A Cognitive Linguistic Analysis of Hindu Philosophy – The Role of Metaphor and Framing in Conceptualizing Divinity within the *Advaita Vedanta* School of Thought in Light of Swami Vivekananda's Teachings.

Suren Naicker

Abstract

In this article, I look at the metaphors employed by Swami Vivekananda to explain otherwise abstruse philosophical principles within the Hindu school of thought, with especial emphasis on the advaita Vedanta, which maintains that there is no duality of existence despite the appearance of such. Using Conceptual Metaphor Theory as a framework, and Corpus Linguistics as a tool, I explore Vivekananda's complete works and have come to the conclusion that, unlike mainstream Western religions, which employ primarily the FAMILY frame to conceptualise God, this is not so within Vivekananda's Hinduism; though he does use the said frame, he more often than not draws on the WATER frame to explain concepts, thereby deviating from the norm.

Keywords: Vivekananda; Conceptual Metaphor Theory; Vedanta

Introduction

After outlining the research problem, the theoretical framework, premised on George Lakoff's Conceptual Metaphor Theory, which fits into the general framework of the Cognitive Linguistics Enterprise, will follow. A brief outline of modern-day Hinduism will also be explicated with reference to its ancient Vedic roots, culminating in the Vedantic philosophy which Swami Vivekananda aligns himself to.

This study aims at mining a significant sub-section of an important body of work, that being *The Complete Works of Swami Vivekananda*; the corpus was read with the explicit intention of finding the various metaphors which Vivekananda used in expounding abstruse philosophical concepts mostly to a fairly green, Anglo-American audience (though not exclusively the case, but the samples chosen for the purpose of *this* study happens to be). In the 'methodology' section, it is explained how these metaphors were pin-pointed, and grouped according to themes into *frames*.

Finally, the article ends with an overview of what these metaphors and frames say about Swami Vivekananda's take on Hinduism in general, and the Vedanta philosophy specifically.

Research Problem

Lakoff's claim that there is a link between the FAMILY metaphor in religious discourse and our political ideologies is rather contentious, and does not form an important part of this article. What I am interested here is using this model to see how applicable would this framework be to other schools of religious thought. Does this polarity exist outside of a Judaeo-Christian context, which Lakoff writes about? Is he justified in claiming that frames and conceptual metaphors govern our religious thought and understanding?

More specifically, two questions are considered:

1. Are the two said family models relevant in a Hindu context – are there alternative models, family-related or otherwise, that we can base our philosophy on?

2. Even if they are relevant, do we necessarily need to explain our religious understanding in terms of frames or (family) metaphors in the first place?

Theoretical Framework

A Brief Overview of Conceptual Metaphor Theory within the Context of Cognitive Linguistics

Cognitive Linguistics (CL) was born as a reaction to the Chomskyan school of

Generative Linguistics (henceforth GL). Whilst the influence of GL can scarcely be exaggerated, CL is fast gaining ground and could rightly be referred to as a rival paradigm.

Both CL and GL actually subscribe to tenets that are rooted in very old philosophical and linguistic traditions. Panini, for example, analysed the Sanskrit language in his classical text, the *Astadhyayi*, most comprehensively and meticulously along regional, stylistic, social and pragmatic lines. Tomes have been written on syntactic, morphological and phonological rules, together with rules for variations and optionality – and indeed the deep vs surface structure phenomena (Kiparsky 1979).

Bundgaard (2003) writes about one of the early precursors to generative grammar, and rightly traces some of the fundamental claims arrogated to Chomsky back to the German philosopher Edmund Husserl, as expounded in his famous *Logical Investigations*. The said work pointed out that language reveals 'a lot about the mind' (p. 5), and that language is a discrete combinatorial system. A distinction is also made between '*Unsinn*' (senselessness) and '*Widersinn*' (nonsense). An instantiation of the former would be a statement like *Shop a go to car be in*, where both the word-order and lexical items do not make any sense; an instantiation of the latter would a statement like *Colourless green ideas sleep furioussly*, where the grammar is acceptable yet the statement is devoid of meaning. Pinker (1994) attributes the latter example to Chomsky, which he used to illustrate the dichotomy between syntax and semantics. Chomsky would also point out that an *Unsinn*-type statement is not logically possible, whereas a *Widersunn*-type statement is. Whilst Husserl would not endorse Chomsky's insistence on treating semantic phenomena almost as an epiphenomenon, we see here that this distinction is not an original one.

Bundgaard then cites Husserl as stipulating that we need to strip language of superfluous verbiage, and find out according to which *principles* language combines it constituent parts into meaningful wholes. Chomsky takes this to imply that we ultimately need to reduce rules of grammar to a finite set of phrase structure rules, analogous to mathematical formulae, which will generate all possible sentences in *any* language (Chomsky 1966). Bundgaard points out that we need to 'find *a priori* rules that specifically govern the combination of linguistics elements' (Bundgaard 2003: 14). Husserl however did not believe that an analysis of this kind should exclude

semantic considerations; in fact, according to Bundgaard, an analysis of this kind should be 'semantic through and through' (p. 10).

Husserl's analysis, then, may be regarded as a semantic combinatorial system, which is an enterprise Chomsky would indeed be averse to endorsing. In fact, it is precisely this fact that caused the rather acrimonious drift to ensue between George Lakoff and Noam Chomsky, and their subsequent ideas. This has been documented in detail by Harris (1993), and alluded to in Botha (1989). Lakoff never intended to work 'outside' the generative school by developing what he then called 'generative semantics', but Chomsky saw this as a threat to his own ideas viciously attacked Lakoff for questioning the axioms upon which generative grammar was based.

Bundgaard then goes on to detail why it is important to outline these 'syntactic templates', and illustrates how these said templates cannot dispense with what he refers to as 'global semantics', analogous to what we may call context or pragmatics. He then draws parallels between the approach suggested by Husserl and that of Leonard Talmy, pointing out that the latter claimed that a study of semantics as a genuine combinatorial system must be a systematic study of the kind of structure specified by closed-class elements, ie. linguistic elements which do not admit new members to its set. Bundgaard illustrates this with regard to how using different prepositions form different conceptual structures apropos to the open-class elements in the proposition; hence, the said preposition does more than just fulfil a *grammatical* role, as traditionally assumed.

The point of Bundgaard's article serves to illustrate that although one would traditionally take Husserl's approach to be a precursor to generative grammar, it would actually be more commensurable to draw the analogy between cognitive linguistics and the said approach, and to point out that both GL and CL date back to much older traditions, though the respective names may not have been in vogue.

In his concluding remarks, Bundgaard points out that any analysis of language would have to account for 'principles of syntactic combination' (p. 26), but one should not reduce the linguistics enterprise only to this and relegate other aspects of the combinatorial system to epiphenomena; the point is to understand and formalize how such combinations serve as a facilitating, two-way vehicle between thought and the world.

This background is relevant since it serves to illustrate how a rela-

tively modern approach to the study of language has its roots in a tradition which ante-dates Chomskyan linguistics, and should not be viewed solely as a *reaction to* the latter, as many scholars have assumed – cf. Faucconier's article, in Janssen and Redeker (1999).

CL is an enterprise quite unlike other schools of thought in that it covers a variety of themes, and the movement cannot be pinned down to a single founder. However, one of the overall goals is ultimately to show how language can give us insight into human nature and thought.

Explaining the relationship between language and the brain, therefore, is meant to explain a substantial part of human nature.

