

ARCHETYPAL METAPHOR IN RHETORIC: THE LIGHT-DARK FAMILY

MICHAEL OSBORN

This study probes the possibilities of one form of "new criticism" occasionally mentioned by critics of rhetorical criticism—the idea that a fresh and sensitive look at the figurative language of a speech, focusing especially upon its metaphors, might yield a critical product rich and useful as some similar ventures in literary criticism.¹ For example, one could study the speeches of a man, or speeches of a certain type, or the public address of different ages, in order to determine preferred patterns of imagery or to trace the evolution of a particular image. One could even consider questions such as whether the quantity of imagery varies according to rhythms such as crisis and calm or development and deterioration within a culture.²

From this plenitude the present study selects for more extensive consideration what an earlier article has termed "archetypal metaphor."³ Investigation indicates that the archetypal metaphor of rhetorical discourse has certain characterizing features.⁴

First, archetypal metaphors are especially popular in rhetorical discourse. Within the almost limitless range of possibility for figurative association, such metaphors will be selected more frequently than non-archetypal approximations. For example, when speakers wish to place figurative value judgments upon subjects, they will more often prefer a light or darkness association over an association with Cadillac or Edsel, ivy or poison ivy, touchdown or fumble, etc.

Second, this popularity appears immune to changes wrought by time, so that the pattern of preferential selection recurs without remarkable change from one generation to another. A similar immunity belongs to archetypal metaphor considered cross-culturally, for such preferential behavior appears unaffected by cultural variation.⁵ Thus, when Dante conceives of God as a light blindingly bright, and of Hades as a place of gloomy darkness, or when Demosthenes speaks of troubled Athens as launched upon a stormy sea, the meaning comes to us clearly across the barriers raised by time and cultural change.

Third, archetypal metaphors are grounded in prominent features of experience, in objects, actions, or conditions which are inescapably salient in human consciousness. For example, death and sex are promontories in the geography of experience.

Fourth, the appeal of the archetypal metaphor is contingent upon its embodiment of basic human motivations. Vertical scale images, which project desirable objects above the listener and undesirable objects below, often seem to express symbolically man's quest for power. Such basic motivations appear to cluster naturally about prominent features of experience and to find in them symbolic expression. Thus, when a rhetorical subject is related to an archetypal metaphor, a kind of double-association occurs. The subject is associated with a prominent feature of experience, which has already become associated with basic human motivations.

This peculiar double-association may well explain a fifth characteristic, the persuasive potency of archetypal metaphors. Because of a certain universality of appeal provided by their attachment to basic, commonly shared motives, the speaker can expect such metaphors to touch the greater part of his audience.

Arising from fundamental interests of men, they in turn activate basic motivational energies within [an] audience, and if successful turn such energies into a powerful current running in favor of the speaker's recommendations. Certain archetypal combinations such as the disease-remedy metaphors are quite obvious in this respect. They provide a figurative form of the threat-reassurance cycle discussed by Hovland *et al.*⁶ Images of disease arouse strong feelings of fear; images of remedy focus that emotional energy towards the acceptance of some reassuring recommendation.

Finally, as the result of the foregoing considerations, archetypal metaphors are characterized by their prominence in rhetoric, their tendency to occupy important positions within speeches, and their especial significance within the most significant speeches of a society. One can expect to find such images developed at the most critical junctures in a speech: establishing a mood and a perspective in the introduction, reinforcing a critical argument in the body, and synthesizing the meaning and force of a speech at its conclusion.⁷ And because of their persuasive power, their potential for cross-cultural communication, and their time-proofing, one can expect the perceptive rhetorician to choose them when he wishes to effect crucial changes in societal attitude, to speak to audiences beyond his own people, or to be remembered for a speech beyond his lifetime.

This paper focuses particularly on four sources of archetypal metaphor—light and darkness, the sun, heat and cold, and the cycle of the seasons—related by their affinity in nature and by their sharing of a basic motivational grounding. The paper's organizing metaphor is of a solar system: it is most illuminating to think of these sources as a kind of spatial family in which light and darkness occupies the center, and the sun, heat and cold, and seasonal cycle sources range out from it in that order of proximity.

