CHAPTER - II
SPEECHES AS A LITERARY GENRE

Speeches have a long tradition right from the ancient period down to the present one. The skill in speaking was an important aspect of the syllabus in the ancient period. In this study my chief concern is to prove speeches or oratory as a form of literature, to establish Vivekananda as a literary artist of abiding merit and to analyse his speeches as regards their literary worth and value in the light of some specific remarks on speeches as a literary form.

Oratory, the rationale and practice of persuasive public speaking, it is immediate in its orator-audience relationship and reactions. The orator may become the voice of political or social history. A vivid instance of this way of speech is Vivekananda’s Address at ‘Parliament of Religions’ in 1893. Vivekananda’s supreme triumph lies in the art of exposition which is really a triumph of recreation. Consider one representative example—“My Life and Mission” in which he explains his mission. What is his mission? To give the Americans a picture of what India is like. He
evokes the picture of contemporary India through a very vivid image: 'It is like a gigantic building all tumbled down in ruins'. In one sentence are captured the past and the present, the embers and the ashes, the glory and the misery— that is India. He does not leave his audience there. He progresses to a hopeful state. But first the transition: 'At first sight then, there is little hope'. An oration involves a speaker, an audience, a background of time, place and other conditions, a message; transmission by voice, articulation, and bodily accompaniments; and may, or may not, have an immediate outcome.

Rhetoric or the art of oratory, is the art of using words effectively. Oratory is instrumental and practical, as distinguished from poetic or literary composition, which traditionally aims at beauty and pleasure. The orator in his purpose and technique is primarily persuasive rather than informative or entertaining. An attempt is made to change human behaviour or to strengthen convictions and attitudes. The orator would correct wrong positions of the audience and establish psychological patterns favourable to his own wishes. Arguments and rhetorical devices are used. Exposition is employed to clarify and enforce the orator's
propositions and anecdotes and illustrations are used to heighten the effect.

The orator need not be a first-rate logician, through a capacity for good, clear thought helps to penetrate into the causes and results. Effective debaters, who depend more heavily on logic, however, are not always impressive orators because superior eloquence also requires strong appeals to the motives, sentiments, and habits of the audience. Oratorical greatness is invariably identified with strong emotional phrasing and delivery. When the intellectual qualities dominate with relative absence of the affective, the oration fails just as it does when emotion sweeps aside reason.

The ideal orator is personal in his appeals and strong in ethical proofs, rather than objective or detached. He enforces his arguments by his personal commitment to his goal. In Encyclopedia Britannica, oratory is divided into four types: "(1) Forensic (2) Deliberative (3) Occasional and (4) Didactic or Philosophical" (20: 785). Classical rhetoricians divide oratory into three distinct kinds: (1) Deliberative oratory, generally calculated to persuade the audience to a particular course of action or point of view (2) Forensic, judicial, or legal oratory, concerned with the legal and quasi-legal accusation and
defense and (3) Panegyric or Epideictic oratory, concerned respectively with praise or blame. L.T. Lemon writes:

The effect of a work of literature or oratory will depend very largely upon the words an author uses to suggest his themes, describe his characters, and make a world for the reader, some sense of the possibilities of diction—word choice—is essential. (Glossary 68)

Austin says that in speaking or writing we perform simultaneously three and sometimes four speech acts: "(1) utter a sentence (2) refer to an object (3) perform an ellocutionary act (4) perform a perlocutionary act" (Abrams, 292).

Typically, forensic, or legal oratory is at its best in the defense of individual freedom and resistance to prosecution. It was the most characteristic type of oratory in ancient Athens, where laws stipulated that litigants should defend their own causes.

In the 1st century BC Rome, Cicero was the foremost forensic orator and exerted a lasting influence on later Western oratory and prose style. Demosthenes the Athenian lawyer, soldier, and statesman was a great deliberative orator.
The third division of persuasive speaking, epideictic, or ceremonial, oratory was panegyrical, declamatory, and demonstrative. Its aim was to eulogize an individual, a cause, occasion, movement, city or state, or to condemn them. Prominent in ancient Greece were the funeral orations in honour of those killed in battle. The 19th-century American speaker Daniel Webster excelled in all the three major divisions - forensic, deliberative, and epideictic oratory.

Another major type of persuasive speaking that developed later was religious oratory. For more than 1,000 years after Cicero the important orators were churchmen rather than politicians, lawyers, or military spokesmen. As delivery habits changed, so did the oratorical language. Alliteration, antithesis, parallelism, and other rhetorical figures of thought and language are sometimes carried to extremes- in speeches addressed to those highly trained in Latin and Greek language traditions. These devices gave way to the clarity of style.