Conceptual Metaphor Theory (henceforth CMT) is one of the sub-themes within the CL paradigm. In a CL context, metaphor is defined as a mapping of a source domain onto a target domain, with concomitant restrictions like the invariance principle, which refers to the fact that these mappings must occur in a way that is 'consistent with the inherent structure of the target domain' (as defined by Lakoff 2007: 279, in Evans *et al*).

By this broad definition, phenomena like synecdoche, simile, metonymy, personification, pathetic fallacy, allegory and parable are conflated. These are primarily literary devices which serve the same purpose *conceptually*. Attempts have even made to integrate metonymy into CMT; as an aside, Goossens (1990), for example, coined the term 'metaphtonymy' in an article discussing how metaphor and metonymy interact. This is indeed a complex and contentious issue, as is the relation between metaphor and blending. It is not clear whether these are distinct processes, or whether one may be subsumed under the other – and if so, *which* is to be subsumed? In light of this contention, Lakoff and Fauconnier put out a statement clarifying their position on this.[1]

Lakoff refers to his approach as *embodied realism*, and claims that since we are embodied beings, all our thinking is based on bodily awareness, which expands to other entities and to the world as we grow older. We start off with learning conceptual metaphors, based on our experiences, which become part of the way we think. Lakoff & Johnson (1980) document various conceptual metaphors which we use in our everyday lives, without even recognizing it as such, for example by saying *I spent an hour on the computer*,

[1] Available at http://www.cogsci.ucsd.edu/~coulson/spaces/GG-final-1.pdf

we are employing a TIME IS MONEY metaphor, whereby you can 'spend' it. In later books, he explains how research in the field of neuroscience is trying to trace the neurological bases of conceptual metaphor. For example, according to this line of thinking, when we see books being piled on top of each other, we see the *height rising*, which activates one part of the brain; we also notice the amount getting *more*, which activates another part of the brain. When we see such things often enough, we start to form a minimal neural pathway between these two brain centres, and a metaphor is born. From then on, we automatically start to associate 'up' with 'more', hence the metaphor UP IS MORE, such that we understand what *The price of fuel went up* means, even though there is no necessary link between the two. Likewise, we start to associate 'up' with 'good', such that if someone is *low down*, we mean that he is immoral; when talking about God, who is the Ultimate Good, we look *up*, etc. Hence, our sense of morality also has its basis in conceptual metaphor, which is embodied (Lakoff 1996).

Lakoff also believes that conceptual metaphors are the cogs which make up frames, which govern both our political and religious views. Frames are cognitive schemas which govern the way we function in the world, and are the driving force behind the tacit rules of social decorum and the like. In Lakoff (2008), he explains various cultural narratives in light of framing and conceptual metaphor, with emphasis on how these lead us to embrace either progressive or conservative politics. Lakoff points out that:

> We can no longer conduct 21st century politics with a 17th century understanding of the mind.... In thinking, the old view comes originally from Descartes' 17th Century rationalism. A view of thought as symbolic logic was formalized by Bertrand Russell and Gottlob Frege around the turn of the 20th Century, and a rationalist interpretation was revived by Chomsky in the 1950's (Lakoff 2008: 6).

The brain gives rise to thought, amongst others, in the form of conceptual frames, image-schemas, prototypes, conceptual metaphors, and conceptual blends. The process of thinking is not algorithmic symbol manipulation, but rather neural computation, using brain mechanisms and global cognitive tools not modularised for the processing of language only. Hence, it is through our framing and conceptual metaphors that we understand the world around us.

Lakoff (1996: 245-262) postulates two models of Christianity, one based on a conservative interpretation, the other based on a liberal one – based on an overall FATHER metaphor. Lakoff's point is that we conceptualise God and His attributes metaphorically, which guides our interpretation of a sacred text like the Bible, as well as what we take our religion to stand for. He claims that there is a match between a STRICT FATHER interpretation of Christianity and conservative, right-wing politics, and consequently, between a NURTURANT PARENT interpretation of Christianity and progressive, left-wing politics.

A Brief Overview of Hindu Philosophy

Broadly speaking, Hindu philosophy can be divided into two main branches, each comprising six sub-schools, which are further divided. The finer details can be quite intricate, so what is presented here is simply a superficial overview with the purpose of contextualizing the current study and explaining where the philosophy and teachings of Swami Vivekananda fit in.

The two main branches are the heterodox and the orthodox systems (*nastika* and *astika* in Sanskrit). The primary distinguishing feature of these two systems is that the former does not accept the authority of the Vedas, whereas the latter does, with varied interpretations. Hence, for our purposes, the emphasis is on the latter, not the former, since Vivekananda (as indeed, does modern-day Hinduism) uses that as the basis for his teachings.

There are six heterodox systems of philosophy, viz.:

1. The materialistic school of Charvaka;
2. The system of the Jainas;
3. The school of presentationists;
4. The school of representationists;
5. The school of idealism; and lastly
6. The school of nihilism.

Then, there are the six orthodox schools:

1. The *Nyaya*;
2. The *Vaiseshika*;

3. The *Sankhya*;
4. The *Yoga*;
5. The *Mimamsa*; and
6. The *Vedanta*.

As mentioned, the criterion for orthodoxy here is acceptance of the Vedas and Vedic literature as the ultimate authority. In fact, most Hindus would not recognize the tenets premised on heterodoxy as being part and parcel of Hinduism. In fact, there are mutually exclusive doctrines within the orthodox schools as well. Even within the Vedic tradition, there is a distinction between *srutis* (that which is revealed via direct perception) and *smiritis* (that which is interpreted and remembered). The former constitute that body of literature which always takes precedence of the latter since the *smiritis* are written for a particular society at a particular time, and therefore not necessarily applicable to all people for all time.

Before going on to explain they key tenets of each school, it would be worth noting that the Hindu mind advocates tolerance not only within the context of intra-Hindu pluralism, but also in an inter-religious context. This is often explained via an analogy with rivers flowing into the sea: just as each river will eventually reach the sea, so will all followers of whatever path they are on eventually 'reach' God. Sivananda (1977: 217) says that they are 'like the six different roads which lead to one city'. This concept needs to be spelt out a bit for it to make sense, but the point I would like to make for now is that these systems are best understood as different perspectives of the same truth, not as different cults within the Hindu tradition. However, it is said that 'No student of Hinduism ought to be satisfied without acquiring a clear and accurate knowledge of the principle distinguishing characteristics of the six philosophical schools' (Sivananda 1977: 217).

Since these six orthodox schools of thought are all premised on Vedic literature, it is necessary to understand exactly what this refers to. The word 'Veda' simply means knowledge, and some would not even want to commit to using this term in any sense which would classify a certain body of work. A study of the Vedas forms 'generally the beginning of an advanced learning in the philosophical and religious literature of India' (Krishnananda 1973: 3).

The hymns in the Vedas are intended to invoke certain aspects of Divinity, represented by deities, which resonate different energies and are

thereby able to synchronise with different aspects of life. Hence, these energies can be summoned for executing an ideal.

The deities which represent various aspects of both God and mankind are interpreted differently by followers of Hinduism. Some see them as purely symbolic – like Lord Vishnu representing God as preserver, yet having no autonomous existence if His own – whereas others indeed see them an actual entities who ought to be propitiated. Others still do not see these as being mutually exclusive, and the comparison used is that of someone looking at a wave and focusing only on that *aspect* of the ocean. Someone may ignore the wave and focus on the ocean as the only reality, or accept that it is ephemeral, or splash about in it and enjoy it for what it is at that point in time. Nonetheless, this does not preclude someone from knowing that the wave is, in a sense, unreal, and yet still indulge in it in whatever way he deems fit.