Light and darkness is the sun of its own archetypal system, in which the sun itself has only planetary significance. The reason for placing light and darkness at the center is that its motivational basis is shared in varying degrees by the other archetypes to be considered here. The nature of these motives and the rationale for their attachment to light and darkness are immediately apparent.

Light (and the day) relates to the fundamental struggle for survival and development. Light is a condition for sight, the most essential of man's sensory attachments to the world about him. With light and sight one is informed of his environment, can escape its dangers, can take advantage of its rewards, and can even exert some influence over its nature.⁸ Light also means the warmth and engendering power of the sun, which enable both directly and indirectly man's physical development.

In utter contrast is darkness (and the night), bringing fear of the unknown, discouraging sight, making one ignorant of his environment—vulnerable to its dangers and blind to its rewards. One is reduced to a helpless state, no longer able to control the world about him. Finally, darkness is cold, suggesting stagnation and thoughts of the grave.

What happens, therefore, when a speaker uses light and dark metaphors? Because of their strong positive and negative associations with survival and developmental motives, such metaphors express intense value judgments and may thus be expected to elicit significant value responses from an audience. When light and dark images are used together in a speech, they indicate and perpetuate the simplistic, two-valued, black-white attitudes which rhetoricians and their audiences seem so often to prefer. Thus, the present situation is darker than midnight, but the speaker's solutions will bring the dawn.

Light-dark metaphor combinations carry still another important implication which students of rhetoric appear to have neglected. There are occasions when speakers find it expedient to express an attitude of *inevitability* or *determinism* about the state of present affairs or the shape of the future. Change not simply *should have* occurred or *should* occur, but *had to* or *will* occur.

The deterministic attitude usually has more strategic value in speeches concerning the future. The speaker may wish to build a bandwagon effect: "you had better come join us: the future is going to happen just as we predict." In moments of public crisis and despondency, the speaker may wish to reassure his audience: "there's no reason to lose heart: good times are just ahead." Statements such as the latter will have not simply a public reassurance value, but also a personal rhetorical value: public declarations of confidence in a future desired by his audience will enhance the speaker's *ethos*, suggesting him as "a man of faith."

The combination of light-dark metaphors is ideally suited to symbolize such confidence and optimism, because light and dark are more than sharply contrasting environmental qualities. They are rooted in a fixed chronological process, the movement of day into night and night into day. Therefore, symbolic conceptions of the past as dark and present as light or the present as dark and the future as light always carry with them a latent element of determinism, which the speaker can bring forth according to his purpose.

Most often, it appears, this sense of historical determinism in rhetoric is tempered by conditions, and therefore can not often be equated with philosophical determinism. The latter eliminates the significance of all contingencies, and, in works such as Hegel's *Reason in History*, sees historical process as one ceaseless, remorseless flow toward a fixed end or "Absolute." Rhetorical determinism, while it also eliminates or ignores the myriad accidents and contingencies of life, nevertheless stops this reductive process one step short of philosophical determinism. It usually offers a conception of two patterned alternatives potential in historical process, depending upon a choice specified in the speech. One of those fundamental, possibly unconscious strategies of rhetoric, it therefore simplifies complex situations and facilitates choice, at the same time lending a certain dramatic significance to the rhetorical situation. If an auditor feels he is playing an important role in an elemental conflict, his gratitude for this feeling of personal significance may well predispose him in favor of the speaker's position.

The choice situation which a speaker thrusts upon his audience always concerns the acquisition of an attitude or the adoption of a solution; these forms of choice become conditions when a speech is imbued with rhetorical determinism. The speaker will say: "the present flowed from the past *because* you adopted (or did not adopt) my solutions or *because* you possessed (or did not possess) certain qualities. The future I envision will flow from the present *if* you adopt my solution or *if* you possess certain qualities." While both conditions may be present in a speech, the solutional condition is suited more to deliberative speeches, the qualitative condition more to ceremonial or inspirational speeches.