Similarly, American speech inherited and then gradually discarded British oratorical techniques for its own vernacular. The later half of the 19th century, or to be more specific after 1885, when
the Indian national Congress was established, there appeared a new awareness and urgency for bringing forth the dormant strength of the nation by reinterpreting the ancient intellectual and cultural attainments in the light of the new challenges of the scientific age. The persons, who undertook the task, were inveterate fighters, sure of their purpose and confident of themselves for fulfilling the mission undertaken. In their zeal, they could not wait for the leisured labour in the study, instead they took recourse to the handy weapon of the force and immediacy of the spoken word, the weapon used with utmost success by the philosophers and prophets in the ancient Greece. It was not for nothing that the Greek thinkers and social activists had pondered over the efficacy of inspired speech with oratorical flourishes. Aristotle, the law-giver, has divided oratory into three categories as discussed above to suit the occasion and specific purposes to which oration has to be addressed. The great liberal parliamentarians and thinkers of the 18th and 19th century England used the medium for moulding and seasoning the otherwise conflicting voices of the conflicting times. Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Keshub Chandra Sen, Ranade, Sri Aurobindo, Vivekananda and M.K. Gandhi used the precedence to eloquent success and not only
buttressed the cause of Indian self-realization but even saw the dreams of a resurgent India in the heyday of the British Empire.

These speakers, eloquent, resourceful, intelligent and adequately self-educated took the Indian intelligencia as well as the common masses of people with their apparent diversity so that within a span of about five decades, India got freedom. In retrospect, we can say that the modern Saga of this onward march started in 1893 when Mahatma Gandhi went to South Africa, Sri Aurobindo came to India and Vivekananda ventured out to America to conquer the West. Those innocuous looking incidents are virtually the incidents, which conquered the world in the sense that their concerted efforts brought to an end the British Empire. It is a strange quirk of fate that it all started after the passage of the third Reforms Act in England, which filled up the English mind of an assurance that ‘Britania ruled the waves, long live the Queen’. It is in this vein that Hugh Walker opens his seminal book *The Victorian Era* and mentions that England in 1890s was in an upbeat mood with the cosy thought that the Empire was secure. The 20th century saw two leaders of World War II who applied oratorical techniques in vastly different ways with equal effect. It was primarily through his oratory
that Adolf Hitler whipped the defeated and divided Germans into a frenzy of conquest, while Winston Churchill used his no less remarkable powers to summon up in the English people their deepest historical reserves of strength. Subsequently, though the importance of persuasive speech in no way diminished, radio and television so reshaped the method of delivery that much of the theory of traditional oratory often seemed no longer to apply. Of Vivekananda's erudition and knowledge it is hardly necessary to say anything, as his books and speeches bear testimony to that. But as these are prized mostly for their contents, it is not often sufficiently realized that his literary gifts and oratorical powers were also of a very high order. It is no longer possible to have direct evidence of his oratorical gifts as no living man of high authority ever heard him speak, but we may judge its quality by contemporary references. The rapturous applause with which the whole audience greeted his first speech in the Parliament of Religions has been noted above. But it is not generally known that his speeches in America had attracted notice in high circles even before that. He delivered a lecture in a church at Annisquam, Massachusetts, in the last week of August, 1893. The local paper described it as a fine lecture. After his
appearance in the Parliament of Religion he attained fame as a great orator. An American paper *New York Critique* referred to him as 'an orator by divine right.' Still more handsome is the tribute paid by the well-known poetess, the late Harriet Monroe, who was for many years editor of *Poetry* a magazine of verse. Miss Monroe attended the World Fair in 1893, and years later in her autobiography, *A Poet's Life* recorded her impressions of the Parliament of Religions and of Swamiji:

But the handsome monk in the orange robe gave us in perfect English a masterpiece. His personality, dominant, magnetic, his voice, rich as a bronze bell; the controlled fervor of his feeling; the beauty of his message to the Western world he was facing for the first time-these combined to give us a rare and perfect moment of supreme emotion. It was human eloquence at its highest pitch. (59-60)

*The Chicago Advocate* though not a friendly critic of Swamiji on account of his attitude towards Christianity, was constrained to observe that his knowledge of English was 'as though it were his mother tongue.' Referring to the session of parliament on 19th
September, when Swamiji read his paper on Hinduism, a local paper wrote:

Great crowds of people, the most of whom were women, pressed around the doors leading to the hall of Colubus, an hour before the time stated for opening the afternoon session, for it had been announced that Swami Vivekananda, the popular Hindu Monk, who looks so much like Mc Cullough’s Othello, was to speak. (Burke, 74)

Vivekananda also possessed musical talents of a very high order. He was regularly trained in high class music and his songs not only profoundly affected Ramakrishna, but also thrilled the hearts of a Punjabi audience at Lahore. Swamiji expressed his views on art on many occasions, which show a high and clear conception of the subject. A passage may be quoted:

Art has its origin in the expression of some idea in whatever man produces. Where there is no expression of idea, however much there may be a display of colours, light and shade, perfection in drawings, high technique—and so on, it cannot be styled as true art. (16)
C.D. Narasimhaiah, in his book *The Swan and The Eagle* remarks that, the linguist’s formulations arise out of a body of written literature and spoken word yet to be rendered in writing.. S.M Banerjee writes in an article captioned “Vivekananda: Orator, Writer and Art Critic” published in the book *Vivekananda The Great Spiritual Teacher*: “His sayings and utterances are mines of literary gems, apart from their depth of philosophic content”(543). Iyengar writes in *Indian Writing in English*: “Vivekananda was among the makers of modern India what he said and wrote must therefore be cherished as our national literature” (15).