The various schools of thought are there to cater for the different ways in which people interpret God. It is interesting to note that the tantras and the agamas deify and spiritualise aspects of the world and of human nature which many would find appalling, offensive and even perverse. However, one could argue that the Hindus believe that all is part and parcel of the Cosmic Consciousness we call God, and therefore *all* people, regardless, should be given a recipe for spiritual edification. Tantric texts, for example, would not stigmatise the prostitute for being what she is, but instead prescribe a way to *use* sex to transcend body-consciousness. However, this philosophy falls under the heterodox schools, and nevertheless it would require a more exhaustive discussion which is beyond the scope of this article.

There are four main Vedas: the Rig-Veda (comprising 10 chapters and 10 589 mantras), the Yajur Veda (comprising 40 chapters and 1 976 mantras), the Sama Veda (comprising 29 chapters and 1 875 mantras), and the Atharva Veda (comprising 20 chapters and 5 977 mantras). The Rig Veda is concerned with panegyrics to the deities. The Yajur Veda is divided into the 'black' and 'white' portions (as is the Atharva Veda). It contains sacrificial formulae, in both prose and verse, to be chanted at the performance of a sacrifice. The Sama Veda, actually, comprises sections from the Rig-Veda in song form, meant to be *sung* during various sacrificial rites. The Atharva Veda, which is genrally held to be the 'youngest' of the four Vedas, comprises mainly spells and incantations.

A Side-note on Ramakrishna's and Vivekananda's Unorthodoxy

Few appreciate that Ramakrishna was very unorthodox in his teachings, and that his teachings differ greatly from that of Vivekananda, as documented in books by Dhar (1976) and Ananyananda (1979), for example. M., the pen name of the disciple of transcribed the *Gospel*, was very uncomfortable with Vivekananda's emphasis on social welfare and service, and many of Ramakrishna's other disciples questioned his interpretation of Ramakrishna's teachings. M. confronted him directly on the issue, and was not happy with the response. His guru-bhais were very happy about his success, but 'when the content of his teachings there became known', there was a lot of dissension (Dhar 1976: 912), mostly because they thought that fame was 'getting to his head', and that Ramakrishna's teachings were being suppressed in favour of Vivekananda's. This matter was settled, partly because it was Ramakrishna himself who named Vivekananda as his successor. At one stage, Vivekananda simply told them that the people ought to understand Vivekananda first before they even begin to understand Ramakrishna.

Ramakrishna even went so far as to say that 'Even should Naren live on beef and pork, it could not harm in the least the great power of spirituality within him' (Ananyananda 1979: 134). It is a well-known fact that Vivekananda ate meat and smoked, as did Ramakrishna. When Vivekananda was taken to task on this issue by the orthodox priests and scholars he responded: 'I am surprised you take so seriously the missionaries' nonsense. . . . If the people in India want me to keep strictly to my Hindu diet, please tell them to send me a cook and money enough to keep him' (CW-5: 64); and later added that chastity and poverty are the two important vows for a monk to adhere to, and that he has never broken that.

There is a lot more to be said on this point, but as it is a digressive point, perhaps this would not be the forum to dilate upon this topic.

It is worth noting that some authorities do *not* accept the *Atharva Veda* as an authentic division. Some point to the grammar used, claiming that it is a much later form, others infer this from the fact that the word 'trayi' is often used to refer to Vedic literature in the ancient scholarship, which denotes a tripartite distinction. This interpretation is not categorically accepted either, since Vedalankar (1965: 128) claims that this could refer to the fact these texts deal with 'the three aspects of human nature: Jnana, Karma and

Upasana'. In other words, those who prefer hands-on activities would prefer the path of karma, or work; those who are of an intellectual bent, would prefer the path of Jnana, or knowledge – philosophical contemplation on the Divine; and those who are of a mystic temperament would prefer the path of worship and meditation. These are all described as different paths to the same goal.

As mentioned earlier, if one reads the Atharva Veda, one would certainly understand why orthodox scholars would want to discount this as being part and parcel of Hindu sacred literature – it is filled with spells and sacrificial rituals, many of which are for worldly gain, like wooing a lover, material success, along with charms and spells to drive away diseases and 'to injure the enemy' (Nowbath *et al* 1960: 27); furthermore, there are certain portions of the *Atharva Veda* and the Yajur Veda which 'are concerned with black magic' (Nowbath *et al* 1960: 26). There are also certain mantras to bind your lover to you, which seem to be adaptations from the mantras of the Rig Veda, used during marriage ceremonies (another reason some think this scripture must have come into the literature at a much later stage). However, despite the ritual aspect, it must also also be noted that the 15th chapter (there are 20 in this Veda) is highly philosophical and speaks of the glories of the Supreme Being.

Now, each Veda has another four divisions, known as the *Samhita*, *Brahmana*, *Aranyaka* and *Upanishad* respectively. The Vedas deal with just about every aspect of inquiry, from the mundane to the sublime. Topics like geography, logic and mathematics are dealt with. Science and astrology are too. As an aside, the 33rd chapter of the Yajur Veda talks of phenomena only recently 'discovered' (or perhaps proven would be a more accurate word), like space-time being conflated as one entity, resulting in gravitational force, the fact that the sun is the centre of the solar system, and that the earth revolves around it, the statement that only massless entities can transcend the speed of light, and a very accurate statement on how old the universe is. All these have been borne out in recent findings. In Naicker (2004) I tease this out in more detail.

The six aforementioned schools of thought are to be understood as being inter-related, even though they may seem to be ostensibly premised on mutually exclusive doctrines. Furthermore, these systems are paired together as follows:

i) The Nyaya and the Vaiseshika;
ii) The Sankhya and the Yoga;
iii) The Mimamsa and the Vedanta.

The understanding is that the Vaiseshika is seen as supplementary to the Nyaya; Yoga is a supplement to the Sankhya, etc.

A study of all these systems are actually 'necessary to understand the Vedanta' (Sivananda 1977: 218). The Nyaya, for example, sharpens the intellect and enables the seeker to grasp the fine philosophical precepts found in the Vedanta. Many would consider the Nyaya a fundamental prerequisite for all philosophical inquiry.

There are very few followers of the Vaiseshika system today. Sankhya is also seen as an anachronistic system, since Yoga is said to be based on the Sankhya principles, and has, in a sense, taken its place. Yoga is practiced by many in its practical form, though there is an over-emphasis of Hatha Yoga, which is the physical aspect of it based on certain *asanas* (postures), and has regrettably been equated with Yoga in its entirety in Western popular culture.

The Nyaya and the Vaiseshika gives an analysis of the physical world. The world is arranged into various categories, and God is said to have made the universe out of atoms and molecules. After doing this, they prescribe various methods for knowing God.

The Sankhya outlines the Hindu concept of the mind. Yoga deals with thought control and meditation techniques, and various methods of disciplining the mind and senses and senses are outlined in the various Yogic texts.

The Vedanta philosophy explains in detail the nature of God (*Brahman*, in Sanskrit), and argues that the individual soul is, in essence, identical with God. Of course, there are three schools of Vedantic thought, which will be explained further below, but the culmination of all Vedic and Vedantic thought is said to be a true understanding of our one-ness with the Cosmic Consciousness which we call God, and furthermore that the material manifestation is actually an illusion (called *Maya* in Sanskrit) which will only be understood when we reach a state of spirituality whereby we have purified our minds and perfected our character to the point of becoming one with God – this is what is understood as Enlightenment (*Samadhi* in Sanskrit – aka *Nirvana*, *Satori*, etc). Spiritual practice is seen simply a method of reclaiming

that lost identity that we have forgotten: like a wave that, though it has a name and a form of its own, is really one with the ocean.