Whatever the conditions, patterns of light-dark metaphors can serve to suggest (where the determinism is left implicit) or to reinforce (where the determinism becomes explicit) the impression that some particular series of events had to or will occur. The metaphoric combination creates and strengthens this feeling by associating possibly controversial assertions concerning the inevitability of a particular process with a general, unquestionably determined cycle of nature. One could, therefore, simply classify this important work of light-dark metaphor

combinations as argument by analogy. The classification, however, seems somewhat bald, especially when qualitative conditions are the hinge upon which rhetorical determinism turns. With such conditions, the symbolic combination emerges as an analogical form significant enough to be individuated as *argument by archetype*.

To discover the reason for this special significance, one must examine more carefully the effectiveness of qualitative conditions. This effectiveness depends upon audience acceptance of a basic ethical premise, which indeed animates a good part of the public discourse of Western nations and even provides much of the rationale for the significant occurrence of such discourse in the first place. This usually invisible axiom may be reconstructed in the following form: *material conditions follow from moral causes*. If a man or state qualifies by having certain specified virtues, the present condition of well-being is explained, or a radiant future is assured. Corresponding qualities of evil in a man or state have led or will lead to correspondingly opposite material conditions.⁹ The Western quality of this submerged premise becomes apparent when one considers that the tracing of material conditions to moral causes tends to enhance the stature and responsibility of individual man within the historical process. The world is made to turn upon the struggle between good and evil within the human soul, giving a grand historical significance to intensely personal crises. An Eastern or Marxist point of view might well reverse the terms of the cause-effect relationship and, accordingly, diminish the stature of the individual.

An assertion that some series of events has been or will be determined, according to the presence of certain moral qualities, may depend therefore upon dual sources of support. First, the assertion rests upon a faith in moral causation and is the conclusion of a submerged enthymematic structure. Second, the assertion may call also upon an association with the fact of an unquestionably determined archetypal process. But the two forms of support do not operate independently. The faith itself is confirmed by an association with the fact of archetypal process, which constantly suggests to the impressionable mind of man that evil darkness contains the promise of light, good light the potential for darkness, in unending succession. Therefore, vivid symbolic representations of light and darkness may often perform a subtle but fundamental probative function in a speech, well deserving individuation in such cases as *argument by archetype*.

Among rhetoricians, ancient and modern, none has been more aware of the potential power of light and dark metaphors than Sir Winston Churchill. Indeed, Churchill in his war speeches shows a remarkably consistent preference for archetypal images in general. This favoritism may be a symptom of a more general truth, that in moments of great crisis, when society is in upheaval and fashionable contemporary forms of symbolic cultural identity are swept away, the speaker must turn to the bedrock of symbolism, the archetype, which represents the unchanging essence of human identity. Audiences also are unusually susceptible in such moments to archetypal images, for it is comforting to return with a speaker to the ancient archetypal verities, to the cycle of light and darkness, to the cycle of life and death and birth again, to the mountains and rivers and seas, and find them all unchanged, all still appealing symbolically to the human heart and thus reassuring one that man himself, despite all the surface turbulence, remains after all man.

One example among Churchill's many finely wrought images illustrates clearly most of the characteristics discussed in the preceding section:

If we stand up to him [Hitler], all Europe may be free and the life of the world may move forward into broad, sunlit uplands. But if we fail, then the whole world, including the United States, including all that we have known and cared for, will sink into the abyss of a new Dark Age made more sinister, and perhaps more protracted, by the lights of perverted science.¹⁰

One first observes a fusion here between the archetypes of light and darkness and the vertical scale, a frequent combination because of the natural association of light with the above and darkness with the below. The opposing value judgments are intense, the presence of rhetorical determinism unmistakable. The situation has been simplified until there are two—and only two—alternatives, one of which must become the pattern for the future. The conditional factor is qualitative, whether the British people choose to remain steadfast in the face of danger. Their moral choice will determine the future material condition. Churchill utilizes symbolism to strengthen their commitment to this virtue, first by conceptualizing a reward, the “sunlit uplands,” second by specifying even more vividly a punishment, “the abyss of a new Dark Age.” By an intense initial contrast of light and dark images, Churchill reawakens the figurative tension of what could be—out of context—a threadbare metaphoric phrase, “the lights of perverted science.” This reinvigorated metaphor provides a grotesque, unnatural association of light with evil, reinforcing the power of the threat. Thus the example is an impressive, apparently intuitive display of potentialities discussed previously.

