of ash, clouds, smoke, donkeys, camels and snow/mist. These objects occupy a colour space tending towards greys and browns, rather than the reds and pinks seen in later sources. In the Mahābhārata, there is equal representation of the grey-brown and red-pink groups – pollen and copper join the list of correlates.

In the classical period represented by Kālidāsa, there is absolutely no use of *aruṇa* for the colour-space of grey-brown; and instances of its use as a noun

signifying the sun or dawn also begin to appear⁵². In the late phase, represented by Māgha's Śiśupālavadhā, the transformation is complete – the hues grey and brown no longer feature in the range of the term *aruṇa*. The collocates of *aruṇa* in this poem include fire, *butea* flowers, pollen, blood and the pomegranate.

6.6. Semantic shift of *aruṇa* – some text-critical consequences

The previous section demonstrates the many distinct senses of the lexeme *aruṇa*, both as a nominal, and as a colour adjective. The two nominal denotations are in the sense of the sun (*Sūrya*) and the sun's charioteer (*Anūru*); and the two adjectival senses corresponding to the white-grey-brown and the orange-red-pink ranges are discussed, along with the relative ebb and tide of the popularity of each sense. From Table 6.1 it can be seen that there has been a shift from more instances in the white-grey-brown range to more in the orange-red-pink range. There is a verse from the Rāmāyaṇa frequently cited by texts of *alaṅkāraśāstra*, and the shift in the relative popularity of the two chromatic senses appears to be responsible for certain text-

⁵²However, upon some spot-checking, I have found epic type examples such as *dhūmāruṇa* in Bāṇa's Kādambarī. A more detailed study is warranted.

critical choices made in selecting variant readings of the verse, as will be seen in the below discussion.

The verse in question is from the Aranya kanda. The reading of the verse according to the critical edition is as follows -

ravi-saṅkrānta-saubhāgyas'tuṣāraruṇa-maṇḍalaḥ |

niśvāsāndha iv'ādarśa candramā na prakāśate ||

Overcome by the sun's lustre, encircled by a dull halo of frost;

like a mirror clouded over by breath, the moon doesn't glow.

In the Dhvanyāloka (first āloka, adhyāya 13 this verse is illustrated as an example for viśeṣokti, and also is used elsewhere as an illustration for the *atyanta-tiraskṛta-vācya* variety of dhvani. The reading of the verse found in the Dhvanyāloka is as follows -

ravi-saṅkrānta-saubhāgyas'tuṣārāvṛta-maṇḍalaḥ |

niśvāsāndha iv'ādarśa candramā na prakāśate || ||

While there can be many reasons for a textual emendation, it is highly possible that this emendation came about because the semantics of *aruṇa* in the context of this verse were no longer intelligible to scholars and scholiasts. Yet another reading for this hemistich - 'tuṣārāvilamaṇḍalaḥ' is also seen in the *Kāvya-mīmāṃsā* of Rājaśekhara, who was a junior contemporary of Ānandavardhana, the author of the *Dhvanyāloka*.

6.7. Avyaktarāga – a ghost word in modern Sanskrit dictionaries

Avyakta-rāga appears to be given as a synonym of *aruna* in the *Amarakośa*. This term is repeated in many later lexicons as a synonym of *aruṇa*. However instances of usage could be found for the term 'avyakta-rāga' are found wanting⁵³. One single instance has been traced by this author, in the *Atharvaṇaprāyaścittāni*, published by Negelein(1913: p 138 fn 1016) – *avyaktarāga-puṣpāṇi tṛṇāni*. Here it appears to be used as a synonym for *aruṇa*. However, the source and authenticity of this gloss is

53 The dictionaries of Monier Williams-Williams and V.S.Apte carry the term with the siglum L, indicating that it is only found mentioned in lexicons, and no attestations can be found.

unknown. Bhanuji Dīkṣita, a commentator of the Amarakośa glosses it as

aruno'vyakta-rāgas'syāt [aruna – avyaktarāga = īśallohitah]

I suggest that the use of '*avyakta-rāga*' as a term for *aruna* must be a redaction from older lexicons that predate the Amara-kośa, since it is repeated by many later lexicographers. The occurrence of *avyaktarāga* in the context of *aruna*, in different Sanskrit lexicons is documented here.

Table 6.2 Entries for *aruna* in the Sanskrit Lexical texts (kośa-s)

Source	Present, citation	Reference details
Anekārtha-samuccaya of Śāśvata	avyakta-rāgam'arunām' aruṇas'sūrya-sārathiḥ । sandhyārāgo'ruṇaḥ kvā'pi lohito'runa iṣyate ॥ 132 ॥	
Amara Kośa	avyakta-rāgastvaruṇah śvetaraktas'tu pāṭalaḥ ॥ 15b॥	1st kanda, dhivarga . #15
Vaijayantī of Yādavaprakāśa	viṣāruṇārunam tāmram' aruṇas'sūryasārathau । avyaktarāge śaśije sandhyābhre lohite ravau ॥ 6॥	tryakṣara-kāṇḍa nānalingādhyaya #6
Anekārthatilaka of Mahīpa	aruṇo bhāskare rakte	॥3.17॥

	<p>niśabde kapile budhe sandhyārāge raveh sūte 'vyaktarāge'pi cāruṇā 3.17 </p>	
<p>Anekārthasaṅgraha of Ācārya Hemacandra</p>	<p>abhīkṣṇam tu bhṛṣe nitye' pyaruṇo'nūru-suryayoh 197b sandhyārāge budhe kuṣṭhe niḥśabdāvyaktarāgayoh vyākule kapile varṇe raktavarṇe'pi vācyavat 198 </p>	
<p>Kalpadrukosa of kesava</p>	<p>lohito rohito raktaḥ śonah kokanadacchavih mañjiṣṭho bāla-sandhyābho 'vyaktarāgo'runo'pi ca 165 </p>	<p>2 bhuvah skandha/ 5 nāṭya-prakāṇḍa</p>
<p>Viśvaprakāśa of Maheśvara</p>	<p>aruṇo'vyaktarāgas'syāt sandhyā-rāge'rka-sārathau niḥśabde kapile kuṣṭhe dravye vācyavad'iṣyate </p>	<p>ṇāntavarga verse 28 </p>
<p>Maṅkhakośaḥ</p>	<p>aruṇā syuh sāndhyarāga sūryasūta divākarāh 237 trisu śone'vyaktarāge lakṣaṇam nāma-cihnayoh </p>	<p>237-238</p>
<p>Nānārthasabdakośa or</p>	<p>aruno'vyakta-rāge'rke</p>	

Medinīkośa	sandhyārāge'rka-sārathau niśśabde kapile kuṣṭhabhede nā guṇini triṣu 33	
Nānārthamañjarī of Rāghava	aruṇah kapile kuṣṭhe sandhyārāge'rka-sārathau avyaktarāge niśśabde dravye triṣu nirūpitah	verse 2 of tryakṣara-ṇāntāh
Nānārthasaṅgraha of Ajayapāla	aruno'rke sāndhya-dīptau rakte cānūru-piṅgayoḥ avyakta-rāge nissange' runāpyātivisausadhau 14	

While the repetition of *avyaktarāga* as a stock expression by lexicographers, may have led to the misapprehension that it is a word, the following hemistich from the Dharaṇīkośa (Kulkarni 1968: p 58) clears any doubt -

'aruṇo'sphuṭarāge ca sūrye sūryasya sārathau'

Instead of the commonly used *avyakta*, here a synonym '*asphuṭa*' is used. Both words mean indistinct. Hence, the term *avyaktarāga* as a gloss explaining *aruṇa* means 'indistinct colour' or 'indistinct redness'. This indicates that the term was probably used to describe vague hues that could not be identified with any of the primary or secondary colours nor with any single prototypical referent. This interpretation is in agreement with the grey-brown attestations of *aruṇa* seen in the epic phase. It would be very surprising if this semantic charge of *aruṇa* had gone undocumented by the traditional lexicographers.

However, it is important to note that *avyaktarāga* or *asphuṭarāga* are not lexemes, they are not entries in the *kośa*-s. These expressions are explanatory glosses given by the lexicographer. Hereby it is demonstrated that the entry '*avyaktarāga*' in the nineteenth century dictionaries, and being perpetuated in modern dictionaries as well, is a ghost word; a pseudolexeme that has been misinterpreted by late commentators such as Maheśvara and compilers of modern bilingual dictionaries such as Apte and Monier-Williams.

6.8. Summary

Studies in Sanskrit colour adjectives in Sanskrit as well as other historical languages are consistent in noting that many early terms refer to degrees of brightness or saturation, rather than to hue (Filliozat 1957, Elizarenkova 1994). The multifarious terms that are associated with *aruṇa* would perplex one who doesn't know better, much as the Homerist Premiere of England William Gladstone (1858 III.487) felt about the greek term *Χλωρος*, (*chloros*) –

Χλωρος [chloros] indicates rather the absence than the presence of definite colour..

If regarded an epithet of colour, it involves at once a hopeless contradiction between the colour of honey on one side, and greenness on another [III.468]...

In what manner are we to find a common thread upon which to hang the colours of iron, copper, horses, lions, bulls, eagles, wine, swarthy men and smoke?

[III.473]

It is a matter of no great surprise that many of these shades of Homer's

Χλωρος are shared by the Sanskrit epic poets' *aruṇa*. This set of examples confirms

our conviction that classical colour vocabulary can only be understood by studying the material correlates of the colour term.

In this chapter, the semantics of *aruṇa* were discussed, both based on the premodern lexical entries, and by studying a cross-section of attestations compiled from the text corpus. It was seen how the chromatic range of *aruṇa* has narrowed from signifying a range of colours – grey, brown, red, orange to a narrower spectrum covering shades of red, and pink alone. While the epic phase of literature abounds in example for the former set, by the classical phase, this connotation has become extinct. Also, it was seen that an expression *avyaktarāga* frequently found in the *kośa*-s, was mistaken as a lexical entry and taken to be a synonym of *aruṇa* by certain commentators and lexicographers. The current research has rectified this misapprehension.

The value of ghost words and misglosses in editing dictionaries is immense. For the study of the interrelation between various *kośa*-s, the text-critical principle of common errors can easily be extended to hapax legomena and ghost words. For this it will be necessary to maintain a registry of such rare words and nonce words.

Systematic inventories of aberrant forms and ghost words exist elsewhere⁵⁴. Glass (2006) suggests it for the Gandhari language, it will be a most helpful resource for lexicographers to develop such an inventory for Sanskrit as well. Such study will be of meta-lexicographical value, in determining the genealogical relationship between the various premodern kośa lexicons.