The idea is that God with form, represented in various symbols and images, is meant for temples and temple-worship. Ashrams, on the other hand, are ideally meant to dispense with this ritualistic aspect to Hinduism, and are meant primarily for meditative practices. In practice, most ashrams still have a ritual element to them, but it is tacitly understood that this is a means to an end. Swami Vivekananda founded a famous ashram in the Himalayan mountains, called *Mayavati Ashram*, which completely dispenses with any kind of ritual-based worship, and does not have any image representing any aspect of God, for example.

Furthermore, rituals performed for self-gain actually defeat the purpose of spiritual life. Hindus believe that we are trapped in what could theoretically be an endless cycle of births and deaths, and the more materialistic we are, the more we would be dragged down into the world. The idea is to perfect oneself by loving everything equally, controlling the desires, etc. – and when one has done this, there would be no need for rebirth. We are born in this world to learn certain lessons, and if we fail in those lessons, we would have to come back until we have indeed learnt what we needed to learn. The more money we desire, the more earth-bound karma we generate, which ties us to the world more, meaning we would have to be reborn time and time again until we learn to renounce our love for Mammon. However, there are rituals meant to propitiate the goddess Lakshmi, who presides over wealth, and the belief is that she would grant material prosperity to those who pray to her. To illustrate: in many temples, there is a special kind of tree, to which you tie a red cloth and walk around eleven times – once a week. After the eleventh week, a special prayer is done. This is done specifically to find your special love and get married.

Now, it might seem contradictory that a tradition which prides itself in the advocacy of abstinence in every sense has these rituals – one to get more money, and one to get a wife/husband, but as mentioned from the Vedantic point of view this is to be understood as a means to an end. Material needs and desires are not frowned upon totally because different people have different predilections, and there are various aspects to Hinduism which caters for this. In fact, there are four stages in Hindu life, known as *brahmacharya*, *grihastha*, *varnaprashta* and *sannyas*. The first is the life of the student, where one is

required to be celibate; the second is the householder life; the third, is when one is expected to engage in selfless service to humanity (after having completed the duties of a householder, when the children are independent, and the married couple purify themselves by becoming more spiritual); and the latter entails complete renunciation of the world by donning the ochre robe, following a strict vegetarian diet and cutting off all ties with family – relying completely on God for everything. It is believed that every person is meant to go through these stages. Each stage of life has certain recommendations in order to be successful at it. For example, chastity and obedience to your teacher are important to being a good student. Sublimation of your *veerya* (explained only recently as sublimation in modern psychology) is important as your semen contains very concentrated and pure energy, which will be wasted if used sexually, and will be transformed into a profound creative force if not. Aside from ethical considerations, the eating of meat is also advised against because it dulls the mind, and induces laziness. There are various scriptures meant to be specifically for students, with concomitant rules and regulations. Just as school students find appeal in the universal charm of story-telling, some scriptures are in the form of stories, which is why we have so many epics, and the richness in symbolism is there simply because students appreciate the symbolism in a more sophisticated manner the more advanced they get.

Likewise, in the stage of married life, which is the second one mentioned above, there are various scriptures which tell of how to conduct yourself as a householder. This includes the rites and rituals that ought to be performed during the wedding ceremony, what being a good mother entails, what being a good *father* entails, etc. (Sivananda 2001). Of course, there is guidance on being a good husband and a good wife as well, together with the duties and prayers each has to do to maintain a spiritual atmosphere in the home. Key to a healthy marriage is a healthy sex life, which is what a *part* of what the Kama Sutra is meant to address.

Scriptures like the Upanishads, upon which Vedantic philosophy is based, are meant for the final two stages of life, when you have gathered life experience, with more than just a bookish knowledge of your profession, have passed the stage of material acquisition to the point where you see its futility, have conquered sexual desire, etc. It is only in this context that a reading of the said scriptures, together with their moral implications, makes any sense.

This is why Vedanta entails having a rather sophisticated view of the world, and requires standards of discipline not otherwise expedient. My point here is that there are scriptures dedicated to each and every aspect of life, even one with advice on how to fulfill your partner sexually (known as the *Kama-Sutra*: *kama* meaning 'sexual love' and *sutra* meaning 'precepts'). Hinduism, then, being described as a 'way of life' is not as clichéd as one might imagine, since every aspect of human life is catered for, but I mention this to make the point that Vedanta is to be understood as not only the culmination, but also the *transcendence* of everything else.

This is why it is said that the Vedantic ideal is to completely do away with ritualistic tendencies of any form. Vivekananda describes this ideology very boldly and unambiguously as such:

> This is the religion of non-dual philosophy. It is difficult. Struggle on! Down with all superstitions! Neither teachers nor scriptures nor gods exist. Down with temples, with priests, with gods, with incarnations, with God Himself! I am all the God that ever existed! There, stand up philosophers! No fear! Speak no more of God and [the] superstition of the world. Truth alone triumphs, and this is true. I am the Infinite (CW-1: 502).

Adi Shankara was the founder of the *Advaita Vedanta* school of thought. During his time, all six systems flourished. Hence, he had to refute these other systems in order to establish his monistic theory. Today, however, Sankhya, Vaiseshika, Mimamsa and Nyaya are virtually not practised. Hence, it is a pointless exercise to go into too much detail expounding the nuances of these systems – that in itself would require a thesis.

The Vedanta, which Vivekananda aligns himself to, was founded by an ancient sage by the name of Vyasa is said to be the founder of the Vedanta school of thought. This system is based on the writings to be found in the Upanishads, and, as explained earlier, it contains the doctrines set forth in the 'closing chapters of the Vedas', which is literally what the Upanishads are (Sivananda 1977: 270). There are 108 Upanishads, and of these there are 12 principle Upanishads.

Suffice to say, then that the Vedanta is the most satisfactory system of philosophy, and in fact, Vivekananda is of the opinion that what we refer to as

Hinduism today is tantamount to Vedanta.

There are three main sub-schools of thought which grew out of Vedantic thinking. Each proponent commented on the Upanishads in his own way and built his own philosophy. Vyasa was very critical of the Vaiseshika and Sankhya systems especially.

The Three Main Schools of Metaphysical thought within Vedantic Philosophy

According to Vivekananda himself, 'The Vedanta philosophy, as it is generally called at the present day, really comprises all the various sects that now exist in India' (CW-1: 357). He later goes in the same discourse, entitled *The Vedanta Philosophy*, he goes on to say that Vedanta really has become one and the same as Hinduism itself. The Vedanta, then, from a practical purview, forms the scriptures of the Hindus, and all systems of philosophy that are orthodox have to take it as their foundation, as mentioned above.

'All our commentators, when they want to quote a passage from the scriptures, as a rule, quote from the Vedanta' (CW-1: 357). The most well-known commentators on the Vedanta are Sankara, Ramanuja and Madhva. They founded the schools known as *Advaita*, *Visishtadvaita*, and *Dvaita Vedanta*. These may be translated roughly as 'non-dualism', 'qualified non-dualism' and 'dualism'. The conventional Hindu mind does not see a tripartite arrangement which perceives the world in three different ways, but rather as rungs on a ladder, each one necessary for understanding the other. A simple illustration would be someone who looks at the ocean and sees a massive body of water. The Advaita Vedantin would openly declare that there is only one ocean, and that the waves are ephemeral, constantly changing and certainly not real; the only reality is the ocean, from which the various waves emanate. The Visishtadvaita Vedantin would say that though the waves may have an ephemeral existence, as long as they are there in that from, we have to acknowledge their existence, short-lived as it may be. The Dvaita Vedantins would tell us that it is silly to imagine that waves and the ocean are the same thing. This might be true in some sense, but a surfer cannot go to the depth of the ocean and expect to surf – he needs the waves, and for him, their ontological status is given as axiomatic. The same goes for people studying wave-patterns, or for children who go to the beach especially to splash in the

waves. Hence, the latter is a more pragmatic philosophy, premised necessarily on dualism.

