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Criticism of *Common Sense* often centers around the archetypal familiarity and emotional imagery of Thomas Paine's metaphoric language because it appealed to his audience's religious and cultural beliefs. However, in order to understand better the appeal of this pamphlet, it is also necessary to consider both its cultural and rhetorical contexts.

In my thesis I have used Kenneth Burke's concept of rhetorical identification in order to read *Common Sense* not only as a debate, lecture, or sermon, but also as a script. Identification helps explain how the repetitive use of rhetorical figures served to complement the story form and enhance the effect of the metaphors in the pamphlet.

Through metaphor and figures which negate, amplify, and create duality, Paine developed an image of England's King George III as the Devil. But Paine's audience did not simply react emotionally to *Common Sense*, they accepted the challenge to become involved in a plot, the ending of which would be determined by the intensity of the audience's religious convictions.
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Introduction

Thomas Paine's *Common Sense*, published in January, 1776, was an astounding popular success even by modern standards. It went through twenty-five editions, and an equivalent to ten million copies (in today's terms) were sold. Why this work should be received so enthusiastically, while more learned treatises by more respected authors were not, has been cause for speculation by students of the Revolutionary Period since the Revolution itself.

The reasons most often cited are: Paine's style appealed to a large and previously ignored audience of middle and lower class colonists; he appealed to his audience's cultural beliefs by using imagery and metaphor for emotional impact when the objective logic of his arguments failed him; his pamphlet rode the crest of a wave of arguments which had been debated by the colonists for years before the publication of *Common Sense*.

Since all of these arguments are valid, I hoped to find, during my research, some way to relate these conclusions. By applying Kenneth Burke's concept of Identification and Northrop Frye's argument that the Bible serves as possibly the definitive Western archetype, I learned to read the pamphlet in a different way: that is, as a story. By involving his audience in a familiar story,
Paine was able to weaken their last emotional tie with England—their loyalty to the king. He did this not by creating any new myths, although he employs several well-known ones, but by helping to weaken the old myth of the Divine Right of Kings, upon which the eighteenth century view of the king as society’s father was based.

In order for Paine to have written so successful a work, he would had to have had a fair understanding of the audience he wished to address. To see Common Sense as a successful demonstration of the identification principles of Kenneth Burke, I have reserved the first section, Myth, Form, and Identification, for a review of two aspects of Burke’s concept of identification with audiences: by their beliefs and by their ability to respond to language, particularly to be influenced by patterns and sequences in conventional and repetitive forms.

Northrop Frye’s conclusion, that the Bible provides one (possibly the) definitive archetype in Western literature will be reviewed as well, because, to a great degree, it explains why Paine’s style had so powerful an effect on his audience.

The remaining two sections are elaborations on the first. The second section, The Colonial Conflict of Myths, consists of a look backward at the historical, social, and intellectual origins of a body of myths commonly familiar to
the British and the colonists. This is justified on two grounds: first, political rhetoric does not function in a vacuum but works to influence a particular audience at a specific time, consequently, rhetorical figures mean little in isolation but rely on a social as well as a linguistic context for their effectiveness; second, it is necessary to explain why Paine needed to make a scapegoat of the king and to identify and separate those beliefs that helped, from those that hindered, the process.

In the third section, *Scapegoating the King*, I have analyzed the text in two parts. The first looks at the metaphors as they contributed to the sequence of the Bible-like story in *Common Sense*. The second examines a limited number of other figures to show how they contributed to a repetitive form which aided the impact made by the metaphors. This needs to be done because critics have emphasized the archetypal vividness of the metaphors without considering the effect of the other rhetorical figures. It is, I hope to demonstrate, not only the metaphor, but metaphor in combination with other figures that allowed Paine to divert some of his audience's wrath away from England, Parliament, and the king's ministers toward the king himself.
A basic definition of rhetoric is the use of words to shape attitudes and induce action in others. For political rhetoric to be effective, that is for the audience to accept and support the rhetor's cause, the discourse must appeal on two levels: it must appeal as an ideology and be in a form which the audience can respond to. Myth or story (Frye says anything with a sequence is a story) satisfies these requirements because its contents reflect cultural beliefs in a form recognizable to audiences.

In his book, *Political Myth*, Henry Tudor summarizes political myth as a story which claims to be a true account of a society's ancient or modern history, with the end of promoting a particular course of action:

What marks...myth is its dramatic form...a political myth is always a myth of a particular group...[that] helps them to see their present condition as an episode in an ongoing drama (138-139).