⁵⁴The [Base des Mots-Fantômes](http://www.atilf.fr/MotsFantomes) - www.atilf.fr/MotsFantomes is an online scholarly registry of French Ghost words. There are no such resources known for Sanskrit.

7. Synthesis

7. Synthesis

This thesis tries to bring together three topics – the role of metaphor in determining meaning extension and semantic change, the special case of polysemy exemplified by sensory terms - visual terms in particular, and the value of grafting corpus linguistic tools over more conventional methods of textual analysis or lexical-semantic analysis. Through this work, some of the unique challenges posed by a historical language are brought to our attention. This holds the promise for developing better techniques of corpus studies, techniques tailor-made to respond to the particularities of the language at hand.

As it was discussed in the second chapter, the account of metaphor given in the Conceptual Metaphor Theory does not correspond to the figures *upamā* (simile), *rūpaka* (metaphor) or the related śāstraic episteme *upamāna* (analogy). While there are no cognitive claims attached, the Sanskrit semantic theories' account of secondary or non-literal signification – *lakṣaṇā vṛtti* is the concept that comes close to the CMT metaphor. While CMT generally is able to explain novel metaphors, it

pays less attention to the role of convention in the production and comprehension of metaphor. The theory of *lakṣaṇā* discussed by the poetics of Sanskrit however appears to be equally equipped to explain novel as well as conventional metaphors on one hand and metaphorical and metonymic transfers on the other. Mammaṭa (eleventh century CE) for example, gives two triggers for a metaphor – contextual 'motivation' - *prayojana* or convention *rūḍhi*. The sophistication of this model is further demonstrated by the inclusion of metaphor as well as metonym as sub-categories under the same head - *lakṣaṇā*.

There have been a few studies analysing Sanskrit literature using the CMT, and the identification of enduring metaphorical patterns have helped in better understanding the domain. However, incorporating the theory of *lakṣaṇā* will help prevalent models of metaphor identification to be more precise.

In the study of scholarly traditions of a premodern linguistic culture such as Sanskrit, it is also useful to consider developing a registry of metaphorical mapping that recur as motifs frequently in the literature. This is crucial for judging the degree of conventionality or novelty of a metaphor. Developing annotated catalogues of metaphorical mappings will play a major role in this direction. The present author is

collecting material towards a diachronic register of metaphorical mappings in Sanskrit literature. In the case of some metaphors backed by conventions, it is seen that source-domain target-domain inversion often occurs in Sanskrit. This was illustrated using attestations from the Mahābhārata drawing upon the source domain of a water droplet on a lotus leaf. This same source domain is used to describe two contrary phenomena. The first is the instability and impermanence of worldly existence which is fickle like a drop of water on the waxy, hydrophobic surface of a lotus leaf. The second is detachment or renunciation – the dispassionate person is unperturbed like a water drop on a lotus leaf which is in contact with the waxy leaf, but doesn't get absorbed into it. As these examples illustrate, the same imagistic setting can be used to evoke or highlight different, even contrary features in two domains.

These expressions are as effective as those which map from the abstract to the concrete, thereby strengthening Grady's (2007: 193) critique of the cognitivist claim that metaphors entail an asymmetrical unidirectional mapping from experiential, embodied, concrete domains to more abstract or intellectual domains . Convention is as much a source for the production of metaphorical expressions as

creativity or any ostensible 'embodied universals'. Easy comprehension is the ultimate yardstick of the success of metaphorical constructions.

The availability of a large number of machine-readable texts and other tagged corpora has made it possible for semantic and lexicographic studies to converge in their methods and motives. Semanticists are usually interested in observing patterns of meaning change or meaning extension, while lexicographers are interested in spelling out every prevalent connotation of a term. Now, it is possible to compile and analyse and present diachronic data for the usage and semantic profile of each lexeme. This will lead to more fine-grained understanding of the meaning profile of entries in the dictionary. Such historically conscious lexical materials will be invaluable, especially in a language like Sanskrit, for determining the historicity of texts. They will put the rather subjective field of stylistics on a more data-driven empirical footing.

The study of colour term semantics in a historical language is not completed by identifying the range of hues a term indexes. There is a wider sphere of associative significations for each colour term, and these are culturally determined. In the case of Sanskrit, some of these are documented in the texts of poetology, which

list the conventional associations of each colour domain. Our work recommends that such associative information too, can be incorporated in dictionary entries, as they are no longer restricted by limitations of space, and are tending to be more encyclopaedic. However one interesting lacuna that does appear from the superimposition of these two sets of data, is that while searchable text corpora are great resources for mapping lexical semantics, mining the corpus will throw up data that doesn't differentiate metaphorical uses from literal ones. The next challenge for classicists working with corpus and computational tools is to try and automate, or even partially automate the process of metaphor identification as a feature of text data mining.

The analysis of the semantics of two lexemes – *rāga* and *aruṇa* illustrated in the thesis, already bring to light little known details about the differences in usage between the Epic period and the classical period in Sanskrit. Collecting detailed semantic data of this kind for more and more vocables, will yield a better understanding of the progression of the literary and semantic contours of the language.

The discussion of some of the instances of *aruṇa* in 20th century translations also points to the importance of metaphorical meanings and polysemy for the translator, and for translation studies in general. The complexities of trying to convey as many of the polyvalent significations of a term as possible are familiar bugbears for translators, and lexical resources that track the diachronic and synchronic aspects of such polysemy will be valuable resources for translators.

By tracking premodern lexicographic sources, it was found that a term *avyaktarāga* was misread by some sources as a word, while it was an explanatory gloss. Such 'mistakes' are of great value in tracking the intertextual relation between various lexicons. It will be a very useful resource for Sanskrit philologists if there is a systematic registry that records all known instances of ghost words, hapax legomena and pseudo-lexemes so that future scholarship will be able to identify other instances of error against this resource. The study of premodern lexicons points to an important feature of word polysemy in Sanskrit. As indicated by the name *abhidhānakośa* (name-book), the lexicons are mainly inventories of nominals and adjectives, recording synonyms in the *pariyāyakośa*-s and polysemous senses in the *anekārthakośa*-s. The verb-books (*Dhātu-kośa*-s) however, do not treat of the

polysemy of verbs. There is a paradoxical treatment of verbs in the Sanskrit tradition.

The *dhātu*-s are said to be intrinsically polysemous, and metaphorical extension of meaning (*lakṣaṇā*) is not accepted for verbs. This differential treatment of polysemy for different parts of speech in the Sanskrit tradition merits further study.

Examples such as *gaura* (see Section 5.8) demonstrate that the *kośa* entries do not distinguish strongly between literal and metaphorical senses; thereby anticipating the very recent practise of recording metaphorical meanings in the lexicon, albeit in an somewhat arbitrary fashion.

As part of the research on the polysemy of colour terms in Sanskrit, several associative meanings of the terms, which have accrued through poetic (and sometimes linguistic) conventions have been noted. This material is a rich resource for developing a historical thesaurus of colour terms, along the lines of the Oxford Historical thesaurus project; which promised to be a most helpful resources for students and scholars of Sanskrit, to be able to have a single source reference resource listing all secondary and associative connotations of each colour lexeme, as well as other visual lexemes such as *citra*, that go beyond the domain of colour.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Amarakosa with the commentary of Mahesvara, enlarged by Raghunath Shastri Talekar. Revised, enlarged, and improved from Chintamani Shastri Thatte's edition of 1882 by Vamanacharya Jhalakikar, under the superintendence of RG Bhandarkar. Bombay:Government Central Book Depot. 1907.

The Anekārthasaṅgraha of Ācārya Hemacandra, edited by Jagannatha Shastri Hoshing. Haridas Sanskrit Granthamala no. 68. Benaras: Chowkhambha Sanskrit Series Office. 1929.

Anekārthatilaka of Mahīpa, Edited by M.M.Patkar. Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate Research Institute. 1947.

Citramīmāṃsā of Appayya Dīkṣita. Edited by Jagadīśacandra Miśra. Varanasi: Chowkhambha Kashi Sanskrit Series # 207. 1971.

Dharaṇīkośa of Dharaṇīdāsa. Part I. Edited by Ekanath Dattatreya Kulkarni. Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate Research Institute. 1968.

Kavyamimamsa of Rājaśekhara. Edited by C.D. Dalal, K.A. Śastri, and K.S.

Ramaswami Sastri, Baroda: Oriental Institute. 1934.

Śrīmadmaṅkhaviracitam Maṅkhakośaḥ. Edited by Theodor Zachariae. Kāśī Saṃskṛta

Granthamālā 216. Vāraṇāsī: Chaukhambā Sanskrit Series. 1972.

Mīmāṃsāsūtra with Śābarabhāṣya, Ślokaṽrttika of Kumārila and the

Nyāyaratnākara of Pārthasārathi Miśra. Edited by Gajānana Śāstrī Musalgaonkar.

Varanasi: Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan. 1979.

The Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana (Amarakośa of Amarasimha) with the Amarakośodghāṭana

of Kṣīrasvāmin. Edited by Krishnaji Govind Oka, Poona, 1912.

Namaliṅgānuśāsana (Amarakośa of Amarasimha) With the commentary

Vyākhyāsudhā or Rāmāśramī of Bhanuji Dikshita. Edited by Paṇaśīkara, V.L. and

Sivadatta Pandit. Bombay : Nirnayasagar Press. Reprint Varanasi: Chaukhamba

Sanskrit Pratishthan. 1914 (1985).

Nānārthamañjarī of Rāghava. Edited by K.V.Krishnamoorthy Sharma. Poona:

Deccan College Postgraduate Research Institute. 1954.

Nānārthasaṅgraha of Ajayapāla. Edited by Chintāmaṇi, T. R. Madras University

Sanskrit Series No.10. Madras: University of Madras, 1937.

Nānārthaśabdakośa or Medinīkośa of Medinīkāra. Edited by Pandit Jagannath Shastri Hoshing. Vāraṇasī: Chaukhambā Sanskrit Series. 1940.

Nānārthārṇavanikṣepa of Keśavasvāmin. Edited by T.Gaṇapathi Sāstri. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series No. XXIII. Trivandrum: Trivandrum Government Press. 1913.

Nyāya Darśanam with Vātsyāyana's Bhāṣya, Uddyotakara's Vārttika, Vācaspati Miśra's Tātparyaṭīkā and Viśvanātha's Vṛtti. Edited by Nyaya-Tarkatirtha, T. and Tarkatirtha, A., Calcutta. 1985.

The Pūrva Mīmāṃsā Sūtras of Jaimini. Translated with a commentary by Ganganatha Jha. Allahabad: Panini Office. 1916.