These different Vedanta systems have one common psychology, and that is, the psychology of the Sankhya system. The Sankhya psychology is very much like the psychologies of the Nyaya and Vaisheshika systems, differing only in minor particulars. This is why the latter two systems are seen as redundant today. As mentioned earlier, the Vedanta and the Sankhya are to be seen as complementary.

The Vedantists agree on three points:

- They believe in God,
- They see the Vedas as Divine revelations, and
- They believe in cycles.

The belief about cycles is as follows: all matter throughout the universe is the result primal matter (*Akasha*), and all the forces acting upon each other, is the outcome of one primal force (*Prana*). Prana acting on Akasha is *projecting* the universe. The word 'creating' in this context would be inaccurate, because the eastern concept of creation is not the same as that of the western one – whereby there was a big bang and something manifested out of nothing. No sect in India advocates such a belief, which is why projection is preferred since Hindus believe that there was an underlying stratum to all creation which has always existed, but manifests itself cyclically through the process expansion and contraction (or 'creation and destruction', or 'the big bang' and 'big crunch', or 'evolution' and 'involution').

At the beginning of a cycle, Akasha is motionless, unmanifested. Then Prana begins to act, more and more, creating grosser and grosser forms out of Akasha — plants, animals, men, stars, and so on. After some time this evolution stops and involution begins, everything being resolved back through finer and finer forms into the original Akasha and Prana, when a new cycle follows. This parallels the claims of modern physics, which postulate red shift and blue shift, and holds that the universe started with a 'big bang', and is therefore expanding, but will eventually stop expanding and start contracting, resulting in a big crunch, which will once again expand, starting with another big bang, etc. (Hawking 1995).

Within the Vedantic context, however, there is something beyond Akasha and Prana. Both can be resolved into a third thing called Mahat, the Cosmic Mind. This Cosmic Mind does not create Akasha and Prana, but *changes* itself *into* them. It ought to be evident now why the English word 'God' is problematic within the Vedantic context, but suffice to say, Mahat would either be a key property of your conventional God, or even tantamount to it.

Methodological Approach

CMT is used as a tool to analyse a body of work pertaining to Hindu philosophy, specifically focusing on the following texts:

- Vivekananda's addresses at the Parliament of Religions, convened in Chicago in September 1893;
- Vivekananda's commentary on a classical Sanskrit text by the saint Patanjali, compiled into a book entitled RAJA-YOGA;
- Transcripts of 21 of Vivekananda's discourses/lectures given across America and the UK.

The above constitute the bulk of the material found in *The Complete Works of Swami Vivekananda – Volume 1,* henceforth CW-1 (and CW-2 to refer to volume 2, etc). The edition I have used is the 'Mayavati Memorial Edition' published in 1977.

After reading through the text manually, I noted the various metaphors, and grouped them into related frames (or more accurately, perhaps, metaphors at a superordinate level). Thereafter, I searched for key words in an electronic version of the said text, just in case I may have missed some during the manual reading. A concordance program called AntConc (version 3.2.2.1w) was used for this, and a KWIC analysis was done to search for the relevant key words. Of course, human intervention was further required to check which of these words linked to phrases employing them in a metaphorical manner; conceptual metaphor is, by definition, something perceived conceptually, and therefore cannot be detected by a computer program. Sentences like

The balloon went up

and

The price went up

will be parsed in exactly the same manner by a machine, meaning that they will be considered syntactically homogenous without any appreciation for the fact that one is literal and the other not. Furthermore, specific lexemes cannot be distinguished as literal or metaphorical by the computer; cf. the use of the word 'father' in the following sentences:

Vivekananda's father was a well-known lawyer in the Calcutta region

vs

We must aspire to perfection, just as our Father in heaven is perfect.

If the corpus contained these two sentences, it would simply show two hits when 'father' is searched for. The computer has no way of 'knowing' when the word is used in a metaphorical sense, and when not – all a concordance program can do is present the user with the word, the number of times it occurs in the corpus, and with a KWIC analysis, the context in which the word occurs. As mentioned, this is why an *ex post facto* manual reading was necessary even after using the concordance program.

Results: Analysis and Discussion

The conceptual metaphors found in the texts can be grouped into 24 different frames[2]:

1. Family

'And of this Indian Mother-Church' (CW-1: 3)
'India herself, the Motherland, as she already exists' (CW-1: 3)

[2] Only a few examples are cited here for illustrative purposes – there were hundreds of instantiations throughout the text…
Text was not bold/underlined in the original.

'These, then — the Shâstras, the Guru, and the Motherland — are the three notes that mingle themselves to form the music' (CW-1, p.3)
'I thank you in the name of the mother of religions' (CW-1: 6)
'these sects were all sucked in, absorbed, and assimilated into the immense body of the mother faith' (CW-1: 8)
'Ignorance is the mother of all the evil and all the misery we see' (CW-1: 34)
'Blessed, indeed, is the woman to whom man represents the fatherhood of God. Blessed are the children who look upon their parents as Divinity manifested on earth' (CW-1: 42)
' 'Thou art our father, and wilt take us to the other shore of this ocean of ignorance' ' (CW-1: 111)
'Patanjali, the father of the Yoga philosophy' (CW-1: 125)
'Kapila, the great father of the Sânkhya philosophy' (CW-1: 165)

2. Book

'Life is infinite, one chapter of which is, 'Thy will be done,' and unless we realise all the chapters we cannot realise the whole' (CW-1: 197)
'There are all the past chapters, and this present chapter, and there are a whole lot of future chapters before him' (CW-1: 266)
'No child is born with a *tabula rasa* — with a clean, blank page — of a mind. The page has been written on previously' (CW-1: 185)

3. Water

'That shows that consciousness is only the surface of the mental ocean' (CW-1: 10)
'[…] the ocean of memory can be stirred up' (CW-1: 10)
'[…] my body is one little continuously changing body in an unbroken ocean of matter' (CW-1: 13)
'[…] each man is only a conduit for the infinite ocean of knowledge and power that lies behind mankind' (CW-1: 69)
'[…] with the help of this body you will cross the ocean of life' (CW-1: 82)
'This little wave of the Prana which represents our own energies, mental and physical, is the nearest to us of all the waves of the infinite ocean of

Prana. If we can succeed in controlling that little wave, then alone we can hope to control the whole of Prana' (CW-1: 84)

'[…] the whole universe was an ocean of thought, he and everyone else had become little thought whirlpools' (CW-1: 85)

'In an ocean there are huge waves, like mountains, then smaller waves, and still smaller, down to little bubbles, but back of all these is the infinite ocean. The bubble is connected with the infinite ocean at one end, and the huge wave at the other end. So, one may be a gigantic man, and another a little bubble, but each is connected with that infinite ocean of energy, which is the common birthright of every animal that exists' (CW-1: 87)

'Think of the universe as an ocean of ether, consisting of layer after layer of varying degrees of vibration under the action of Prana' (CW-1: 88)

'All are parts of the same ocean of Prana, they differ only in their rate of vibration' (CW-1: 89)