Churchill's purpose with this image was exhortation. When he intends comfort and reassurance, certain variations occur in the image patterns:

Good night, then: sleep to gather strength for the morning. For the morning will come. Brightly will it shine on the brave and true, kindly upon all who suffer for the cause, glorious upon the tombs of heroes. Thus will shine the dawn.¹¹

This example forms much of the conclusion of his address “To the French People.” He is speaking to a defeated people: because they are already in “the new Dark Age,” he does not mention light and dark alternatives, and the sense of conflict and contrast has faded. There is only one pattern now for the future, the reassuring movement from darkness into light. The speaker sees this movement as so inexorable, so inevitable, that he does not even mention conditions. They are present only implicitly: the moral qualities of endurance, courage, and loyalty to the “cause” even to the point of suffering and death. To strengthen his assertion that the future is favorably determined, Churchill relies upon—and at the same time reinforces—his *ethos* as “a man of faith.” But is such confidence actually more confidence than it is prayer, an effort to invoke the predicted future by a kind of public incantation? Whatever it is, the immediate effect of consolation and encouragement is compromised only if his auditors can sense uncertainty behind the brave words.

The nature of the figuration, as well as the patterns of figurative development, appear to have changed. The first example, consonant with its vigorous, exhortative temper, thrusts its changes of meaning directly upon the audience. “Sunlit uplands,” “abyss,” “Dark Age,” are obviously metaphors from the first crack of the language. They force their auditors immediately into the experience of resolution.¹² But this second example illustrates a somewhat slower—perhaps more soothing—tempo of meaning change. Churchill's speech was delivered during the evening, and he has obviously taken advantage of the circumstance.¹³

"Good night . . . sleep to gather strength for the morning" could be taken quite literally. But from that moment the metaphoric intent begins to reveal itself, so that the movement into figurative meaning develops gradually throughout the example. One can not escape a certain physical similarity with the coming of dawn itself: a subtle onomatopoeic quality pervades the whole.

The sun is implicit in all light-dark images, and in the planetary system around light and darkness it is especially close to the center. But it does have special functions as an archetypal source. While light-dark images serve generally as value judgments upon the actions and conditions of men, the sun can symbolize more aptly human character. Most often it serves a eulogistic purpose, suggesting qualities of goodness which belong to a man. Thus sun images are at once less dynamic and more personal than metaphors of light and darkness.

An especially artful example occurs in Edmund Burke's "On American Taxation," in which the image first apotheosizes Lord Chatham, then comments less favorably by the subtlest form of ironic contrast upon the character of Charles Townsend:

For even then, sir, even before this splendid orb was entirely set, and while the western horizon was in a blaze with his descending glory, on the opposite quarter of the heavens arose another luminary, and for his hour, became lord of the ascendant.

This light, too, is passed and set forever.¹⁴

The example indicates still another implication of sun imagery. While light and darkness are grounded in a chronological sequence, there are also subordinate cycles in the various phases of the night and day. The night phases are not archetypally significant, but different moments of the day are charged with such significance. The dawn-twilight cycle emerges especially as a symbol for human life from birth to death, indicating that the birth-death cycle, itself an archetypal source, may require metaphoric illumination when it becomes the subject for discourse. MacArthur's sentimentalized self-portrait in his "Address to Congress" further exemplifies this usage. In both his introduction and conclusion, he sees himself "in the fading twilight of life." By positioning the images in these critical places, he reveals that his primary purpose in the speech is to focus sympathetically upon himself. To enhance further the symbolic appeal, MacArthur uses images contrast, referring in the body of the speech to "the dawn of opportunity" in Asia.¹⁵