Śṛṅgāraprakāśa of Bhoja (2 volumes). Edited by Rewaprasada Dvivedi and Sadashivakumara Dvivedi. Delhi: IGNCA and Motilal Banarsidass. 2007.

The Viśvaprakāśa of Maheśvara, Edited by Śīlaskandha Sthavira. Benaras: Chaukhambha Sanskrit Book Depot. 1911.

The Vaijayantī of Yādavaprakāśa – Gustav Oppert. Madras: Madras Sanskrit and Vernacular Text Publication Society. 1893.

Secondary Sources -

Bedekar, V. M., 1968. "The Doctrine of the Colours of Souls in the Mahābhārata : Its Characteristics and Implications". Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Vol. 48/49, Golden Jubilee Volume 1917-1967 (1968). 329-338.

Bhat, D.N. Shankara. 1994. *The adjectival category: criteria for differentiation and identification*. Vol. 24. John Benjamins Publishing.

Bhattacharya, Biswanath. 1982. *A history of Rupaka in Alankara Shastra*. Varanasi: Chaukhambha Orientalia.

Bhattacharyya, S., 1971. *Imagery in the Mahābhārata: influence on later Sanskrit literature*. Calcutta: Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar.

Biggam, Carole Patricia. 2012. *The semantics of colour: A historical approach*. Cambridge University Press.

Böhtlingk, O. and Roth, R., 1855. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*. St. Petersburg: Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften,.

Bradley, M., 2014. Colour as Synaesthetic experience in Antiquity. In S. Butler and Purves, A. (ed.) *Synaesthesia and the Ancient Senses*. Routledge. 2014. pp.127-140.

Brockington, J.L., 1977. Figures of Speech in the Rāmāyaṇa. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, pp.441-459.

Brugman, C.M., 1988. *The story of over: Polysemy, semantics, and the structure of the lexicon*. Taylor & Francis.

Coomaraswamy, A.K., 2007. *Figures of Speech Or Figures of Thought?: The Traditional View of Art*. World Wisdom, Inc.

Chanda, V., 2008. Fire and hot liquids: Anger in Hindi and English. *Multilingualism and applied comparative linguistics*, 2, pp.2-23.

Clarke, M., 2004. The semantics of colour in the early Greek word-hoard. *Bar International Series*, pp.131-139.

Covill, Linda. 2009. *A metaphorical study of Saundarananda*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.

Dash, Siniruddha. 1986. "The Syntax And Semantics Of Sanskrit Nominal Compounds" (PhD dissertation submitted to Savitribai Phule Pune University, <http://hdl.handle.net/10603/157778> accessed on 08th December 2017

Davids, C. Rhys., 1906. "Similes in the Nikayas." *JPTS*, pp. 52-151.

Deshpande, Madhav., 1972. "On the notion of similarity in Indian poetics." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 2, no. 1: 21-52.

Duda,P., 2011. Indology in e-space. *Acta Universitatis Carolinae Philologica*, (1), 117-122.

Elizarenkova, T., 1994. Notes on Names of Colours in the Ṛgveda. *Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute*, 54, pp.81-86.

Emeneau, M.B., 1944. The Sinduvara Tree in Sanskrit Literature. University of California Publications in Classical Philology XII. p. 333.

Filliozat, J., 1957. Classement des couleurs et des lumières en Sanskrit. *Problèmes de la couleur*, pp.303-311.

Geeraerts, D., 2010. *Theories of lexical semantics*. Oxford University Press.

Ghatage, A.M. and Joshi, S.D., 1977. *An encyclopaedic dictionary of Sanskrit on historical principles*(Vol. 1, No. 1). Pune: Deccan College Post Graduate and Research Institute.

Gibbs, R.W., 1994. The poetics of mind. Cambridge University Press.

Gladstone, W.E., 1858. Homer's perceptions and use of colour. *Studies on Homer and the Homeric age*, Vol III, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Glass, Andrew, 2006. A preliminary study of Gandhari lexicography. In *Papers of the 12th World Sanskrit Conference, Held in Helsinki, Finland 13-18 July, 2003: Themes and tasks in old and middle Indo-Aryan linguistics*(Vol. 5, p. 273). Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.

Glynn, D., 2014. Polysemy and synonymy. In *Corpus methods for semantics: Quantitative studies in polysemy and synonymy*, 43, p.7.

Gombrich, Richard.,1979. "He cooks softly': adverbs in Sanskrit grammar." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 42, no. 02: 244-256.

Gonda, Jan., 1949. *Remarks on Similes in Sanskrit literature*. Vol. 1. Brill Archive.

Grady, Joseph E. 2007. 'Metaphor', in Dirk Geeraerts and Hubert Cuyckens (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 188-213.

Gries, S.T., 2006. Corpus-based methods and cognitive semantics: The many senses of to run. *Trends in linguistics studies and monographs*, 172, p.57.

Grondelaers, S., Geeraerts, D. and Speelman, D., 2007. A case for a cognitive corpus linguistics. in *Methods in cognitive linguistics*, 18, p.149.

Hamilton, Rachael., 2016. The metaphorical qualities of cool, clear, and clashing colours. In Wendy Anderson, Ellen Bramwell and Carole Hough (ed.) *Mapping English Metaphor Through Time*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 97-114.

Hopkins, E.W., 1883. Words for color in the Rig Veda. *The American Journal of Philology*, 4(2), pp.166-191.

Houben, J.E., 2003, December. Bhartrhari as a 'cognitive linguist'. In *Bhartrhari: Language, Thought, Reality: Proceedings of the International Seminar on Bhartrhari, New Delhi* (pp. 523-43).

Iyer, Subrahmanya. K.A., 2003. *Studies in the Imagery of the Ramayana*. Lucknow: University of Lucknow Publications.

Jha, Ganganatha., 1979. " *The Pūrva-mimāmsā sūtras of Jaimini: with an original commentary in English.*" Varanasi: Bharatiya Publishing House.

Johnston, E.H., 1936 (1998). *Buddhacarita or Acts of the Buddha by Asvaghosa.* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.

Joshi, Shivram Dattatray., 1966. *Adjectives and Substantives as a Single Class in the Parts of Speech.* University of Poona,

Joshi, P.P., 2013. On the Concord and Government Relations in Sanskrit. In Scharf 2015.

Jurewicz, Joanna., 2014. "The Cow's Body as the Source Domain of Philosophical Metaphors in the Ṛgveda: The Case of 'Udder'(ūdhas)." *The Body in Language: Comparative Studies of Linguistic Embodiment* : 98.

Jurewicz, Joanna., 2008. "Anger and Cognition. Conceptual Metaphor in the 'Rgveda'." *Rocznik Orientalistyczny (Annual of Oriental Studies)* 1, no. 61: 7-19.

Jurewicz, Joanna., 2004. "The Rigveda, the cognitive linguistics and the oral poetry." *European Review* 12, no. 04 : 605-613.

Karambelkar. Manjiri., 2014. Technical study of the dictionaries published in Sanskrit language since 1800 A D . PhD Thesis submitted to Tilak Maharashtra Vidyapeeth . <http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/handle/10603/34869> accessed on 20th January 2018.

Keerthi, Naresh and R.Venkata Raghavan (forthcoming) "Identifying Metaphor in Language – from CMT to Kāvyaśāstra".

Kövecses Zoltán. 2010. *Metaphor: a Practical Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kragh, U.T., 2010. Of similes and metaphors in Buddhist philosophical literature: poetic semblance through mythic allusion. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 73 (3), pp.479-502.

Krishnamacharya, E., 1920. *Udayasundarikatha Of Soddhala* 1920. Baroda: Central Library.

Krishnamurti, Bh., 1998. "Metaphor in Indian literature: Some thoughts on a taxonomy." *The Life of Language: Papers in Linguistics in Honor of William Bright* : 299.

Kulkarni, Amba., 2016. Lexical and corpus resources-Sanskrit. in Hock, H.H and Elina Bashir (ed.) *The Languages and Linguistics of South Asia*, De Gruyter Mouton.

Kulkarni, Narayan Nathji. (1929) *The Anekārthasamuccaya of Śāśvata*. Poona: Oriental Book Agency.

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M., 2003. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: The University of Chicago.

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M., 1999. *Philosophy in the Flesh* (Vol. 4). New York: Basic Books.

Lakoff, George (1990) "The Invariance Hypothesis: Is Abstract Reason Based on Image-Schemas?" *Cognitive Linguistics* 1, 39-74.

Lakoff, G., 1987. *Women, fire, and dangerous things: What categorization reveals about the mind*. Chicago: The University of Chicago.

Lehrer, Adrienne., 1985. "The influence of semantic fields on semantic change." In ed. Jacek Fisiak *Historical semantics. Historical word-formation*. Berlin: Mouton 283-296.

Lowe, J.J., 2015. *Participles in Rigvedic Sanskrit: The syntax and semantics of adjectival verb forms*. OUP Oxford.

Mácha, Jakub. 2016. "Conceptual Metaphor Theory and Classical Theory: Affinities Rather than Divergences." In *From Philosophy of Fiction to Cognitive Poetics*, edited by Piotr Stalmaszczyk. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

MacLaury, R.E., 1992. From brightness to hue: An explanatory model of color-category evolution. *Current Anthropology*, 33(2), pp.137-186.

McMahan, David. 2013. *Empty vision: metaphor and visionary imagery in Mahayana Buddhism*. Routledge, 2013.

Myers, M.W., 1995. *Let the Cow Wander: Modeling the Metaphors in Veda and Vedānta* (No. 14). University of Hawaii Press.

Olivelle, P., 2008. *The Life of the Buddha*. Clay Sanskrit Series. New York University Press.

Olivelle, P., 2004. The semantic history of dharma in the middle and late Vedic periods. *Journal of Indian philosophy*, 32(5-6), 491-511.

Olivelle, P., 1997. Orgasmic rapture and divine ecstasy: the semantic history of ānanda. *Journal of Indian philosophy*, 25(2), 153-180.

Olivelle, P., 1981. Contributions to the semantic history of Saṃnyāsa. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 265-274.

Pataskar, Bhagyalata A. 2006. "Semantic analysis of the technical terms in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* meaning "adjective"". *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 59-70.

Pathak, Madhusudan Madhavlal., 1968. *Similes in the Rāmāyana*. Baroda: Maharaja Sayajirao University.

Patkar, M.M., 1980. *History of Sanskrit lexicography*. Munshiram Manoharlal.