'[…] this world is only one drop in an infinite ocean' (CW-1: 101)

'[…] the waves in the ocean of the mind' (CW-1: 104)

'If it [the mind] is clear, and there are no waves, we shall see the bottom. The bottom of the lake is our own true Self; the lake is the Chitta and the waves the Vrittis' (CW-1: 112)

' 'One moment of company with the holy makes a ship to cross this ocean of life' ' (CW-1: 123)

'This body is the boat which will carry us to the other shore of the ocean of life' (CW-1: 124)

'[…] the Purusha so great that the whole universe seems as a drop in the ocean and falls off by its own nothingness' (CW-1: 141)

'The whole universe is one ocean of matter' (CW-1: 144)

'[…] the knowledge takes the Yogi across the ocean of birth and death' (CW-1: 164)

'[…] the infinite river of souls is flowing into the ocean of perfection, of self-realisation' (CW-1: 175)

'Supposing we are materialists, for argument's sake, we shall have to come to this, that the whole universe is simply an ocean of matter, of which you and I are like little whirlpools. Masses of matter are coming into each whirlpool, taking the whirlpool form, and coming out as matter again. The matter that is in my body may have been in yours a few years ago, or in the sun, or may have been the matter in a plant, and so on, in a continuous

state of flux. What is meant by your body and my body? It is the oneness of the body. So with thought. It is an ocean of thought, one infinite mass, in which your mind and my mind are like whirlpools' (CW-1: 213)

'[…] everyone from the highest angel to the lowest particle of matter is but an expression of that one infinite ocean' (CW-1: 214)

'There is, as it were, an infinite ocean behind, and you and I are so many waves, coming out of that infinite ocean' (CW-1: 221)

' 'As so many rivers, having their source in different mountains, roll down, crooked or straight, and at last come into the ocean — so, all these various creeds and religions, taking their start from different standpoints and running through crooked or straight courses, at last come unto THEE' ' (CW-1: 222)

'As the gentle falling of the dew at night brings support to all vegetable life, so, slowly and imperceptibly, this divine philosophy has been spread through the world for the good of mankind' (CW-1: 222)

'It is only a question of time, and time is nothing in the Infinite. It is a drop in the ocean' (CW-1: 238)

' 'As all the rivers of the world constantly pour their waters into the ocean, but the ocean's grand, majestic nature remains undisturbed and unchanged, so even though all the senses bring in sensations from nature, the ocean-like heart of the sage knows no disturbance, knows no fear.' Let miseries come in millions of rivers and happiness in hundreds! I am no slave to misery! I am no slave to happiness!' (CW-1: 262)

'I want to love where this mighty river of my love can go, the ocean of love; this rushing tremendous river of my love cannot enter into little pools, it wants the infinite ocean' (CW-1: 273)

'But you find out that it is very difficult to cross this ocean [of Maya by] yourself' (CW-1: 279)

'[They are] different little whirlpools in this ocean of mind'[3] (CW-1: 283)

'The manifold does not destroy the unity. The millions of waves do not destroy the unity of the ocean. It remains the same ocean' (CW-1: 284)

'Let us realise [that] we are the infinite power. Who put a limit to the power of mind? Let us realise we are all mind. Every drop has the whole of the ocean in it' (CW-1: 286)

[3] Brackets in original.

4. Circuit

'[…] we can send electricity to any part of the world, but we have to send it by means of wires. Nature can send a vast mass of electricity without any wires at all. Why cannot we do the same? We can send mental electricity' (CW-1: 138)

'When the mind has been trained to remain fixed on a certain internal or external location, there comes to it the power of flowing in an unbroken current […] towards that point' (CW-1: 104)

5. Cyclic Nature of Life

'[…] just as in the case of electricity the modern theory is that the power leaves the dynamo and completes the circle back to the dynamo, so with hate and love; they must come back to the source' (CW-1: 109)

'We know there is no progress in a straight line. Every soul moves, as it were, in a circle' (CW-1: 236)

6. Animal

'The human mind is like that monkey, incessantly active by its own nature' (CW-1: 97)

'As the snake is happy in giving up his old skin' (CW-1: 180)

'The organs are the horses, the mind is the rein, the intellect is the charioteer, the soul is the rider, and the body is the chariot. The master of the household, the King, the Self of man, is sitting in this chariot. If the horses are very strong and do not obey the rein, if the charioteer, the intellect, does not know how to control the horses, then the chariot will come to grief. But if the organs, the horses, are well controlled, and if the rein, the mind, is well held in the hands of the charioteer, the intellect, the chariot reaches the goal' (CW-1: 132)

7. Light vs Dark

'The lamp is constantly burning out' (CW-1: 65)

'So we must work faithfully using the prescribed methods, and light will come' (CW-1: 72)

'[…] the mind is in three states, one of which is darkness, called Tamas, found in brutes and idiots' (CW-1: 112)

8. Heat

'If you boil all their theories down, the residuum will be that' (CW-1: 84)

9. Fire

'And when it reaches the metropolis of all sensations, the brain, the whole brain, as it were, reacts, and the result is the full blaze of illumination, the perception of the Self' (CW-1: 92)

10. Conduit

'[…] each man is only a conduit for the infinite ocean of knowledge' (CW-1: 69)

'I have already spoken of the Ida and Pingala currents, flowing through either side of the spinal column' (CW-1: 94)

11. Physical Actions

'Instead of being knocked about in this universe' (CW-1: 58)

'The world is ready to give up its secrets if we only know how to knock, how to give it the necessary blow' (CW-1: 73)

12. Machine

'Breath is like the fly-wheel of this machine [referring to the body]' (CW-1: 80)

13. Power

'So Pranayama is not breathing, but controlling that power which moves the lungs' (CW-1: 85)

14. Master-slave

'[…] we shall conquer nature, we shall be masters of phenomena of nature' (CW-1: 233)

'God's children are your Master's children. [And children are but different forms of the father.] You are His servant'[4] (CW-1: 249)

15. Building

'Wherever there is life, the storehouse of infinite energy is behind it' (CW-1: 87)

'On reason we must have to lay our foundation' (CW-1: 103)

16. Journey

'The Chitta is always trying to get back to its natural pure state, but the organs draw it out. To restrain it, to check this outward tendency, and to start it on the return journey to the essence of intelligence is the first step in Yoga, because only in this way can the Chitta get into its proper course' (CW-1: 113)

'Those Yogis who do not reach perfection die and become gods; leaving the direct road they go into one of the side streets, and get these powers. Then, again, they have to be born. But he who is strong enough to withstand these temptations and go straight to the goal, becomes free' (CW-1: 163)

17. Instruments

'[…] just as by the telescope and the microscope we can increase the scope of our vision, similarly we can by Yoga bring ourselves to the state of vibration of another plane' (CW-1: 88-89)

18. Up is Better; Up is Spiritually Edified

'Whenever a prophet got into the superconscious state by heightening his emotional nature, he brought away from it not only some truths, but some

[4] Brackets in original

fanaticism also, some superstition which injured the world as much as the greatness of the teaching helped' (CW-1: 102)

'What we call knowledge is a lower state than the one beyond knowledge. You must always bear in mind that the extremes look very much alike. If a very low vibration of ether is taken as darkness, an intermediate state as light, very high vibration will be darkness again. Similarly, ignorance is the lowest state, knowledge is the middle state, and beyond knowledge is the highest state, the two extremes of which seem the same' (CW-1: 119)

19. Plant

'It [the Vedanta philosophy] is, as it were, the very flower of all the speculations and experiences and analyses, embodied in that mass of literature' (CW-1: 220)