How do we define literature and identify literary qualities? What transforms or makes a verbal message into a work of art a thing of beauty a text with its own literary texture? Although a clear cut distinction between ordinary day to day communication and literary communication is not possible, yet it is an established fact that even an ordinary statement can assume literary qualities from the content. The famous example of J.L. Austin will make this point clear:

I hereby pronounce you man and wife’, can be said by a priest performing a wedding where it assumes a religious
value with no 'literariness', but the same statement can be grafted and made part of various situations, like in a play, to give it a literary or fictional value.

(Krishnaswamy, *Literary I*).

George Steiner has defined literature in negative terms he says that the language of literature is not cryptic like the language of science, it is delphic i.e. obscure, ambiguous, vague an oracular. According to Ezra Pound all great literature is simply language charged with meaning to the utmost possible degree. Jonathan Culler in his book *Literary Theory: A Very Short Introduction* says:

... works that today are studied as literature in English or Latin classes, in schools and universities were once treated not as a special kind of writing but as fine examples of the use of language and rhetoric. They were instances of a larger category of exemplary practices of writing and thinking, which included speeches, sermons, history, and philosophy. (21)

In the light of these comments and opinions it can be safely asserted that speeches have to be considered as a literary form. Literature is a mirror to life and Vivekananda's speeches deal with
various aspects of life which go beyond the barriers of caste and creed, colour and community, time and clime, and have a universal appeal which is a touchstone of great literature. Iyengar remarks:

Though verse is older than prose but in Indian English Literature, prose precedes the verse. It was only after the talented first generation of Indians learning English used prose for 'translation, petitioning..., oratory, political agitation, social reform ... etc. (History 519) that poetry written by Indians appeared on the scene. The early users of English prose fortunately were “men cast on an Olympian mould” (519) and among those rare men, Vivekananda holds a position, which beacons to immortality.

Vivekananda could have flourished into a poet of ‘great renown’ in the usual sense of the term because he possessed a sharp observant eye and a sensitive heart, which responded to every gust of feeling. He had in ample measure the qualities, which Milton thought to be the essence of great poetry and above all, he possessed the crowning poetic quality of spontaneity, which enabled him to convey his feelings in a natural, rhythmic manner. Vivekananda is a literary artist of abiding merit, although people normally group him
with the writers associated with the Indian Renaissance of the late 19th Century. Vivekananda was one of them no doubt but he was much more besides and that 'much more' is definitely the special literary propensity of his mind, which is testified by every word he uttered. Sister Christina said: "..... his was no case of abstract and prepared dissertation. Every thought was passion, every word was faith, every lecture was a torrential improvisation" (Swan and Eagle 43). Although, Swami Vivekananda claimed that he was 'first and foremost a poet', his name and fame rested mainly on his unmatched ability as an orator. He has been variously described as 'storm', 'cyclone', 'thunder', 'lightning' and 'hurricane' by those who marvel at the Man and his work. Noted Scholar C.D. Narasimhaiah in a brilliant article captioned "A Tongue Of Flame" published in his book The Swan And The Eagle says:

Vivekananda’s eloquence issued forth from a ‘tongue of flame’, but it was not the vicious rhetoric of a political agitator – he treated politics as trash – or a social reformer, but a rhetoric, which was alive with truth, reason and imagination. (42-43)
Moreover, his work can not be placed in the category called by Scott James as 'literature of information.' His work invariably belongs to the class, which may only be called 'Literature Of Power', while the former deals with the transient information, the latter with the essential universal issues of life, which have been expressed by our Upnishads and other instruments of knowledge.

Vivekananda’s works deal not with the pieces of information to be gone through and forgotten but with the varieties of life, which remain fundamentally the same, which no ‘custom can stale’. He writes about the perennial issues of vital human interest. He sings in praise of love, pity, compassion, duty and steadfast faith. What else can be the touchstone of a great literature?