Patton, Laurie L., 2008. "Ṛṣis imagined across difference: some possibilities for the study of conceptual metaphor in early India." *The Journal of Hindu Studies* 1, no. 1-2 : 49-76.

Philip, G., 2011. *Colouring meaning: Collocation and connotation in figurative language*. John Benjamins Publishing.

Pollock, Sheldon., 2015. Introduction to "*World Philology*". Edited by Sheldon Pollock, Benjamin A. Elman, and Ku-ming Kevin Chang. Harvard University Press

Popova, Yanna., 2005. "Image schemas and verbal synaesthesia." *From perception to meaning: Image schemas in cognitive linguistics*: pp1-26.

Radhakantadev, R., 1998. *Sabdakalpadruma* – 4 volumes. Delhi: Nag Publishers.

Raja, K.Kunjunni., 1955. "Indian Theories of Homophones and Homonyms".

Brahmavidya: Adyar Library Bulletin Vol 19. pp 193- 222.

Raja, K.Kunjunni., 1963. *Indian Theories of Meaning*. Madras: The Adyar Library and Research Centre.

Samtani, N.H., 1993. "A study of aspects of raga." in Ram Karan Sarma (ed.) *Researches in Indian and Buddhist Philosophy: Essays in Honour of Professor Alex Wayman* . pp 61-67.

Shapiro, L., 2010. *Embodied cognition*. Routledge.

Scharf, Peter M., ed. 2015. *Sanskrit syntax: Selected papers presented at the seminar on Sanskrit syntax and discourse structures, 13-15 June 2013*, Université Paris Diderot, with an updated and revised bibliography by Hans Henrich Hock. Providence: The Sanskrit Library; New Delhi: D. K. Printworld.

Sharma, R.K., 1964 (1988). *Elements of Poetry in the Mahābhārata*. University of California Press. (Reprint) Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.

Shastri, Satyavrat., 1977. Synonyms in Sanskrit. *Indologica Taurinensia*, Torino, Italy, Vol. III.

Shastri, Satyavrat., 1970. Synonyms in the Bhāgavatapurāṇa. *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*. 51, no. 1/4 (1970): 135-149.

Sivadatta, P., (ed.) 1926. *The Alankarasekhara Of Kesavamisra*. Bombay: Nirnayasagar Press.

Sowani, V. S., 1919. "The history and significance of upama." *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 1, no. 2: 87-98.

Speyer, Jacob Samuel., 1886. *Sanskrit syntax*. EJ Brill.

Steen, G., 2008. The paradox of metaphor: Why we need a three-dimensional model of metaphor. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 23(4), pp.213-241.

Steen, Gerard. 2007. *Finding metaphor in grammar and usage: A methodological analysis of theory and research*. Vol. 10. John Benjamins Publishing.

Stolova, N.I., 2015. *Cognitive linguistics and lexical change: Motion verbs from Latin to Romance* (Vol. 331). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Sudyka, Lydia., 2006. Passions of the Indigo colour. In Jaroslav Vacek (ed.) *Pandanus 06: Nature in Literature and Ritual*. Prague: Pandanus. 37-52.

Sweetser, E., 1990. From etymology to pragmatics: The mind-body metaphor in semantic structure and semantic change. *Cambridge: CUP*.

Teubert, W. (2001). Corpus linguistics and lexicography. *International journal of corpus linguistics*, 6(Special Issue), 125-153.

Tribushinina, E., 2008. *Cognitive reference points: Semantics beyond the prototypes in adjectives of space and colour*. Netherlands Graduate School of Linguistics: LOT.

Trynkowska, Anna., 2013. "Political Metaphors in the Mahākāvya: The Conceptual Metaphor the state is the human body in Māgha's Śiśupālavadhā." *Cracow Indological Studies*. Vol XV. Pp 23-36.

Turner, James., 2014. *Philology: The Forgotten Origins of the Modern Humanities*. Princeton University Press,

Turner, Mark., 1996. *The literary mind: The origins of thought and language*. Oxford University Press.

Van de Walle, L., 1993. *Pragmatics and Classical Sanskrit: A pilot study in linguistic politeness*. (Vol. 28). John Benjamins Publishing.

Venkatacharya.T., (ed.) 1979. "The Rasārṇavasudhākara of Siṃhabhūpāla. Madras: Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1979.

Viberg, Åke., 1983. "The verbs of perception: a typological study." *Linguistics* 21, no. 1 123-162.

Vogel, J.P., 1962. *The goose in Indian literature and art* (No. 2). Leiden: EJ Brill.

Vogel Claus., 1979. Indian lexicography. (A History of Indian Literature. Vol. V: Scientific and Technical Literature. Fasc. 4.). Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1979.

von Negelein, J., 1913. Atharvaprāyaścittāni. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, pp.71-120.

Wiley. Kristi. L., 2000. Colors of the Soul: By-Products of Activity or Passions?. *Philosophy East and West*, Vol. 50, No. 3. 348-366.

Williams, Joseph.M., 1976. "Synaesthetic adjectives: A possible law of semantic change." *Language* : 461-478.

Yu, N., 2008. The Chinese heart as the central faculty of cognition. Culture, body, and language: Conceptualizations of internal body organs across cultures and languages, 7 , p.131.

Appendix I – Statistics for the occurrences of the lexeme *rāga* in the three phases

Text	Emotion/Passion	Colour/Redness	Both (pun)	Doubtful / anomalous	Total instances
Rāmāyaṇa	1	7	-	1	9
Mahābhārata	108	5	-	3	116
Buddhacarita	18	-	1	-	19
Kumārasaṃbhava	3	14	-	-	17
Daśakumāracarita	42	5	2	2	52

Appendix I A. Occurrences of *rāga* in the Buddhacarita – 19 instances

[BCar, 1, 20.2](#) devā nanandurvigate 'pi **rāge** magnasya duḥkhe jagato hitāya //

[BCar, 1, 73.1](#) vidahyamānāya janāya loke **rāgāgnināyaṃ** viṣayendhanena /

[BCar, 2, 39.1](#) iṣṭeṣvaniṣṭeṣu ca kāryavatsu na **rāgadoṣāśrayatām** prapede /

[BCar, 3, 52.1](#) snehācca bhāvaṃ tanayasya buddhvā sa **rāgadoṣān** avicintya kāmścit

/

[BCar, 4, 11.1](#) śaktāścālayituṃ yūyaṃ **vītarāgān** ṛṣīnapi /

[BCar, 4, 76.2](#) jagāma yamunātīre **jātarāgaḥ** parāśaraḥ //

[BCar, 4, 94.2](#) kiṃ hi vañcayitavyaṃ **syājājatarāgasya** cetasaḥ //

[BCar, 4, 95.1](#) vañcayanti ca yadyevaṃ **jātarāgāḥ** parasparam /

[BCar, 4, 99.1](#) asaṃśayaṃ mṛtyuriti prajānato narasya **rāgo** hṛdi yasya jāyate /

[BCar, 5, 18.2](#) svajane 'nyajane ca tulyabuddhirviṣayebhyo **vinivṛttarāgadoṣaḥ** //

[BCar, 5, 26.2](#) **kṣayamakṣayadharmajātarāgaḥ** śāsisimhānavikramaḥ prapede //

[BCar, 5, 64.2](#) vasanābharaṇaistu vañcyamānaḥ puruṣaḥ strīviṣayeṣu **rāgameti** //

[BCar, 5, 65.2](#) dhruvamatra na vardhayetpramādaṃ guṇasaṃkalpahatastu **rāgameti** //

[BCar, 6, 49.1](#) sahajena viyujyante **parṇarāgeṇa** pādapāḥ /

[BCar, 7, 53.2](#) **rāgeṇa** sārdhaṃ ripuṇeva yuddhvā mokṣaṃ parīpsanti tu sattvavantaḥ

//

[BCar, 10, 28.2](#) vyatyasya **rāgādiha** hi trivargaṃ pretyeḥa ca bhraṃśamavāpnuvanti //

[BCar, 10, 32.1](#) snehena khalvetadahaṃ bravīmi **naiśvaryarāgeṇa** na vismayena /

[BCar, 12, 48.1](#) tato **rāgādbhayaṃ** dr̥ṣṭvā vairāgyācca paraṃ śivam /

[BCar, 13, 61.1](#) tallokaṃmārtam karuṇāyamāno rogeṣu **rāgādiṣu** vartamānam /

Appendix I B. Occurrences of *rāga* in the Rāmāyaṇa – 9 instances

[Rām, 2, 54, 16.2](#) idānīm api vaidehī **tadrāgā** nyastabhūṣaṇā //

[Rām, 3, 50, 16.2](#) babhau **cādityarāgeṇa** tāmram abhram ivātape //

[Rām, 4, 27, 5.1](#) **saṃdhyārāgotthitais** tāmrair anteṣv adhikapāṇḍuraiḥ /

[Rām, 5, 22, 20.1](#) **divyāṅgarāgā** vaidehi divyābharaṇabhūṣitā /

[Rām, 5, 53, 12.2](#) īsvareṇāpi yad **rāgānmayā** sītā na rakṣitā //

[Rām, 6, 39, 16.2](#) rujā cābruvato hyasya **dr̥ṣṭirāgeṇa** sūcyate //

[Rām, 6, 102, 7.1](#) **divyāṅgarāgāṃ** vaidehīm divyābharaṇabhūṣitām /

[Rām, 6, 102, 9.1](#) **divyāṅgarāgā** vaidehī divyābharaṇabhūṣitā /

[Rām, 6, 109, 2.1](#) snānāni **cāṅgarāgāṇi** vastrāṅyābharaṇāni ca /

Appendix I C. Occurrences of *rāga* in the Mahābhārata – 116 instances –

[MBh, 1, 66, 7.14](#) **kāmarāgābhibhūtasya** muneḥ pārśvaṃ jagāma sā //

[MBh, 1, 68, 79.2](#) yadṛcchayā **kāmarāgājīātā** menakayā hyasi //

[MBh, 1, 94, 14.2](#) samaṃ śasāsa bhūtāni **kāmarāgavivarjitaḥ** /

[MBh, 1, 121, 4.2](#) tadguhyadarśanād asyā **rāgo** 'jāyata cetasi /

[MBh, 1, 178, 17.6](#) dhanurdharā **rāgakṛtapratijñam** atyagnisomārkam athārkaputram /