'He [Lord Krishna] taught that a man ought to live in this world like a lotus leaf, which grows in water but is never moistened by water' (CW-1: 12)

'The seed is put in the ground, and earth and air and water are placed around it. Does the seed become the earth; or the air, or the water? No. It becomes a plant, it develops after the law of its own growth, assimilates the air, the earth, and the water, converts them into plant substance, and grows into a plant' (CW-1: 19)

'Little do these ignorant, deluded persons dream that whilst they are congratulating themselves upon their miraculous power to transform human hearts, which power they think was poured upon them by some Being above the clouds, they are sowing the seeds of future decay, of crime, of lunacy, and of death' (CW-1: 97)

'Then will all sorrows cease, all miseries vanish; the seeds for actions will be burnt, and the soul will be free forever' (CW-1: 105)

'Put a seed into the ground and it disintegrates, dissolves after a time, and out of that dissolution comes the splendid tree' (CW-1: 110)

20. Reason as Person to be Followed

'On reason we must have to lay our foundation, we must follow reason as far as it leads, and when reason fails, reason itself will show us the way to the highest plane' (CW-1: 103)

21. Institutions as Traps

'If you take my advice, do not put your neck into the trap. The moment they try to put their noose on you, get your neck out and go somewhere else' (CW-1: 267)

'We have got ourselves caught in the trap, and we will have to work out our freedom' (CW-1: 141)

22. Bondage

'Buddhism ... broke the chains of the masses' (CW-1: 257)

23. Food

'Those that only take a nibble here and a nibble there will never attain anything' (CW-1: 99)

24. Stage

'[…] sound symbols play a prominent part in the drama of human life' (CW-1: 45)

As mentioned, these metaphors are only a portion of those found, but I believe it gives an accurate overview of the crux of Vivekananda's key ideas from the said texts. Most metaphors are attached to frames which are unsurprising in the sense that they are perfectly commensurable with common sense, in sync with other schools of thought (including Occidental ones), and therefore require little explanation to be interpreted.

The FAMILY frame gives us an interesting take on how Vivekananda conceives India, Hinduism and the key exponents of the various schools of Hindu thought. He believes that India is oldest cultured society in the world, and therefore refers to it as the 'Mother-Church', 'Motherland', etc. Likewise, Hinduism being the oldest religion known to man is referred to as 'the mother of all religions', ostensibly implying that all other religions are off-shoots from this original way of life. He qualifies this later on by referring to Judaism as the oldest Occidental religion, and Hinduism as the oldest Oriental religion, and elsewhere adds Zoroastrianism: 'Three religions now stand in the world

which have come down to us from time prehistoric — Hinduism, Zoroastrianism and Judaism' (CW-1: 8). His general point though is that Hinduism is unique in that 'Judaism failed to absorb Christianity and was driven out of its place of birth by its all-conquering daughter' (CW-1: 8). Furthermore, only 'a handful of Parsees' (CW-1: 8) remain as a shadow of the grandeur that may have once been. Hinduism, however, embraced sect after sect over the thousands of years of its existence, ostensibly questioning the universality and applicability of Vedic. Yet, 'like the waters of the seashore in a tremendous earthquake it receded only for a while, only to return in an all-absorbing flood, a thousand times more vigorous, and when the tumult of the rush was over, these sects were all sucked in, absorbed, and assimilated into the immense body of the mother faith', that being Hinduism (CW-1: 8). Hence, the various schools of thought that have sprung up over the years have never become break-away factions, with the exception, perhaps, of Buddhism, though that too may need to be qualified.

Regarding the BOOK frame, Vivekananda explains nature (both human nature and the natural environment) as a kind text that, with the right kind of 'literacy', we can understand, interpret and come to grips with. The knowledge we gain from this would be, ultimately, an understanding of who we are, and where we fit in to the grander scheme of things – the realization that we are part and parcel of this universe, not a separate entity, as we think we are, whilst still in our 'illiterate' state. The means by which we would attain the kind of 'literacy' which would enable us to 'read' this book would be the various spiritual practices delineated in the various texts, specifically the eight-fold practice of Raja-yoga.

Vivekananda also describes the human mind as a 'blank page' which has been 'written on previously', and categorically declares that 'no child is born with a *tabula rasa*' (CW-1: 185); hence, he is a classical empiricist in that he subscribes to the Lockean axiom, viz. that 'there was nothing in the intellect that was not first in the senses' (Uzgalis 2010). This may sound contradictory, but can be understood if one bears in mind that Eastern thought subscribes to the doctrines of reincarnation and metempsychosis; whilst actual memories are generally eradicated after death, the predilections embedded in one's being remain. These are called *samsaras*. Even concrete memories are believed to be recorded in the ether, and can be tapped in to.

The most pervasive frame used by Vivekananda is that of WATER. The human mind (*Chitta*, in Sanskrit) is described as either as a lake, or an ocean. When the mind is active, there are 'waves' created on this ocean, and the more sensory stimulation we are subjected to, the more 'waves' we create in our minds, causing us to be more restless. When we restrain our senses, we allow these 'waves' to subside, thereby enabling this 'ocean' to subside. The aim of yoga is to get the mind to be as calm as possible, since the mind, though necessary to function in everyday life, precludes us from getting in touch with our intuitive self, which enables the individual soul (*jivatman*) to connect with the cosmos, which can be seen as the Greater Soul (*Paramatman*), of which the individual soul is a part – separate only insofar as the wave is 'separate' from the ocean. Memories are like bubbles which sink (sic) into the 'ocean', and can be called up (remembered). Memories from long ago sink deeper, but never disappear – this includes memories from previous births, which is why the 'ocean of memory' can always be 'stirred up' (CW-1: 10).

Advaita Vedanta holds that the world does not really exist. In this sense, Vivekananda may be deemed an idealist (cf. Srivastava 1973), though Vivekananda himself refused to be boxed into a category. The world as we see it is merely an illusion, and with the dawn of the relevant knowledge, we will see that what we once perceived as something real, will dissipate into nothingness – the world is just a conglomeration of ideas. In CW-1, Vivekananda alludes to an incident regarding Humphrey Davy, the famous British chemist, where whilst teaching a class he was overpowered by some kind of gas which heightened his sensory perception, and during that moment he was able to see through the *phenomenon* (the term being used in the Kantian sense) and perceive the *nounenon* behind the forms, whereby Davy described the 'whole universe' as 'an ocean of thought', and every person thereby, a 'little thought' whirlpool in this ocean (CW-1: 85).

The concept of *Prana* is an important one, and may be defined as the underlying, animating force which pervades the universe. In the context of the Raja-yoga text which Vivekananda provides a commentary on, it is important to note that this particular text is based on the Sankhya, the details of which are not important, except that there is a belief that beyond this *Prana* is something called *Purusha*, which is Supreme Intelligence. The goal then of Raja-yoga would be to tap into this cosmic *Prana* by controlling this *Prana*

housed within your own body, after which you can tap into the Purusha. Unlike *Advaita Vedanta*, the Sankhya philosophy does not subscribe to this idea of oneness. Hence, the very idea of 'merging' into an 'ocean', as the Vedantins would like to, is foreign. This is why, in *this* context, he now talks about us as housing 'little waves' of Prana, which we must control, and will enable us to tap into the 'infinite ocean' of the greater Prana, so to speak (CW-1: 84). This would give the practitioner various powers, detailed in the text. Furthermore, if we do not allow ourselves to be distracted by these powers, we would be able to tap into the Purusha, which is 'so great that the whole universe seems as a drop in the ocean', and thereby attain enlightenment (CW-1: 141).