Arnold believed that poetry or literature has its test in its agility to ‘form, to sustain and to move’ — to form the basic core of human goodness, to sustain that core and move men towards the formation of that core and this was exactly done by Vivekananda’s lectures. It was the necessity of the moment and paucity of time, which prompted Vivekananda to adopt the medium of speech but he raised speech to the height of transcreation. He achieved what Hitler achieved through his lectures years later for Germany and what
Churchill did with his lectures to England. They awakened their nations to the challenges of the time and this itself is the proof that Vivekananda is a literary artist, who can make a dead nation awake, arise and go on striving till the goal is gained.

Swami Vivekananda was a virtuous man skilled in speaking to use Cato's definition of an orator. His literature comprises for the most part a recorded collection of his orations, that he delivered throughout his whirlwind tour of the West for the last nine years of his life. It is a regrettable fact that many of his speeches could not be recorded. From literary point of view he was an orator first and then a writer. The power of his oratory was well acknowledged by the American and the English press. The way he taught the West the whole philosophy of Advaita Vedanta in a foreign language with all force and vitality of a simple but artistic language goes a long way to establish him as a master of rhetoric. He was the first preacher of Advaita Vedanta preaching in the West in English language, and he established the spiritual superiority of India over the West.

His speeches are Homeric in the sense that he spoke with a divine inspiration as Homer did. Time and again, he admits the divine force behind him. Even Plato affirms in his *Dialogues* the
divine inspiration of the poet. It is an inborn quality that cannot be
taught. Erasmus once said about Bernard that he was a preacher by
nature rather than by art. The same can be said about Swamiji.

Occasional oratory is a broad class that covers both epideictic
and panegyric oratory. All famous orators from the ancient Greek
Orator Pericles to modern orators like Sir Winston Churchill were
more or less either political or philosophical orators, but
Vivekananda’s oratory was a combination of all types of oratory.
Though elements of all these forms of oratory can be traced in his
speeches, he can be called by and large a philosophical orator, his
speeches at the Parliament and some other speeches in which he
defended Hinduism as forensic oratory, his speeches on the opening
and closing day of the Parliament of Religions as occasional, his
lectures on “Women in India”, “The Great Teachers of the World”,
“On Lord Buddha”, “Christ, My Master” as panegyric and others as
philosophical. But do we not find the element of forensic oratory in
his lecture “My Plan of Campaign” when he pleads his own case
before the court of the people? or do we not find the traces of
occasional oratory in his “Paper on Hinduism” when he extols
Americans? The evidence of panegyric oratory can be easily noticed
in his *Lectures from Colombo to Almora*. It does not mean that they are not so but a generic classification seems far-fetched. Above all, a Vedantic flame burns throughout his speeches. Even when he speaks on "My Master," he paints his sketch in the background of Hindu religion, culture and tradition. Therefore we may well appreciate his oratory without making a hard and fast classification of it, in the light of the guiding principles laid down by classical masters. It has not yet been discovered whether he read Cicero and Quintilian or not. But he has studied Aristotle and Plato, and both have rhetorical treatises respectively to their credit. We come to know from his travelogue, "Memoirs of European Travel" that he was well conversant with the Greek and Roman art and history in general. In it he writes in brief about Asiatic and Attic styles. Whether he studied them or not, he honoured some of their guiding principles. Ancient rhetoric consists of five parts, Invention, Disposition, Elocution, Memory and Delivery. In one form or another these are present in his oratory. He was ingenious in inventing arguments, skilled in arranging his ideas in order leading them to a logical conclusion and his memory was unique as he spoke
without any note or preparation. For the delivery and elocution he was widely praised. *Appeal Avalanche* reports:

The speaker differs in one respect in particular from some American orators. He advances his ideas with as much deliberation as a professor of mathematics demonstrates an example in algebra to his students. *(Works VII: 419)*

Before we take up his speeches and judge them in the light of the guiding principles laid down by classical masters, we must take a brief look at what makes Vivekananda sway the intelligentsia of America and the Europe. He was one of the youngest delegates in the Parliament of Religions attended by eminent scholars of the world, much older and experienced than he was. Yet he accomplished the first task of a good orator assigned by Cicero to make the audience understand in the very first attempt. One may ask what makes this alien do so in a foreign land? It is the gesture and posture of the preacher that creates the first impression on the audience. To describe his gesture at the time when he, for the first time, arose to address the Parliament, it is better to quote *St. Louis Observer* of September 21, 1893.
With his black, curly locks thrown back from his broad brow, his keen, clear eye fixed upon the audience, his long brown finger emphasizing the utterances of his vibrant voice, he looked the very image of a propagandist, and one trembled to know that such a figure stood at the head of the movement to consolidate all the disciples of Buddha and to spread 'the light of Asia. (Burke, 81)

His very gesture sent a message of universal brotherhood. He was young and dangerously handsome with his athletic physique. His unusual robe arose a curious interest in the audience. Their eyes kept staring at him. *Chicago Advocate* describes him:

In certain respects the most fascinating personality was the Brahmin monk, Swami Vivekananda with his flowing orange robe, saffron turban, smooth-shaven, shapely, handsome face, large, dark subtle penetrating eye. (Burke, 87)

The audience responded to his first address “Sisters and Brothers of America” with aplomb that lasted for a few minutes and it shows as if they were mentally prepared for it. But what did prepare them for
such reception? Obviously, it was his regal bearing, divinely radiating gesture, hypnotic posture, dress and Christ-like simplicity of manner, and above all, the blessing of Ramakrishna that prepared the ground for stirring people’s emotion to its depth. Above all it is the personality of the man that leaves the deepest and longest impression on our mind. Swamiji himself says that the personality of man is two thirds, and his intellect, his words are but one third. It is the real man, the personality of the man that runs through us. He stands identical with Aristotle who maintains that orator in the course of oration establishes an ethos, maintains a personal character which itself functions as a means of persuasion.

As for his words, they are emotionally charged, well picked up and ‘sensational’. To quote a few emotive lines from his addresses at the Parliament:

> It fills my heart with joy unspeakable to rise in response to the warm and cordial welcome which you have given us. I thank you in the name of the most ancient order of monks in the world: I thank you in the name of the mother of religions; and I thank you in the name of
millions and millions of Hindu people of all classes and sects. (*Works* I: 3)

The magnificence of the address lies in two things—first the negative capability of the speaker and second the emotive language. By using ‘us’ instead of ‘me’ he turns the welcome given to him to all. Again, he thanks but in the name of somebody else. The emphasis is on ‘millions and millions of Hindus.’ The message implied in it is that the Hindu religion is ‘stretching its arms’ to embrace all. Whatever applause is given to him, being an emulator of the *Gita*, he cannot attach himself to it. It was not he but ‘the religious consciousness of India that spoke through him.’ Secondly, the structural parallelism strengthened by the repetition of the principal clause “I thank you” creates a sonorous rhythmic effect on the mind of the audience.

He continues to whip up emotion, to erase and ease out the feelings of hatred and discrimination for the Hindu from the mind of the American people:

Allow me to call you, brethren, by that sweet name-heirs of immortal bliss-yea, the Hindu refuses to call you sinners. Ye are the children of God, the sharers of immortal bliss... Ye divinities on earth-sinners! It is a sin
to call a man so... Come up O lions, and shake off the delusion that you are sheep; you are souls immortal, spirits free, blest and eternal. *(Works I:11)*

Swamiji’s emphatic rap in the speech “Ye divinities on earth” shook the fundamental notion of the Christian that men are in a state of original sin after the fall. The speaker displays his mastery of rhetorical style by giving pauses, by repeating the image of ‘immortal bliss’ frequently and using other images like ‘ye divinities,’ ‘soul,’ ‘lion,’ ‘spirit’ to reinforce the same idea, by the artistic arrangement of words, fully charged with evocative spirit and by invocations and exclamations. He succeeded in infusing into the souls of his hearers a plea of sovereign and sublime virtue and in relieving the friction by his homeopathic treatment with words of praise. All this makes it a classical piece of oratory.

Swamiji’s language is milder and sentences are short and simple. The speech contains intensity of feeling and impetuosity:

*It matters not as long as India is true to herself and to her religion. But a blow has been struck at her heart by this awful godless West when she sends hypocrisy and atheism into her midst. Instead of sending bushels of*
abuses, carloads of vituperation and shiploads of condemnations, let an endless stream of love go forth.

(Works II: 517)

About his speeches at the Parliament, it may be said that he employed a simple style for stirring the audiences’ mind and reaching the people. He was very much conscious of the theory of decorum. Nowhere else had he delivered such a formal and enchanting address? Nowhere else had he been so much conscious of the mind of the audience, elsewhere, in most cases, he spoke what he had to say—be it appeasing or inciting to hearers. His oration, here, is an example of forensic oratory in the sense that he was pleading before a jury of all sects the case of Hinduism and of India in a logical, argumentative way rendering facts of its universality and the malady of Christian missionary’s work in India. He won the case by getting his criticism endorsed by the Parliament. If the impression of the audience is any test for successful oratory, he proved himself, beyond doubt, a successful orator. The Americans, especially women, flocked round him. Huge crowds cheered him wherever he went and whenever he spoke from his Life we come to know that he was a vast crowd puller and was made to speak at the
end of the day lest the audience should leave the venue. Hundreds of newspaper reporters flocked around him and declared him the hero of the Parliament. His command over English language was instantly recognized. *Boston Evening Transcript*, Sept. 23 wrote that he spoke excellent English. At the Parliament, he spoke in the language of the people devoid of all technicalities and obscurity. He read the English translation of Sanskrit Verse from the scriptures. Though he had a good knowledge of Latin and French he did not use Latin and French words and expressions. About his language, Marie Louise Burke writes:

He deliberately couched his message in language as simple and nontechnical as possible, for his intention was to reach the people with words and ideas meaningful to all. He was a world Teacher not a pedant. (Burke, 94)

But when the occasion called for a scholarly presentation of Hinduism, as it did at the Scientific Section, where sharp-minded philosophers, theologians and scholars came to learn and perhaps to challenge, he received so much ovation and acclamation that it made him weep.
He was conscious of the fact that to move the audience is only a preliminary task of a preacher, the task ahead is to teach the Advaita Vedanta to the West. As for the principle – to delight, it should be noted that he hardly spoke anything for this end. Whenever delight came, it came through his exemplum, fables, parables, reminiscences and anecdotes in his speech. But the purpose of all these is to teach and not to delight. For instance, he gave short address at the Parliament on “Why We Disagree” through an exemplum of the frog in the well. Each frog thinks that this little well is the whole world. So like those frogs everyone thinks that his religion is the only truth. As a matter of fact exemplum fables and parables are common in the text of a sermon. Exemplum was a popular device in the middle ages when extensive collections of it were published for use by preachers. It can also be found in Chaucer’s “The Pardoner’s Tale” in which the pardon, preaching on the thesis “Greed is the root of all evil,” uses the exemplum of three revelers who set out to find Death but find a treasure and kill one another in the attempt to get it.

Like exemplum, parable too, has always been the favourite device of a preacher. Buddha, Christ, Ramakrishna taught more
through parables and fables. Vivekananda makes his points clear by means of poetic analogy. He tells, the story of the man who wanted a ghost to work for him but who, when he had the ghost, could not keep him employed, until he gave him a curly dog's tail to straighten. By this story he draws a parallel between our case and the case in the story with the ghost. This shows how practical he is. He does not live in a fool's paradise; rather he knows the reality that he or for that matter anybody else, however great, cannot make the world free from all evils.

He uses a fable, in his lecture "Soul, God and Religion," of a cub of lion that was brought up in the flock, who ate grass and bleated like a sheep. It remained a sheep until a lion came and showed it its image in the water. So we are like that lion ignorant of our reality, bleating as a man while we are divine. The concept that man is immortal while men are dying each day is so abstruse particularly for the West in that it demands a parable or fable to make it comprehensible.

Again while speaking on the topic "What is Religion?" he simplifies the philosophy of Advaita and makes it digestible to the audience by using another fable of two birds sitting on a tree, one on
the top, another below.' The bird below was eating a sweet fruit, another a bitter one. He looked up and saw the other bird 'calm and majestic.' 'He came near the other bird' and was enveloped in the rays of light and was changed into the higher bird. And he found that there had been but one bird all the time on the tree. The lower bird was but the reflection of the one above. The story shows how we are one with the Lord. This material world is but Maya. The need is to rise above the plane of Maya and to identify ourselves with the reality. But to know the reality we need one who has realized the divinity.

His favourite rhetorical devices are: repetition of words, ideas and quotations, allusions, and references to scriptures, questions followed by answers and at times rhetorical questions, polemic development of ideas, illustrations, simple and hypothetical sentence structures, images and figures of speech. These are frequently used devices. Besides these, we cannot overlook the use of Sanskrit words, pauses, digressions and other linguistic and stylistic devices.

Swamiji belongs to the 'liberal' school of orators and bears the impact of Macaulay on his prose-style in amplitude and richness of phrasing and weight of miscellaneous learning. But there is hardly
any artifice and embellishments. That is why he abandons the severity of treatise and speaks or writes not for the specialists, as Aristotle or in modern times T.S. Eliot did, but for all. The former advocates the spread of culture and religions 'deluge the world with religion' while the latter wants to preserve it by not letting it come to the commoners. Being a preacher, he had to reach the people and hence in art he comes close to Leo Tolstoy who stressed on the aspect of communication in art. Like Donne, he is more concerned with his material—the delivery of his thoughts. He says:

What matters it whether you speak correct grammar or with fine rhetoric? What matters it whether your language is ornamental or not? The question is whether or not you have anything to give.....If you have, then give. Words but convey the gift: it is but one of the many modes. (*Works* IV: 123-24)

In some respects Vivekananda is comparable with Donne. Both are preachers and both believe in the immortality of soul. They drive home the subtle scholastic arguments through parables and exemplum as well as by the use of homely idioms and images. But Donne's language is riches in sensuousness, colour ornament and in
metaphysical images. In language, the two cannot be compared. Swamiji’s age was the Victorian age. Both spoke in the language of their own ages.