[MBh, 1, 204, 8.7](#) muner api mano vaśyaṃ **sarāgaṃ** kurute 'ṅganā /

[MBh, 1, 212, 1.251](#) gāndharveṇa vivāhena **rāgāt** putrārthakāraṇāt /

[MBh, 1, 212, 1.253](#) gāndharvastu kriyāhīno **rāgād** eva pravartate /

[MBh, 1, 212, 1.271](#) **rāgonmādapralāpī** syād arjuno jayatām varaḥ /

[MBh, 2, 47, 22.1](#) **pramāṇarāgasparśādhyam** bāhlicīnasamudbhavam /

[MBh, 2, 58, 32.3](#) **sarāgaraktanetrā** ca tayā dīvyāmyaham tvayā //

[MBh, 3, 2, 28.1](#) snehāt **karaṇarāgas** ca prajajñe vaiśayas tathā /

[MBh, 3, 2, 29.2](#) dharmārthinaṃ tathālpō 'pi **rāgadoṣo** vināśayet //

[MBh, 3, 2, 33.1](#) **rāgābhibhūtaḥ** puruṣaḥ kāmēna parikṛṣyate /

[MBh, 3, 2, 61.2](#) **moharāgasamākrānta** indriyārthavaśānugaḥ //

[MBh, 3, 2, 76.1](#) **rāgadveṣavinirmuktā** aiśvaryaṃ devatā gatāḥ /

[MBh, 3, 5, 13.1](#) ajātasatrur hi **vimuktarāgo** dharmēnemāṃ pṛthivīm śāstu rājan /

[MBh, 3, 54, 22.1](#) manoviśuddhiṃ buddhiṃ ca bhaktiṃ **rāgaṃ** ca bhārata /

[MBh, 3, 57, 13.2](#) tathā tathāsya dyūte vai **rāgo** bhūyo 'bhivardhate //

[MBh, 3, 81, 105.2](#) taṃ prahasyābravīd devo muniṃ **rāgeṇa** mohitam /

[MBh, 3, 197, 6.1](#) akāryam kṛtavān asmi **rāgadveṣabalātkṛtaḥ** /

[MBh, 3, 198, 68.2](#) śiṣṭācāre bhavet sādḥū **rāgaḥ** śukleva vāsasi //

[MBh, 3, 201, 4.1](#) tato **rāgaḥ** prabhavati dveṣas ca tadanantaram /

[MBh, 3, 201, 5.1](#) tasya lobhābhibhūtasya **rāgadveṣahatasya** ca /

[MBh, 3, 201, 8.1](#) adharmas trividhas tasya vardhate **rāgadoṣataḥ** /

[MBh, 3, 208, 4.1](#) bhūtānām eva sarveṣāṃ yasyāṃ **rāgas** tadābhavat /

[MBh, 3, 208, 4.2](#) **rāgād** rāgeti yām āhur dvitīyāṅgirasah sutā //

[MBh, 3, 208, 4.2](#) rāgād **rāgeti** yām āhur dvitīyāṅgirasah sutā //

[MBh, 3, 247, 23.2](#) na duḥkhaṃ na sukhaṃ cāpi **rāgadveṣau** kuto mune //

[MBh, 3, 252, 1.2](#) **saroṣarāgopahatena** valgunā sarāganetreṇa natonnatabhruvā /

[MBh, 3, 252, 1.2](#) saroṣarāgopahatena valgunā **sarāganetreṇa** natonnatabhruvā /

[MBh, 3, 275, 15.1](#) yo hyasyā harṣasambhūto **mukharāgastadābhavat** /

[MBh, 4, 20, 25.1](#) pāpātmā pāpabhāvaśca **kāmarāgavaśānugaḥ** /

[MBh, 5, 36, 51.2](#) **rāgadveṣavinirmuktā** vicarantīha mokṣiṇaḥ //

[MBh, 5, 37, 33.2](#) **vikṛṣṭarāgaṃ** bahumāninaṃ cāpy etānna seveta narādhamān ṣaṭ //

[MBh, 6, 11, 13.2](#) puṣye bhavanti martyānāṃ **rāgo** lobhaśca bhārata //

[MBh, 6, 24, 56.2](#) **vītarāgabhayakrodhaḥ** sthitadhīrmunirucyate //

[MBh, 6, 24, 64.1](#) **rāgadveṣaviyuktaistu** viṣayānindriyaiścaran /

[MBh, 6, 25, 34.1](#) indriyasyendriyasyārthe **rāgadveṣau** vyavasthitau /

[MBh, 6, 26, 10.1](#) **vītarāgabhayakrodhā** manmayā māmupāśritāḥ /

[MBh, 6, 29, 11.1](#) balaṃ balavatāṃ cāhaṃ **kāmarāgavivarjitam** /

[MBh, 6, 30, 11.1](#) yadakṣaram vedavido vadanti viśanti yadyatayo **vītarāgāḥ** /

[MBh, 6, 36, 7.1](#) rajo **rāgātmakaṃ** vidhi tṛṣṇāsaṅgasamudbhavam /

[MBh, 6, 39, 5.2](#) dambhāhamkārasamyuktāḥ kāmārāgabalānvitāḥ //

[MBh, 6, 40, 23.1](#) niyatam saṅgarahitamarāgadveṣataḥ kṛtam /

[MBh, 6, 40, 51.2](#) śabdādīnviṣayāṁstyaktvā rāgadveṣau vyudasya ca //

[MBh, 6, 62, 34.1](#) rājan sattvamayo hyeṣa tamorāgavivarjitaḥ /

[MBh, 6, 92, 67.1](#) nānārāgaiḥ kambalaiśca paristomaiśca dantinām /

[MBh, 7, 47, 40.1](#) srutarudhirakṛtaikarāgavaktro bhrukuṭipuṭākuṭilo 'tisimhanādaḥ /

[MBh, 7, 61, 51.1](#) rājakāmasya mūḍhasya rāgopahatacetasah /

[MBh, 8, 6, 12.1](#) rāgo yogas tathā dākṣyaṁ nayaś cety arthasādhakāḥ /

[MBh, 9, 37, 40.1](#) tam prahasyābravīd devo munim rāgeṇa mohitam /

[MBh, 10, 2, 24.1](#) rāgāt krodhād bhayāl lobhād yo 'rthān īheta mānavah /

[MBh, 12, 9, 29.1](#) vītarāgaścarann evaṁ tuṣṭim prāpsyāmi śāśvatim /

[MBh, 12, 17, 1.2](#) asaṁtoṣah pramādaśca mado rāgo 'praśāntatā /

[MBh, 12, 47, 48.1](#) yo mohayati bhūtāni sneharāgānubandhanaiḥ /

[MBh, 12, 59, 19.1](#) tāṁstu kāmavaśam prāptān rāgo nāma samasprśat /

[MBh, 12, 59, 100.1](#) tam prajāsu vidharmāṇam rāgadveṣavaśānugam /

[MBh, 12, 116, 6.1](#) yo hyasatpragraharatiḥ sneharāgabalātkṛtaḥ /

[MBh, 12, 136, 131.2](#) sāntvitāste na budhyante rāgalobhavaśam gatāḥ //

[MBh, 12, 153, 6.2](#) rāgo dveṣastathā moho harṣah śoko 'bhimānitā /

[MBh, 12, 156, 17.2](#) rāgadveṣaprahīṇasya tyāgo bhavati nānyathā //

[MBh, 12, 156, 18.2](#) śubham karma nirākāro vītarāgatvam eva ca //

[MBh, 12, 169, 33.2](#) nāsti rāgasamaṁ duḥkham nāsti tyāgasamaṁ sukham //

[MBh, 12, 172, 31.1](#) apagatabhayarāgamohadarpo dhṛtimatibuddhisamanvitaḥ

praśāntah /

- [MBh, 12, 172, 37.2](#) ajagaracaritaṃ vrataṃ mahātmā ya iha naro 'nucared **vinītarāgaḥ** /
- [MBh, 12, 190, 8.1](#) **rāgeṇa** jāpako japyam kurute tatra mohitaḥ /
- [MBh, 12, 190, 8.2](#) yatrāsyā **rāgaḥ** patati tatra tatropajāyate //
- [MBh, 12, 192, 119.2](#) guṇāmsteṣāṃ samādatte **rāgeṇa** pratimohitaḥ //
- [MBh, 12, 192, 120.2](#) **sarāgastatra** vasati guṇāmsteṣāṃ samācaran //
- [MBh, 12, 192, 125.1](#) athavecchati **rāgātmā** sarvaṃ tad adhiṭṭhāti /
- [MBh, 12, 206, 10.1](#) tasmāt tarṣātmakād **rāgād** bījājjāyanti jantavaḥ /
- [MBh, 12, 206, 15.2](#) jāyate tad ahamkārad **rāgayuktena** cetasā //
- [MBh, 12, 206, 16.1](#) **śabdarāgācchrotram** asya jāyate bhāvitātmanaḥ /
- [MBh, 12, 206, 16.2](#) **rūparāgāt** tathā cakṣur ghrāṇaṃ gandhacikīrṣayā //
- [MBh, 12, 207, 13.1](#) **rāgotpattau** caret kṛcchram ahnastriḥ praviśed apaḥ /
- [MBh, 12, 208, 25.2](#) sa tayor apavargajño **vītarāgo** vimucyate //
- [MBh, 12, 247, 5.2](#) śaucaṃ **rāgo** laghustaikṣṇyaṃ daśamaṃ cordhvabhāgitā //
- [MBh, 12, 254, 12.1](#) iṣṭāniṣṭavimuktasya **prītirāgabahiṣkṛtaḥ** /
- [MBh, 12, 257, 5.2](#) **kāmarāgād** vihiṃsanti bahir vedyāṃ paśūnnarāḥ //
- [MBh, 12, 258, 67.1](#) **rāge** darpe ca māne ca drohe pāpe ca karmaṇi /
- [MBh, 12, 265, 5.1](#) tato **rāgaḥ** prabhavati dveṣāśca tadanantaram /
- [MBh, 12, 265, 6.1](#) lobhamohābhibhūtasya **rāgadveṣānvitasya** ca /
- [MBh, 12, 265, 9.2](#) adharmastrividhastasya vardhate **rāgamohajaḥ** //
- [MBh, 12, 284, 4.2](#) **rāgadveṣau** vivardhete hyanityatvam apaśyataḥ //
- [MBh, 12, 284, 5.1](#) **rāgadveṣābhibhūtaṃ** ca naraṃ dravyavaśānugam /
- [MBh, 12, 287, 10.1](#) **vītarāgo** jitakrodhaḥ samyag bhavati yaḥ sadā /