Sun metaphors may serve also to distinguish between qualities of light. Natural, sun-produced light is preferred over man-made light, permitting metaphoric value contrasts within the symbolic scope of light itself. Such contrasts occur infrequently, and are of a finer, more subtle sort than the obvious figurative oppositions of light and darkness. Edmund Burke provides an example in "Previous to the Bristol Election," which contrasts rather obscurely the light of open day with candlelight:

The part I have acted has been in open day; and to hold out to a conduct, which stands in that clear and steady light for all its good and all its evil, to hold out to that conduct the paltry winking tapers of excuses and promises, I never will do it. They may obscure it with their smoke, but they never can illumine sunshine by such a flame as theirs.¹⁶

Burke illustrates also a final potential of sun metaphors based upon the eclipse phenomenon. Eclipse has an obvious, trite connection with "bad luck,"

"misfortune," but in the hands of a master rhetorician it may acquire fresh, more interesting associations. Implicit in it is the suggestion that darkness may be momentary, that a period of misfortune in national life may be only transitory, and that the nation will emerge again quickly into its former brightness. Generally some modicum of sunlight remains to reassure and sustain the observer. Thus there may be an occasional rhetorical advantage in suggesting that a nation is in the darkness of eclipse, rather than in the darkness of night. Burke's example illustrates this potential only in a partial sense:

Tarnished as the glory of this nation is, and as far as it has waded into the shades of an eclipse, some beams of its former illumination still play upon its surface, and what is done in England is still looked to as argument, and as example.¹⁷

Somewhat farther distant from the center of the light-dark system is the contrast of heat and cold, represented most vividly and frequently in fire imagery. Fire partakes not only of the central light-dark motivational basis but also that of the sun to which it is contiguous. It has an extensive range of possible metabolic associations, as Philip Wheelwright's discussion indicates.¹⁸

Wheelwright notes that the warmth of fire associates it with bodily comfort, with the growth of the body and its food, and with the preparation of food. Its tendency to shoot upward relates it to the motivational basis of vertical-scale imagery: that which reaches above can symbolize the difficult effort by man to improve upon his condition, to aspire to "higher" ideals and attainments. Because fire is the most active, most rapidly changing of nature's elements, it can represent youth and regeneration. On the other hand, in its sun embodiment it can symbolize the permanence of nature, an association which gives meaning to the home's hearth-fire and to the church's altar-fire. Because fire burns and disintegrates substance, it can be viewed either as a destructive or as a purifying force: symbolically it can be either infernal or purgatorial. Because of its spontaneous generation and rapid reproduction, fire can represent also the birth of an idea and how it proliferates in the mind. Furthermore, just as a torch spreads flame from one place to another, an idea can leap from one mind to another.

With respect to the relationship between fire and light, Wheelwright claims an inseparable connection, such that fire suggests light, light fire to the mind of the recipient:

Modern household appliances have so successfully enabled us to separate light and heat, that we are prone to forget how naturally in ancient times the two phenomena went together. . . . Even on a cold winter's day the sun could be felt in one's marrow. Consequently, in those contexts where light served as a symbol of intellectual clarity it tended to carry certain metaphoric connotations of fire as well. . . . As fire, glowing with light, warms the body, so intellectual light not only instructs but also stimulates the mind and spirit.¹⁹

His suggestion, however, that the modern mind may no longer be as susceptible to the ancient association of fire and light is not supported by a prominent example from the rhetoric of John Kennedy:

Let the word go forth from this time and place . . . that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans. . . . The energy, the faith and the

devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world.²⁰

The example confirms Wheelwright's notion that fire has a natural association with youth and regeneration.

While fire represents here dedication, a constructive impulse, Churchill provides an example which symbolizes destruction—and perhaps purification.