After sowing the seeds of Vedanta in America and England, Vivekananda sailed for his beloved motherland. On the way he landed first at Colombo and was accorded a warm welcome by the Hindus (Tamils) of Sri Lanka. He got an enthusiastic reception when he went from Colombo to Almora; he addressed the people at several places in between. *His Lectures from Colombo to Almora* can be grouped into deliberative oratory for he puts forth his further plan of action, his mission as well as the dual role that India has to play—of a teacher and of a student. India has to come out to teach spirituality to the West and at the same time has to be ready to learn science and technology. To establish a relation of equality, India has to give her share in the development of civilization or else she will be condemned to remain a beggar. In many respects this group of oratory differs from his Parliamentary ones or from his addresses in the West after the Parliament but internally the same flame burns. The difference is in subject, language and style.
For in India, as he himself admits, 'We are more Puranic or Tantric than Vedantic.' This shows that he was always conscious of the sense of decorum that a good orator ought to have according to Cicero and Quintilian. (Khatri, *Speeches* 60)

His satire, though 'aimed at correction of vices in religion, never tends to be lampooning. His irony is aimed at irrational practices and not at individuals. He is full of praise for Buddha and Christ but satirizes the degeneration in their religions.

From the rhetorical point of view, his lecture "My Plan of Campaign" delivered at Madras is perhaps the most powerful, moving and personal in subject. He comes out as an aggressive orator unmasking the baseness of these societies and their leaders. To meet the rhetorical need, he hurls a volley of rhetorical questions. Balanced antithesis, periodical sentences rhetorical repetition of emotive words and phrases, conversational question are some of the common devices he employed to realize the desired effect. In the kind of expository and revealing oratory, he gets full sympathy even from the reader who has nothing of the living touch of his oration.
In the praise of his land and religion he speaks in the vein of Pericles who spoke in "The Praise of Athens." In disseminating Shri Ramakrishna's teachings he is modern prototype of St. Paul who was the first apostle of Christ. As Demosthenes exhibited his persuasiveness in politics, Vivekananda showed this skill in religion and in a short time he could make more than three thousand disciples in the West. Demosthenes in his speech, "The Danger of Appeasement," creates the motion and tension through his conditional sentences- If you choose to follow his example and profess that you are at peace, I raise no objection. It is popular even today in political oratory but now it serves more the diabolical purposes of the politicians. But in Vivekananda it is positive, simple and hypothetical. For example "If Vedanta...spreads, the whole humanity will become spiritual."

Vivekananda does not let his oratory become artificial. His oratory has the burning flame of Satan's undaunted resolution and a sense of urgency. Milton dislikes oratory and therefore his God is rightly devoid of rhetorical power. Interestingly enough it is the character of Satan that appeals to Vivekananda the most in the *Paradise Lost*. But oratory as a form of literature has never died out,
it has continued in one form or another- in the oratorical speeches of fictitious characters-say in Brutus, Antonio or in the superb parody of *Pickwick Papers* or in the law court, parliament, on public pulpit, sometimes effulgent, at others subdued. However, the scientific spirit gradually began to gain ground in this genre. By the nineteenth century the scientific spirit pervaded all forms of art and literature. Moreover, the eighteenth century with its prime orators, the Younger Pitt, Charles, James Fox, Edmund Burke and Sheridan who dazzled England with their carefully polished brilliance and the nineteenth century with its preacher Newman, orators like William Thackeray, The Four Georges, John Ruskin, Victor Hugo, Randolph Churchill maintained the sanctity of oratory. Vivekananda, born and brought up in an atmosphere charged with Victorian spirit, was influenced in his oratory in one way or another by the Victorian orators and preachers. That is why he makes a scientific, psychological and humanistic interpretation of Vedanta philosophy. He is perhaps the most analytic, eclectic and scientific of all modern preachers. He has the dramatic power and sincerity of Newman. He argues like him exploring arguments with gentle insistence so as to show the self-contradiction of his opponents. His introspective honesty and
controlled irony, the modulated flow of his prose, the assimilation of a scientific spirit in his religious discourses put him among the Victorian preachers. His Movement is identical, in some respects, to the contemporary Oxford movement in England. Both aimed at reviving their respective religions from their state of decadence in which they had fallen. Like Carlyle, he preached renunciation, work and hero-worship. But Swamiji’s heroes were the two extremes—the incarnations and the downtrodden while Carlyle’s heroes were prophets, kings, poets, aristocrats and the likes. Swamiji, though no less thrilling, convincing and persuasive in the art of oratory than the modern speakers like Winston Churchill, Roosevelt and Nehru, could not get the same popularity and recognition in the literary and public field. It is partly due to the lack of modern facilities. A.N. Gilkes and R.H. Ellingworth in the *Introduction to an Anthology of Oratory* rightly comments:

> A new technique was required, and a great new age of oratory arose; ...Able now to call the world on the air preachers, statesmen and philosophers have eagerly and often magnificently, grasped the opportunity. Without the radio Churchill could not have roused the ‘buoyant
and imperturbable temper' of Britain nor created the mood he did so much to express. (6)

And partly because he is subjected to 'Indian misfortune,' Vivekananda was conscious of it and termed it as superstition. He used to say that 'If a man quotes...a Huxley, a Tyndale, or a Darwin it is swallowed without salt.' We recognized him as a prophet and philosopher only when the West gave him recognition. Hardly any serious attempt has been made to study the literary value of his speeches and writings. One may well ask if we are waiting for an English critic to give him recognition in that way.