- [MBh, 12, 289, 11.2](#) **rāgaṃ** moham tathā sneham kāmam krodham ca kevalam /
- [MBh, 12, 289, 49.2](#) **vītarāgā** mahāprājñā dhyānādhyayanasamṣadā //
- [MBh, 12, 290, 38.2](#) **rāge** mohe ca samprāpte kvacit sattvaṃ samāśritam //
- [MBh, 12, 290, 71.2](#) **vītarāgān** yatīn siddhān vīryayuktāmstapodhanān //
- [MBh, 12, 297, 20.2](#) svadharme yatra **rāgaste** kāmam dharmo vidhīyatām //
- [MBh, 12, 308, 28.2](#) **muktarāgaścarāmyekaḥ** pade paramake sthitaḥ //
- [MBh, 12, 308, 35.2](#) nābhirajyati caiteṣu vyarthatvād **rāgadoṣayoḥ** //
- [MBh, 12, 313, 19.2](#) nirdvam̐dvo **vītarāgātmā** brahmāśramapade vaset //
- [MBh, 12, 313, 48.2](#) nautsukyam̐ nṛtagīteṣu na **rāga** upajāyate //
- [MBh, 12, 316, 6.2](#) nāsti **rāgasamam̐** duḥkham̐ nāsti tyāgasamam̐ sukham //
- [MBh, 12, 317, 6.1](#) doṣadarśī bhavet tatra yatra **rāgaḥ** pravartate /
- [MBh, 12, 337, 45.2](#) bhaviṣyasi tapoyukto na ca **rāgād** vimokṣyase //
- [MBh, 12, 337, 46.1](#) **vītarāgaśca** putraste paramātmā bhaviṣyati /
- [MBh, 13, 2, 87.1](#) sneho **rāgaśca** tandrī ca moho drohaśca kevalaḥ /
- [MBh, 13, 23, 22.2](#) kṛtam̐ karmākṛtam̐ cāpi **rāgamohena** jalpatām //
- [MBh, 13, 27, 89.1](#) madhupravāhā **ghṛtarāgoddhṛtābhir** mahormibhiḥ śobhitā
brāhmaṇaiśca
- [MBh, 13, 105, 28.1](#) nirāśiṣo nirmamā **vītarāgā** lābhālābhe tulyanindāpraśamsāḥ /
- [MBh, 13, 110, 104.1](#) jitendriyo **vītarāgo** juhvāno jātavedasam /
- [MBh, 13, 110, 125.1](#) nānāvidhasurūpābhir **nānārāgābhir** eva ca /
- [MBh, 13, 115, 11.3](#) tathā śāstreṣu niyataṃ **rāgo** hyāsvāditād bhavet //
- [MBh, 13, 132, 6.2](#) **vītarāgā** vimucyante puruṣāḥ sarvabandhanaiḥ //
- [MBh, 13, 137, 25.2](#) aho tvayādya vipreṣu **bhaktirāgaḥ** pradarśitaḥ /

[MBh, 14, 19, 5.2](#) nirdvaṃdvo **vītarāgātmā** sarvato mukta eva saḥ //

[MBh, 14, 37, 12.2](#) stambho dambho 'tha **rāgaśca** bhaktiḥ prītiḥ pramodanam //

[MBh, 14, 42, 51.1](#) **rāgaśokasamāviṣṭaṃ** pañcasrotaḥsamāvṛtam /

[MBh, 14, 45, 7.1](#) kriyākāraṇasamyuktaṃ **rāgavistāram** āyatam /

[MBh, 14, 93, 69.2](#) svargārgalaṃ lobhabījaṃ **rāgaguptaṃ** durāsadam //

[MBh, 14, 94, 25.2](#) **rāgamohānvitaḥ** so 'nte kaluṣāṃ gatim āpnute //

[MBh, 15, 1, 17.1](#) ārālikāḥ sūpakārā **rāgakhāṇḍavikāstathā** /

Appendix I D. Occurrences of *rāga* in the Kumārasambhava – 17 instances

[KumSaṃ, 1, 4.2](#) **balāhakacchedavibhaktarāgām** akālasaṃdhyām iva dhātumattām //

[KumSaṃ, 1, 33.1](#) abhyunnatānguṣṭhanakhaprabhābhir nikṣepaṇād **rāgam**

ivodgirantau /

[KumSaṃ, 3, 6.1](#) adhyāpitasyośanasāpi nītiṃ **prayuktarāgapraṇidhir** dviṣas te /

[KumSaṃ, 3, 30.2](#) **rāgeṇa** bālāruṇakomalena cūtapravāloṣṭham alaṃcakāra //

[KumSaṃ, 3, 54.1](#) āvarjitā kiṃcid iva stanābhyāṃ vāso vasānā **taruṇārkarāgam** /

[KumSaṃ, 4, 19.2](#) tam imaṃ kuru dakṣiṇetaraṃ caraṇaṃ **nirmitarāgam** ehi me //

[KumSaṃ, 5, 10.2](#) akāri tatpūrvanibaddhayā tayā **sarāgam** asyā rasanāguṇāspadam

//

[KumSaṃ, 5, 11.1](#) **viṣṭarāgād** adharān nivartitaḥ stanāṅgarāgāruṇitāc ca kandukāt /

[KumSaṃ, 5, 11.1](#) **viṣṭarāgād** adharān nivartitaḥ **stanāṅgarāgāruṇitāc** ca kandukāt /

[KumSaṃ, 7, 7.1](#) sā gaurasiddhārthaniveśavadbhir dūrvāpravālaiḥ **pratibhinnarāgam** /

[KumSaṃ, 7, 9.1](#) tām lodhrakalkena hṛtāṅgatailām **āśyānakāleyakṛtāṅgarāgām** /

[KumSaṃ, 7, 18.1](#) rekhāvibhaktaś ca vibhaktagātryāḥ

kiṃcinmadhūcchiṣṭavimrṣṭarāgaḥ /

[KumSaṃ, 7, 58.1](#) prasādhikālambitam agrapādam ākṣipyā kācid **dravarāgam** eva /

[KumSaṃ, 7, 82.1](#) tad īśadārdrāruṇagaṇḍalekham **ucchvāsikālāñjanarāgam** akṣṇoḥ /

[KumSaṃ, 7, 91.1](#) tau sandhiṣu vyañjitavṛttibhedam rasāntareṣu **pratibaddharāgam** /

[KumSaṃ, 8, 79.1](#) tatkṣaṇam viparivartitahriyor neṣyatoḥ śayanam **iddharāgayoḥ** /

[KumSaṃ, 8, 89.2](#) nirmale 'pi śayanam niśātyaye nojjhitam **caraṇarāgalāñchitam** //

- -

Appendix I E. Occurrences of rāga in the Daśakumāracarita

[DKCar, 1, 4, 12.2](#) manasābhimukhaiḥ samākuñcitai **rāgalajjāntarālavartibhiḥ** ...//

[DKCar, 1, 4, 18.1](#) tasyā manogatam **rāgodrekaṃ** ... /

[DKCar, 1, 4, 23.1](#) vivekaśūnyamatirasau **rāgātirekeṇa** ... taruṇīm .. saṃlapannatiṣṭhat

//

[DKCar, 1, 4, 24.1](#) tato **rāgāndhatayā** sumukhīkucagrahaṇe matiṃ vyadhata /

[DKCar, 1, 5, 5.1](#) yā vasantasahāyena... **kamanīyakarṇapūrasahakārapallavarāgeṇa**

...//

[DKCar, 1, 5, 14.3](#) sāpi bhartṛdārikā ... **rāgapallavitamānasā** ... haṃsabandhanam

akārṣīt /

[DKCar, 1, 5, 14.5](#) kanyākumārāvevam ... **manojarāgapūrṇamānasau** babhūvatuḥ //

[DKCar, 1, 5, 15.4](#) mātaramanugacchantī ... tadanena **bhavanmanorāgo** 'nyathā mā
bhūd iti ...nijamandiramagāt //

[DKCar, 1, 5, 24.2](#) paredyuh prabhāte vidyeśvaro

samadhikarāgarañjitasāmājikamanovṛttiṣu ...kṣaṇamatiṣṭhat /

[DKCar, 1, 5, 25.4](#) sarveṣu tadaindrajālikameva ... paśyatsu **rāgapallavitaḥṛdayena** ...
/

[DKCar, 1, 5, 25.9](#) evaṃ daivamānuṣabalena ... **suratarāgamupanayan** ...

śrāvayāmāsa //

[DKCar, 2, 1, 8.1](#) ambujāsanā ... prauḍhakandalīkuḍmālamiva **rūḍharāgarūṣitam** ...

kāntasyādharamañimadhīram ācucumba //

[DKCar, 2, 1, 9.1](#) tadārambhasphuritayā ca **rāgavṛtṭyā** bhūyo ... ratiprabandhaḥ //

[DKCar, 2, 1, 53.1](#) sa ca tāṃ ... **pratyāñiyamānarāgapūrāṃ** nyarūpayat //

[DKCar, 2, 1, 59.1](#) tasminneva kṣaṇāntare ... **pāñisparśarāgaprasārite** ... iti vācaḥ
samabhavan //

[DKCar, 2, 2, 13.1](#) eṣa hi gaṇikāmāturadhikāro ... svato **rāgāndhāya** ...vicārya

bhūyobhūyaḥ saṃyojanamiti //

[DKCar, 2, 2, 40.1](#) śrutvaitad ṛṣir **udīrṇarāgavṛttir** ...viśayopabhogenoparudhyata iti //

[DKCar, 2, 2, 55.1](#) sa tu **rāgādaśanihata** ivodbhrāmyābravīt priye kimetat //

[DKCar, 2, 2, 63.1](#) svaśaktiniṣiktaṃ **rāgamuddhṛtya** tayaiva ...

mahadvairāgyamarpitam //

[DKCar, 2, 2, 67.1](#) ṛṣimuktaśca **rāgaḥ** saṃdhyātvenāsphurat //

[DKCar, 2, 2, 318.1](#) agādhe ca **rāgasāgare** magno ... sudūram udamādyata //

[DKCar, 2, 2, 340.1](#) drṣṭvaiva **sphuradanaṅgarāgāś** ...kṣaṇamatiṣṭham //

[DKCar, 2, 3, 90.1](#) tatastasyā eva .. maddarśanātīrāgaprathamopanatena yathocitaṃ
śayanīyamabhaje //

[DKCar, 2, 3, 119.1](#) vyasījacca mattarājahaṃsavikaṇṭharāgavalgugadgādāṃ giram
vyaktamasmi vipralabdā //

[DKCar, 2, 3, 127.1](#) arīramam cānaṅgarāgapeśalaviśālalocanām //

[DKCar, 2, 3, 152.1](#) sā tathā iti ... maduktamādṛtyātrptasuratarāgaiva .. agād
antaḥpuram //