What he [Hitler] has done is to kindle a fire in British hearts, here and all over the world, which will glow long after all traces of the conflagration he has caused in London have been removed. He has lighted a fire which will burn with a steady and consuming flame until the last vestiges of Nazi tyranny have been burnt out of Europe, and until the Old World—and the New—can join hands to rebuild the temples of man's freedom and man's honor, upon foundations which will not soon or easily be overthrown.²¹

One notes again Churchill's tendency to build figurative, enlarged meanings out of literal conditions. The "conflagration" in London caused by Nazi bombings extends figuratively to the anger felt in "British hearts," and extends again to represent the nature of future retaliation. In such cases Churchill does not introduce *items for association* out of context, which is the usual practice in metaphor,²² so much as he uses a previous subject as an *item for association* with subjects which follow. This practice provides a certain artistic cohesiveness in his image patterns.

One notes also the coupling of fire, symbolic destruction, with the activity of building, symbolic construction. This archetypal combination suggests that an especially arresting metaphor, because of the adventure of creating and resolving it, can establish an appetite for imagery in both speaker and audience which makes further vivid figuration appropriate and perhaps even mandatory.²³ The destruction-construction effects suggest also that, as with disease-recovery metaphors, some balancing function, partly aesthetic and partly reassuring, is served by the second member of the metaphoric combination.

The cycle of the seasons, most distant from the center in the light-dark system, impinges upon the motivational bases of all which precede it in proximity to that source. The variations in light and darkness from one season to another, the different qualities of sunlight, the extreme variations in heat and cold, all give seasonal contrasts a complex and powerful potential for symbolizing value judgments rising from hope and despair, fruition and decay. Furthermore, the inescapable rhythm of seasonal succession provides another potential symbol for all stipulations of a determined present or an assured future. For these reasons the cycle of the seasons is immensely significant in poetry and fictional prose; Shakespeare, for example, made superb use of the source.²⁴ Therefore, it is surprising and somewhat perplexing that this basic environmental archetype is virtually ignored by rhetoricians.²⁵

Understanding this strange neglect, which one must assume points to some special inadequacy or inappropriateness of the seasonal cycle for rhetorical purposes, requires a consideration of the nature of the source and a comparison with similar, more popular archetypes. Seasonal images are unpopular in rhetoric because of the subject matter with which the rhetorician typically deals and because of the usual nature of his audience. The succession of the seasons is a slow, deliberate process. It is suited more for long-range representation of the

process of change and of the general condition of men within that process. It fits more the poet's or philosopher's elevated perspective upon time and the gradually evolving nature of man's destiny. But the subject matter of rhetoric is most often dynamic, immediate, and concrete. It has to do with specific problems and specific solutions. Some innate inappropriateness appears, therefore, between the subject matter of rhetoric and the symbolizing potential of seasonal contrasts.

A further reason for the unpopularity of the source lies in the psychology of audience and in the interaction between rhetorical subject matter and that audience. The succession of phases in light and darkness is immediate and vividly obvious: to promise light after darkness implies that a solution will come quickly, an attractive assurance for popular audiences who are impatient of long term effects or whose needs are felt concretely and acutely. The succession of the seasons, on the other hand, implies a slower and more deliberate process, not especially gratifying for such audiences. Moreover, while the succession of phases in light and darkness is rapid and spectacular, the prolonged process of seasonal change lacks dramatic impact for people who are not attuned aesthetically to long-range contrasts and subtle changes.

Thus the cycle of the seasons is an aristocratic source, which provides specialized symbols for subjects at higher levels of abstraction for the consideration of sophisticated audiences. One must conclude that the seasonal archetype provides a dimension of potential power and appeal from which the rhetorician, by the nature and circumstances of his art, is usually excluded.

The examination of one family of archetypal sources does not yield a complete, precise set of questions which the critic can use to exhaust the implications of any given rhetorical image. However, these explorations do suggest an initial pattern of inquiry.

Concerning metaphoric *invention*, what characterizes a speaker's selection of *items for association*? Does he have favorite metaphors for favorite subjects, and among these metaphors is there any kind of harmonizing relationship which would indicate an underlying unity of imaginative outlook on public questions? Does the speaker vary the tempo of meaning change in different situations, and if so for what purpose and to what effect?