His craftsmanship is evident in the skillful change of style. Usually, he speaks in a simple colloquial and Senecan style. Whenever he turns to India's glorious heritage of her ancient sages and impersonal scriptures, his style becomes grand and sublime to suit the grand theme. Take for example the first sentence of "The Future of India":

This is the ancient land where wisdom made its home before it went into any other country, the same India whose influx of spirituality is represented as it were, on the material plane, by rolling rivers like oceans, where
the eternal Himalayas, rising tier above tier with their snow-caps, looks as it were, into the very mysteries of heaven. (Works III: 235)

The use of phrases like 'influx of spirituality,' 'rolling rivers' with alliteration of 'r' sound; the visual image of 'eternal Himalays,' 'snow caps' coupled with the mystic feeling of the phrase 'mysteries of heaven' in this periodical sentence with swift rhythmic movement gives an effect of sublimity and grandiloquence. In many other passages the sublimity and elegance of style is achieved by the use of Sanskrit phrases and words taken from scriptures and through metaphors and similes.

He believes that 'the very sound of Sanskrit words give a prestige and a power and strength to the race.' The same can be applied to literature. As for the device of repetition- whatever form it takes, and whether simple repetition or repetition with a difference-it is a powerful weapon in Vivekananda's oratory which can be easily noticed in most of his speeches. Again, he frequently employs repetition of letters, words and aphorisms to achieve memorability and 'punch'. Another type of repetition is the repetition of subject. His principal subject is the teachings of Vedanta combined with the
concept of daridranarayana that runs through almost all the pages of his works—be it his oratory, prose writings, poems or letters. He repeats the main idea, he wants to impress upon the mind of his audience. Vivekananda’s narrative power and dramatic skill are at their best when he narrates the story of the *Ramayana*, the *Mahabharata*, the *Story of Jada Bharata* and the *Story of Prahlada* at the Shakespeare Club, California, with a marathon spell. He appears in them not as a rhetorician but as a story-teller. If he had lived longer, he might have written stories for he had expressed his longing for writing stories like *Alice in Wonderland*.

Like an accomplished craftsman, he uses metaphor, simile, images, allegory and other figures of speech. His figures are generally functional and the sense is imbued in them. See for example the use of metaphor: “freedom we talk about is the glimpse of the blue sky through the clouds and that the real freedom—the blue sky itself—is behind” (*Works* III:14). The image of ‘blue sky’ is mainly symbolic and ‘its power’ resides in the emotional and intellectual complex that it transmits via its sensuous element. Vivekananada had a great fascination for the poetry of the
Upanishads and he employs the whole range of imagery concrete and abstract.

As for diction, he introduces a panorama of Vedantic terms, least known to the Western people. And it was an arduous task to translate, explain and imprint these on the minds of the hearers. *Appeal-Avalanche* called his choice of words as 'the gems of the English language.' *Detroit Free Press* enlightens us by its on-the-spot observation;

This dusky gentleman uses poetical imagery as an artist uses colours, and the hues are laid on just where they belong, the result being somewhat bizarre in effect, and yet having a peculiar fascination. Kaleidoscopic were the swiftly succeeding logical conclusions, and the deft manipulator was rewarded for his efforts from time to time by enthusiastic applause. (*Works III: 497*)

But in the treasure of his diction, there was no dearth of words and phrases from the scriptures of other religions. His oft-quoted French phrase is raison d'etre. However he rarely uses Latin or French words, but Sanskrit and Hindi words and phrases followed by their English translation are common. The wide ranging references,
allusions and the choice of connotative words like Maya, Atma, soul, Ahur Mazada, nihilism, utilitarianism, materialism, Hegelianism, atheism, Pran, cosmic mind, Satchitananda, Henotheism, Purus, Jiva and such numerous words, variation in tone and style according to the need of the subject and occasion, the universality of the subject, systematic arrangement of thought and its artistic presentation—all these and more make his oratory a classic work of literature.

Thus from the above discussion it is clear that the literary merit of Vivekananda’s speeches is beyond question, they possess the literary qualities of denotation, connotation and suggestion. They are amusing, informative and, above all, enlightening. His sublimity of character, his concern for the spiritual upliftment of the masses, his spirit of selfless service and sacrifice and his command of the English language make his speeches a part of the world literature, which will serve as an example for the orators all over the world forever.