[DKCar, 2, 3, 175.1](#) prāgapi rāgāgnisākṣikamaṅgena guṇarūpā dattaiva ... jāyā //

[DKCar, 2, 5, 10.1](#) diṣṭyā cānucchiṣṭayauvanā ... nātivīśadarāgo mukhe
vidrumadyutiradharamaṇiḥ ... mamāsyāmāsaktiḥ //

[DKCar, 2, 5, 14.1](#) bhāgyamatra parīkṣiṣye iti .. kimapyāviddharāgasādhasam
lakṣasuptaḥ sthito 'smi //

[DKCar, 2, 5, 15.1](#) sāpi kimapyutkampinā trāsavismayaharāgaśaṅkāvilāsa-
vibhramavyavahitānieva śayane sacakitamaśayiṣṭa //

[DKCar, 2, 5, 16.1](#) ajaniṣṭa me rāgāviṣṭacetaso 'pi kimapi nidrā //

[DKCar, 2, 5, 71.1](#) punastamādāya ... ullasanmadana- rāgavihvalāṃ vallabhāṃ ...
mayopalabdā //

[DKCar, 2, 6, 4.1](#) so 'bhyadhata saumya ... vismṛtavindhyavāsarāgam vasantya
vindhyavāsinyāḥ pādamūlād apatyadvayam //

[DKCar, 2, 6, 43.1](#) abhuktapūrvā ... kandukamamandarāgarūṣitākṣam anaṅgam
ivālbata //

[DKCar, 2, 6, 53.1](#) evamanekakaraṇamadhuraṃ .. ghanadarśitarāgavibhramā
vidyullatāmiva viḍambayantī ... paryakṛḍata rājakanyā //

[DKCar, 2, 6, 138.1](#) raktatalāṅgulī ... vṛttamadyavibhaktarāgādharā ... ca
mūrdhajakalāpaḥ //

[DKCar, 2, 6, 207.1](#) tena randhreṇopaśliṣya rāgam ujjvalīkṛtya yathāsau...
tathopapādanīyam iti //

[DKCar, 2, 6, 293.1](#) avādicca nātha tvaddarśanād upodharāgā ... samāśvāsītāsmi //

[DKCar, 2, 7, 3.0](#) galati ca jana eṣa rāgeṇānargalenārdita ittham khalīkṛtaḥ //

[DKCar, 2, 7, 19.0](#) atha tadākarnya ... rāgalajjāntarālacāriṇī ... anaṅgasāgare kirasi //

[DKCar, 2, 7, 19.0](#) atha tadākarnya ... rāgānilacālitaraṇaraṇikātarāṅgiṇy
anaṅgasāgare kirasi //

[DKCar, 2, 7, 30.0](#) dattā ceyam cittajena garīyasā sāksīkṛtya rāgānalam //

[DKCar, 2, 7, 31.0](#) tadanenāścaryaratnena ... rāgataralenālamkriyatām hṛdayam //

[DKCar, 2, 7, 34.0](#) atha kadācid ... kālāṇḍaja-kaṇṭha-rāga-rakta-

raktādharāratiraṇāgrasaṃnāhaśīlini ... sāgaratīrakānane krīḍārasajātāsaktirāsīt //

[DKCar, 2, 7, 34.0](#) atha kadācid śālīnakanyakāntaḥkaraṇasaṃkrāntarāgalaṅghitalajje
... krīḍārasajātāsaktirāsīt //

[DKCar, 2, 7, 35.0](#) atha.. rāgatṛṣṇaikatantrastatra ... sakhījanena kanakalekhā //

[DKCar, 2, 7, 42.0](#) tena ceyam ... kanakalekhādarśanaidhitena rāgeṇārakṣyata //

[DKCar, 2, 7, 76.0](#) tattvasya hṛdayahāri ... kanyakātīrāgajanitām ... eṣa na niṣiddhaḥ //

[DKCar, 2, 8, 119.0](#) pāne 'pi nānāvidharāgabhaṅgapaṭīyasāmāsavānām āsevanāt
vilasitāni bhayārtiharaṇācca sāmgramikatvam iti //

[DKCar, 2, 8, 119.0](#) pāne 'pi nānāvidharāgabhaṅgapaṭīyasāmāsavānām āsevanāt ...
aṅgajārāgadīpanādaṅganopabhogaśaktisaṃdhuḥṣaṇam ... sāmgramikatvam iti //

[DKCar, 2, 8, 215.0](#) sa khalvasyāḥ... maddarśanarāgabaddhasādhvasāḥ... mayā
niroddhavyaḥ iti //

[DKCar, 2, 8, 216.0](#) mayāpi sasmitaḥ mañjuvādinīrāgalīnadṛṣṭīlīḍhadhairyeṇa ...
pracaṇḍavarmā iti //

Appendix II - Attestations for Aruṇa

	Red Orange	Grey Brown	Sun	Dawn	Other anomalous	Total occurrences
Rāmāyaṇa	3	8 +1*	1*	-	2	14*
Mahābhārata	7	7	-	-	4	18
Buddhacarita	-	3	-	-	-	3
Kālidāsa	8+ 1*	-	4 +1*	5	-	19
Māgha	16	-	1	-	-	17