Scarcely is there ever mention of God in Vivekananda's writings. This may be because the word connotes something foreign to Hindu philosophy. When describing the 'infinite ocean', and its 'tiny bubbles' and 'little waves' all being part of it (CW-1: 87), the analogue in this context for the ocean would be what the Western mind would call God. What marks the Hindu conception of God as different here is that people, the world, the universe (all analogues for the bubbles, waves, etc.) are not *separate* from each other, or from God; a large wave and a smaller wave are separate only in a very artificial sense, such that 'everyone from the highest angel to the lowest particle of matter is but an expression of that one infinite ocean' (CW-1: 214). The radical thing about this belief is that there is no qualitative difference between one wave and another, even if one is, for the moment, bigger than the other. Hence, every 'drop has the whole of the ocean in it' (CW-1: 286), meaning that we are really the same as each other, and indeed as God. The body we have gives us a false, temporary form, which precludes us from merging with God, like a wave that gets thrown out and 'forgets' to go back to the ocean, where it belongs. The belief is that every being will one day merge into the Cosmic Consciousness we call God, hence the proclamation that 'the infinite river of souls is flowing into the ocean of perfection' (CW-1: 175).

The CIRCUIT frame conceives of the body as a conduit for thoughts, which behaves like electricity. This does not only refer to nerve currents 'flowing' in the central nervous system, but also to the idea that certain people can transfer their feelings and thoughts to other people, as if by wireless technology. Furthermore, Vivekananda claims that the entire universe is pulsating with energy, which every person can tap into. If the prescribed

methods are followed, every person can tap into this energy and become a powerful dynamo, 'flowing in an unbroken current' (CW-1: 104).

Regarding the CYCLIC frame, Vivekananda believed that strictly speaking, there is no such thing as a straight line, even in the context of basic Euclidean geometry; it only seems that way from our limited perspective. Even motion can never occur in a straight line. He explicitly states that 'every motion is in a circle' (CW-1: 109), and illustrates this using the following hypothetical thought experiment: if we were somehow able to take an object and project it into space with enough power, and live long enough, assuming the object encounters no obstructions, would 'come back exactly to your hand'. He then concludes that any 'straight line, infinitely projected must end in a circle' (CW-1: 109). In recent times, this notion has gained increasing popularity in light of Einstein's theories of relativity, which has empirically proven that space-time is indeed curved, and that the Euclidean axioms do not apply to space-time geometry. However, Vivekananda takes this as a basis to make a metaphysical point, namely that we are all going to go back where we came from: we are on a path of learning, and will eventually end up where we started, at the very beginning of time, in a state of *sunyata* (nothingness), being one with the universe. That is why every soul moves 'in a circle' (CW-1: 236). Vivekananda also explains that the emotions and thoughts that you send out will always come back to point of origin, as it is like the power which 'leaves the dynamo and completes the circle back to the dynamo' (CW-1: 109).

Conclusion

I have not discussed the other frames as the same themes run through them in different ways, and space constraints preclude it from discussion here. The remaining metaphors listed above can be understood within this context. Nevertheless, an in-depth analysis of all the frames and their concomitant metaphors mentioned here will require scores more to be written.

The FAMILY frame was indeed used, but certainly not with the primary aim of portraying God as a father figure of some sort, or even as a nurturant parent, as can be seen from the examples cited above. Hence, Lakoff is incorrect in his prediction that our political views are necessarily based on our conceptions of the government as a parental figure, and that we

superimpose these views consistently onto our religious beliefs. Hence, Lakoff's 'guess […] that what makes conservative Christians conservative is that they interpret their religion as requiring a Strict Father model of the family' may apply to Christians and/or American politics, but does not apply in the Eastern context since there is no necessary connection between one's political views, and one's religious views (Lakoff 1996: 247-248). Also, there is no consistent family metaphor used to conceptualise God, as Lakoff predicts.

It is evident, then, that Vivekananda's interpretation of Hindu lore sets it apart from most other traditions in that there is no concept of evil, hell and punishment, for example. None of the metaphors employed frame any issue along retributive lines, and there is no notion of God as an authority figure who needs to be feared in any sense.

Though there are analogues with other Eastern traditions, what we see here is a claim that humanity is one, not only qualitatively the same as each other, but the idea is that the whole of creation is essentially a manifestation of this one essence. This is what sets *Advaita Vedanta* apart from other schools of Hindu thought, and from other religious traditions.

References

Ananyananda, S (ed) 1979. *The Life of Swami Vivekananda by his Eastern and Western Disciples. Two Volumes.* Mayavati: Advaita Ashram Press.

Botha, RP 1989. *Challenging Chomsky: The Generative Garden Game*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.

Bundgaard, PF 2003. *The Ideal Scaffolding of Language: Husserl's Fourth 'Logical Investigation' in the light of Cognitive Linguistics*. Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Chomsky, N 1966. *Cartesian Linguistics – A Chapter in the History of Rationalist Thought* . New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Dhar, SN 1976. *A Comprehensive Biography of Swami Vivekananda. Two Volumes.* Madras: Jupiter Press.

Evans, V, B Bergen & J Zinken (eds) 2007. *The Cognitive Linguistics Reader*. London: Equinox Publishing Ltd.

Gandhi, MK 1957. *An Autobiography: The Story of my Experiments with Truth*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Goossens, L. 1990. Metaphtonymy: The Interaction of Metaphor and Metonymy in Expressions for Linguistic Action, *Cognitive Linguistics* 1, 3:. 323 - 340.

Harris, RA 1993. *The Linguistics Wars*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Janssen, T & G Redeker (eds). 1999. *Cognitive Linguistics: Foundations, Scope, and Methodology*. New York: Mouton De Gruyter.

Kiparsky, P 1979. *Panini as a Variationist*. CA, Massachussetts: MIT Press.

Krishnananda, S. 1973. *A Short History of Religious and Philosophic Thought in India*. Rishikesh: Divine Life Society Press.

Krishnananda, S 1989. *Essays in Life and Eternity*. Rishikesh: Divine Life Society Press.

Lakoff, G & M Johnson 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G 1996. *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G 2008. *The Political Mind : Why You Can't Understand 21st-Century American Politics with an 18th-Century Brain*. New York: Penguin Group.

Naicker, S 2004. Science and Vedanta. *Religio – The Journal of Religious Studies at UNISA* August,2: 8 - 10.

Nikhilananda, S 1974. *The Gospel of Sri Ramakrishna*. 6th Edition. Madras: Jupiter Press.

Nowbath, RS, S Chotai & BD Lalla (eds) 1960. *The Hindu Heritage in South Africa*. Durban: South African Hindu Maha Sabha Publication.

Sivananda, S 1977. *All about Hinduism*. Rishikesh: Divine Life Society Press.

Srivastava, RP 1973. *Contemporary Indian Idealism with Special Reference to Swami Vivekananda, Sri Aurobindo and Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan*. New Delhi: Motilal Banarasdass.

Pinker, S 1994. *The Language Instinct*. New York: Penguin Books.

Uzgalis, W 2010. John Locke. In Zalta, Edward N (ed): *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy Winter 2010 Edition.* Available at: http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2010/entries/locke/. (Accessed in August 2012.)

Vedalankar, PN 1965. *A Glimpse into the Vedas*. Bombay: Vindayar Books.

Vivekananda, S 1977. *The Complete Works of Swami Vivekananda – Volumes 1-9*. Calcutta: Mayavati Press.

Suren Naicker
Department of Linguistics
University of South Africa
naicks@unisa.ac.za