With respect to *organization*, how significant is the position of an image within a speech? If its major appearance is in the introduction, does the metaphor echo and reverberate through the remainder of the speech in minor variations? Or if especially arresting, does it appear to create an eidetic disposition within speaker and audience, causing a chain-reaction of imagery to extend throughout the speech? If its major statement is in the conclusion, is the image prepared for by minor variations which condition the audience? If any of these phenomena occur, has one in effect an organization of images which runs parallel with the organization of topics? Does this image order dominate the substantive order, or is it subservient to that order? Do such patterns repeat themselves among the various speeches of a man, and if so, what can one infer that would individuate the speaker's rhetorical artistry?

Concerning *ethical proof* implications, does the intensive use of light-dark contrasts project the speaker as one who has little difficulty in making clear, decisive choices between good and evil? Does the speaker suggest himself as a man of faith or conviction by his symbolic representations of the past-present, present-future relationships? If he does communicate some sense of rhetorical determinism, does he attach conditions, and if so, what is their nature?

The *motive* basis of archetypal metaphor suggests other questions. Among the range of motivational attachments which surround an archetype, what particular motive does a specific image emphasize? Does this implicit motive stimulation reinforce, or run counter to, the system of motivational appeals made explicit within the speech? From the same subject comes a somewhat more general question with important implications for the rhetorical theorist. Might one construct inductively from the study of archetypes a system of motives particularly relevant to rhetorical discourse, rather than adopting by authoritative warrant some general list of "impelling motives"?

At least one important question may be asked relating to the *logical proof* function. Does an image embody some tacit enthymematic structure and function as a demonstration within itself, or does it serve more to dramatize, illustrate, and reinforce a logical structure made explicit elsewhere in the speech?

Two final possibilities and questions, directed as much to the theorist as to the critic, merit discussion. The first concerns the long-pursued relationships between rhetoric and poetic. Published research for some time now has been seeking general distinctions between the two arts, and while often suggestive seems, perhaps fortunately, not to have produced final answers. The discussion of seasonal images here supports the possibility that a more microscopic venture, concerned with tracing fine distinctions according to the imagery appropriate to each art form, might advance this inquiry.²⁶

The second question concerns the relationships between archetypal and non-archetypal metaphor. At what moments might the non-archetype be preferable to its archetypal counterpart? That there are such moments is suggested by Laura Crowell's analysis of Franklin Roosevelt's 1936 presidential campaign address at Pittsburgh.²⁷ The critic finds a sustained baseball image and explains that the speech was given at Forbes Field. Thus the same kind of special circumstance which enhanced Churchill's images of dawn and fire made in this case a non-archetypal figure more appropriate.

A more significant possibility is raised by a different interpretation of the evidence presented in Wilcomb E. Washburn's excellent survey of early American political symbolism.²⁸ In the perspective here Washburn's evidence suggests that archetypal images may be especially crucial not only when a society is in upheaval, but also in its formative stages before it has achieved a certain national identity. Such images, which appeal to *all* men, must bear the burden of figurative persuasion before the emergence of images which appeal to *these* men. Thus, in the popular demonstrations of 1788 which urged the adoption of the federal constitution, structural and ship-of-state images were emphasized. But by 1840 a set of indigenous symbols—"log cabin," "hard cider," and the "plough"—had emerged to dominate the political imagery of the day. Such images are creatures of the moment, but they are more timely even as they are more evanescent. They may permit a more precise focusing upon whatever values and motives are salient in society at a given time.

NOTES

¹See for example: Martin Maloney, "Some New Directions in Rhetorical Criticism," *Central States Speech Journal*, IV (March 1953), 1-5, and Robert D. Clark, "Lessons from the Literary Critics," *Western Speech*, XXI (Spring 1957), 83-89. Various approaches in literary criticism are illustrated by: Richard Harter Fogle, *Hawthorne's Fiction: The Light and the Dark* (Norman, 1964); Caroline F. E. Spurgeon, *Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us* (Cambridge, 1935); and Stephen Ullmann, *The Image in the Modern French Novel* (Cambridge, 1960).