II A – Aruṇa in the Rāmāyaṇa – 14 occurrences

tāṃ sūnyaśṛṅgāṭakaveśmarathyāṃ rajo'ruṇadvāarakapāṭayantrām || || Ay, 65, 26.3

dr̥ṣṭvā bhasmāruṇaṃ tac ca dagdhāsthithānamaṇḍalam || || Ay, 71, 8.1

bahulā bahulair varṇair nīlapītasitāruṇaiḥ || || Ay, 88, 20.2

kapotāṅgāruṇo dhūmo dr̥ṣyate pavanoddhataḥ || || Ay, 111, 6.2

nivṛttākāśāsayanāḥ puṣyanītā himāruṇāḥ || || Ār, 15, 12.1

raviṣaṃkrāntasubhāgyas tuṣārāruṇamaṇḍalaḥ || Ār, 15, 13.1

abhyavarṣan mahāmeghas tumulo gardabhāruṇaḥ || || Ār, 22, 1.2

uddhūtaś ca vinā vātaṃ reṇur jaladharāruṇaḥ || || Ār, 22, 14.1

vyomni meghā vivartante paruṣā gardabhāruṇāḥ || || Ār, 23, 4.2

veṣṭayann iva vṛkṣāgrān kapotāṅgāruṇo ghaṇaḥ || || Ki, 13, 22.2

sa dr̥ṣṭvā svāṃ tanuṃ pakṣair udgatair aruṇacchadaiḥ || Ki, 62, 9.1

pāṇḍurāruṇavarṇāni nīlamāñjiṣṭhakāni ca || Su, 55, 6.1

haritāruṇavarṇāni mahābhrāṇi cakāśire || || Su, 55, 6.2

rajaścāruṇavarṇābhaṃ subhīmam abhavad bhṛśam || Yu, 43, 15.1

II B – Aruṇa in Mahābhārata – 18 instances

tāvat suvṛttāv anamanta māyayā sattamā gā aruṇā udāvahan || 1, 3, 62.2 ||

apadhyānena sā tena dhūmāruṇasamaprabhā || 1, 224, 29.1 ||

kadalīmṛgamokāni kṛṣṇaśyāmāruṇāni ca || 2, 45, 19.1 ||

padmodaracyutarajaḥkiñjalkāruṇarañjitaiḥ || 3, 155, 51.2 ||

raktapītāruṇāḥ pārtha pādapāgragatā dvijāḥ || 3, 155, 75.1 ||

haritāruṇavarṇānām śādvalānām samantataḥ || 3, 155, 76.1 ||

tasmin girau prasravaṇopapanne himottarīyāruṇapāṇḍusānu || 3, 174, 16.1 ||

babhūva payasā siktā śāntadhūmarajo'ruṇā || 3, 179, 4.2 ||

karabhāruṇagātrāṇām harīṇām yuddhasālinām || 3, 268, 25.1 ||

grahau tāmrāruṇasīkhau prajvalantāviva sthitau ||6, 3, 24.1 ||

vyūhaḥ krauñcāruṇo nāma sarvaśatrunibarhaṇaḥ || || 6, 46, 39.2 ||

dhūmrāruṇam rajastīvram raṇabhūmiḥ samāvṛṇot || || 6, 89, 22.1

taruṇastvaruṇaprakhyāḥ saubhadraḥ paravīrahā || 7, 9, 46.1 ||

dāntāstāmrāruṇā yuktāḥ śikhaṇḍinam udāvahan || || 7, 22, 13.2

taṁ satyadhṛtim āyāntam aruṇāḥ samudāvahan || 7, 22, 32.2 ||

aruṇābhrāvṛtākāram tasmin deśe babhau viyat || 8, 32, 76.2 ||

krauñcapṛṣṭhāruṇam raudram bāṇajālam vyadṛśyata || 8, 35, 45.2 ||

aruṇām sarasvatīm prāpya papuḥ sasnuśca tajjalam || 9, 4, 49.2 ||

krauñcapṛṣṭhāruṇam raudram bāṇajālam vyadṛśyata || 8, 35, 45.2 ||

aruṇām sarasvatīm prāpya papuḥ sasnuśca tajjalam || 9, 4, 49.2 ||

aruṇām ānayāmāsa svām tanuḥ puruṣarṣabha || 9, 42, 24.2 ||

aruṇāyām mahārāja brahmahatyāpahā hi sā || 9, 42, 25.2 ||

taṁ abravīl lokagurur aruṇāyām yathāvidhi || 9, 42, 34.1 ||

iṣṭvā yathāvad balabhid aruṇāyām upāsprṣat || 9, 42, 35.2 ||

athājagāma taṃ deśaṃ kesarī kesarāruṇaḥ || 12, 117, 28.1 ||

śuklaḥ kṛṣṇastathā rakto nīlaḥ pīto 'ruṇastathā || 12, 177, 32.2 ||

namaste vajrahastāya piṅgalāyāruṇāya ca || 13, 14, 151.1 ||

śakro hyajñātarūpeṇa jaṭī bhūtvā rajo'ruṇaḥ || 13, 36, 2.1 ||

śuklaṃ kṛṣṇaṃ tathā raktaṃ nīlaṃ pītāruṇaṃ tathā || 14, 49, 46.1 ||

trailokyam abhavad rājan raviścāsīd rajo'ruṇaḥ || 14, 76, 14.2 ||

rāsabhāruṇasaṃkāśā dhanuṣmantaḥ savidyutaḥ || 14, 76, 19.1 ||

trivarnāḥ śyāmarūkṣāntāstathā bhasmāruṇaprabhāḥ || 16, 1, 5.2 ||

aruṇo dṛśyate brahman prabhātasamaye sadā || 1, 14, 21.2 ||

udyann atha sahasrāṃśur dṛṣṭvā tam aruṇaṃ prabhuḥ || 1, 14, 21.4 ||

sarvalokapradīpasya hyaruṇo 'pyamaro 'bhavat || 1, 14, 21.8 ||

aruṇaṃ cātmanaḥ pṛṣṭham āropya sa pitur gṛhāt || 1, 20, 15.15 ||

tatrāruṇaḥ sa nikṣiptaḥ diśaṃ pūrvāṃ mahādyutiḥ || 1, 20, 15.18 ||

kaśyapasya suto vidvān aruṇetyabhiviśrutaḥ || 1, 20, 15.40 ||

tataḥ pitāmahājñātaḥ sarvaṃ cakre tadāruṇaḥ || 1, 20, 15.44 ||

uditaścaiva savitā aruṇena tadāvṛtaḥ || 1, 20, 15.45 ||

aruṇaśca yathaivāsya sārathyam akarot prabhuḥ || 1, 20, 15.47 ||

janayāmāsa putrau dvāvaruṇaṃ garuḍaṃ tathā || 1, 27, 34.1 ||

aruṇastayostu vikala ādityasya puraḥsaraḥ || 1, 27, 34.2 ||

tārṣyaścāriṣṭanemiśca tathaiva garuḍāruṇau || 1, 59, 39.1 ||

vainateyastu garuḍo balavān aruṇastathā || 1, 60, 38.1 ||

aruṇasya bhāryā śyenī tu vīryavantau mahābalau || 1, 60, 67.1 ||

dvau putrau vinatāyāstu vikhyātau garuḍāruṇau || 1, 60, 67.4 ||

purastād aruṇaścaiva taruṇaḥ saṃprakāśate || 1, 99, 9.5 ||

aruṇaścāruṇiścaiva vainateyā vyavasthitāḥ || 1, 114, 62.2 ||

sakhā daśarathasyāsījjaṭāyur aruṇātmajaḥ || 3, 263, 1.2 ||

aruṇodayeṣu dr̥ṣyante śataśaḥ śalabhavrajāḥ || 6, 2, 29.2 ||

aruṇasyāgrato yānti parivārya divākaram || 6, 8, 30.2 ||

sa tena sahitastathāvaruṇena yathā raviḥ || 7, 150, 14.3 ||

aruṇaṃ darśayāmāsa grasañ jyotiḥprabhaṃ prabhuḥ || 7, 159, 43.2 ||

aruṇasya tu tasyānu jātarūpasamaprabham || 7, 159, 44.1 ||

aruṇo 'bhyudayāṃcakre tāmṛīkurvann ivāmbaram || 7, 161, 2.2 ||

sūryāruṇau yathā dr̥ṣṭvā tamo naśyati māriṣa || 8, 23, 15.1 ||

aruṇo garuḍaścaiva vṛkṣāścauṣadhibhiḥ saha || 9, 44, 14.2 ||

II C - Aruṇa in Buddhacarita – 3 occurrences

harituragaturaṅgavatturaṅgaḥ sa tu vicaranmanasīva codyamānaḥ |

aruṇaparūṣatāram antarikṣaṃ sa ca subahūni jagāma yojanāni ||5.87||

vilambakeśyo malināṃśukāmbarā nirañjanairbāṣpahatekṣaṇairmukhaiḥ |

striyo na rejurmṛjayā vinākṛtā divīva tārā rajanīkṣayāruṇāḥ ||8.21 ||

bhasmāruṇā lohitaḥinducitrāḥ khaṭvāṅgahastā haridhūmrakeśāḥ |
 lambasrajo vāraṇalambakarṇāścarmāambarāścaiva nirambarāśca ||12.21 ||

II D – Aruṇa in Kālidāsa – 19 Instances

turaga-khura-hatas' tathā hi reṇur'
 viṭapa-viṣakta-jal'ārḍra-valkaleṣu |
 patati pariṇat'āruṇa-prakāśaḥ
 śalabha-samūha iv'āśrama-drumeṣu || AS 1. 32 ||

yātyekato'staśikharam patir' oṣadhīnām
 āviṣkṛto'ruṇa-puraḥsara ekato'rkaḥ |
 tejodvayasya yugapad' vyasanodayābhyām
 loko niyamyata iv' ātmadaśāntareṣu || AS 4.2 ||

tava sucaritam' aṅgulīya nūnam
 pratanu mam'eva vibhāvyate phalena |
 aruṇa-nakha-manoharāsu tasyāś'
 cyutam' asi labdha-padam yad' aṅgulīṣu || AS 6. 11 ||

sidhyanti karmasu mahatsv'api yanniyojyāḥ
 saṃbhāvanā-guṇam' avehi tam' īśvarāṇām |
 kiṃ vā'bhaviṣyad' aruṇas' tamasām vibhettā

taṃ cet' sahasra-kiraṇo dhuri n'ākariṣyat || AS 7.4 ||

bakulāvalikā - "sakhi aruṇa-śatapatram' iva śobhate te caraṇaḥ" || mlv 3.240 ||

lagna-dvireph'āñjana-bhakti-citraṃ

mukhe madhuśrīs'tilakaṃ niveśya |

rāgeṇa bālāruṇa-komalena

cūta-pravāloṣṭham' alaṃcakāra || KS 3.30 ||

nayanāny' aruṇāni ghūrṇayan'

vacanāni skhalayan' pade pade |

asati tvayi vāruṇī-madaḥ

pramadānam'adhunā viḍambanā || KS 4.12 ||

harit'āruṇa-cāru-bandhanaḥ

kala-puṃs'kokila-śabda-sūcitaḥ |

vada samprati kasya bāṇatām

nava-cūta-prasavo gamiṣyati || KS 4.14 ||

vimucya sā hāram' ahārya-niścayā

vilola-yaṣṭi-pravilupta-candanam |

babandha bālāruṇa-babhru valkalaṃ

payodhar'otsedha-viśīrṇa-saṃhati || KS 5.8 ||

kim'ity' apāsy'ābharaṇāni yauvane
 dhṛtam tvayā vārdhaka-śobhi valkalaṃ |
 vada pradoṣe sphuṭa-candra-tārakā
 vibhāvarī yady'aruṇāya kalpate || KS 5.42 ||

tad' īśad'ārdr'āruṇa-gaṇḍa-lekham'
 ucchvāsi-kālāñjana-rāgam' akṣṇoḥ |
 vadhū-mukhaṃ klānta-yavāvataṃsam'
 ācāra-dhūma-grahaṇād babhūva || KS 7.82 ||

padmakāntim' aruṇa-tribhāgayoḥ
 saṃkramayya tava netrayor' iva |
 saṃkṣaye jagad'iva prajeśvaraḥ
 saṃharaty'aharasāv'aharpatiḥ || KS 8.30 ||

dūram' agni*-paripeya-raśminā
 vāruṇī digaruṇena bhānunā |
 bhāti kesaravat'eva maṇḍitā
 bandhujīva-tilakena kanyakā || KS 8.40 ||

vṛntāc'chlathaṃ harati puṣpam' anokahānāṃ
 saṃsrjyate sarasijair' aruṇāṃśu-bhinnaiḥ|

svābhāvikam paraguṇena vibhāta-vāyuḥ
 saurabhyam' īpsur'iva te mukha-mārutasya || RV 5.69 ||

yāvat' pratāpa-nidhir' ākramate na bhānur'
 ahnāya tāvad' aruṇena tamo nirastam |
 āyodhan'āgrasaratām tvayi vīra yāte
 kiṃ vā ripūn's'tava guruḥ svayam' ucchinatti || RV 5. 71 ||

yeṣaṃ vibhānti taruṇāruṇarāga-yogād'
 bhinnādri-gairika-taṭā iva dantakośāḥ || || 5.72|| ||

anuyayau yamaṇyajaneśvarau
 savaruṇāv'aruṇāgrasaraṃ rucā || || RV 9.6|| ||

aruṇa-rāga-niṣedhibhir' aṃśukaiḥ
 śravaṇa-labdha-padaisca yavāṅkuraiḥ |
 parabhr̥t'āvirutais'ca vilāsinaḥ
 smara-balair'abalaikarasāḥ kṛtāḥ || RV 9.43 ||

etāḥ karotpīḍita-vāridhārā
 darpāt'sakhībhir'vadaneṣu siktāḥ |
 vakretarāgrair' alakais taruṇyaś'
 cūrṇāruṇān' vāri-lavān vamanti || RV 16.66||

II E - Instances from Māgha's Śiśupālavadhā – 17 instances

dadhatsaṃdhyāruṇavyomasphurattārānukāriṇīḥ || 2.18 ||

śyāmāruṇairvāraṇadānatoyairāloḍitāḥ kāñcanabhūparāgāḥ || 3.27 ||

jvālākaṇāruṇarucā nikareṇa reṇoḥ|| || 5.55 ||

aruṇitākhilāsailavanā muhurvidadhatī pathikānparitāpinaḥ || 6.21 ||

kanakabhaṅgapiśaṅgalairdadhe sarajasāruṇakeśaracārubiḥ || 6.47 ||

adhikamaruṇimānamudvahadbhirvikasadaśītamarīciraśmijālaiḥ || 7.63 ||

navakuṅkumāruṇapayodharayā svakarāvasaktarucirāambarayā || 9.7 ||

vihitāñjalirjanatayā dadhatī vikasatkusuakusumāruṇatām || 9.14 ||

atha sāndrasāṃdhyakiraṇāruṇitaṃ harihetihūti mithunaṃ patatoḥ || 9.15 ||

timiramakhilamastaṃ tāvadevāruṇena || 11.25 ||

Aruṇajalajarājīmugdhahastāgrapādā || || 11.40 ||

līlācalatstrīcaraṇāruṇoṭpalaskhalattulākoṭīninādakomalaḥ || 12.44 ||

pravidāritāruṇataroṅgranayanakusumojjvalaḥ sphuran || 15.83 ||

ruṣāruṇīkṛtamapi tena tatksaṇaṃ nijam vapuḥ punaranayannijāṃ rucim || 17.4||

krudhā dadhattanumatilohinīmabhūtprasenajidgaja iva gairikāruṇaḥ || 17.13||

sakuṅkumairaviralamambubindubhīrgaveṣaṇaḥ pariṇatadāḍimāruṇaiḥ || 17.14 ||

siktaścāsrairubhayathā babhūvāruṇavigrahaḥ || 19.53 ||