While actual historical events may be incorporated into the myth, their chronological order need not be maintained but may be rearranged for emphasis. Supporting details which have no historical validity may also be provided by the rhetor who claims a sort of poetic license as a storyteller.
What is important is not the verifiability of the myth, but rather the fact that the audience accepts it as an accurate reflection of their society's past. Political rhetoric based on myth requires participation from the audience by asking readers to accept a particular view of themselves. Additionally, there must be a conflict to be resolved between a hero, representing forces for good (therefore including the rhetor) and a villain who represents evil. The villain usually tries to enslave, rob, and otherwise abuse the good and innocent. The division of the world into 'us' and 'them' excludes third party compromise.

Kenneth Burke's multilayered concept of identification becomes a useful way to study political rhetoric, because it provides a partial explanation of how a rhetor isolates his audience by appealing to myth. Identification is audience-centered, for as Burke says in *A Rhetoric of Motives*, "You persuade a man only insofar as you talk his language by speech, gesture, tonality, order, image, attitude, idea, identifying your ways with his" (55). Identification emphasizes the reader's responsiveness to words. Language is a symbolic way of inducing cooperation in humans, who by nature respond to symbols. This responsiveness allows a rhetor to solicit cooperation in separate beings who have distinct and often conflicting interests. The rhetor and his reader become 'consubstantial' when they share a common
identity (social, professional, religious, etc.). This recognition of a common identity presumes that if interests coincide, then the rhetor and his audience must also share common goals and enemies as well. In "Rhetoric-Old and New," Burke observes that the rhetor's job becomes a bit easier when identification is an end in itself, "as when people earnestly yearn to identify themselves with some group or another. Here they are not necessarily being acted upon by a conscious external agent, but may be acting upon themselves" (63). And while classical rhetoric emphasized deliberate design, rhetoric based on identification may contain a partially "unconscious" (63) element in its appeal, as when a rhetor unconsciously appeals to an audience like himself.

A rhetor is not likely to find ideal audiences such as those described in Edwin Black's article "The Second Persona," which are shaped by the writing so that responses are precisely what the rhetor expected. Lacking the ideal audience, the rhetor must create or "carve out" an appropriate one. Burke suggests the use of several major devices which can be used to carve out a receptive audience. The two that I found most useful in studying Common Sense are the conventional and the repetitive forms.

The conventional form is that of story. Stories fulfill readers' expectations because they recognize and become
involved in a familiar sequence of events, images, and thoughts: the appeal is in the form itself. Burke notes: ...you are drawn to the form, not in your capacity as a partisan, but because of some "universal" appeal in it. And this attitude of assent may then be transferred to the matter which happens to be associated with the form (58).

The other major form useful in considering Common Sense as a story is what Burke calls the repetitive form. This device helps deliver the reader toward the climax and resolution of the story when too obvious a reliance on the story (conventional form) might cause the careful reader to reject the argument because of its lack of objectivity. In addition to inducing cooperation through sheer repetition of sounds, vocabulary, figures, and other details of theme, the repetitive strategy also relies, for its impact, on the accumulation of works by various authors which repeat the same themes, images, and so on. Burke urges us to think of the repetitive form not as a single address only, but also as a "general body of identifications" (26).

This familiarity resulting from accumulated exposure to themes and images is discussed by Northrop Frye, among others, as the appeal of the archetype. Literary symbols become conventional archetypes when they appear in a large number of works, or as Frye puts it in The Edu-
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cated Imagination, "every form of literature has a pedigree" (40). Some themes and literary situations occur over and over again, and while they may be superficially different they remain essentially the same. This basic similarity occurs because archetypes evolve from 'pre-literary' myth, ritual, and fairytale.

Common Sense has a "pedigree" as well. It is based on the biblical story of man: his original innocent happiness in Eden, his subsequent fall due to temptation from the Devil, and his redemption through Christ's sacrifice. In The Great Code Frye points out that the Bible itself is a large myth which extends from the Creation to the Apocalypse, and it consists of an enormous variety of aphorisms, proverbs, riddles, and fairytales among other things. He notes:

Its rhetoric is polarized between the oracular, the authoritative, and the repetitive on one hand, and the more immediate and familiar on the other. The more poetic, repetitive, and metaphoric the texture, the more the sense of external authority (214).

Scriptural authority was cited by both the loyalists and the rebels to justify their political positions (excluding some of the Founding Fathers-to-be who favored Deism to Christianity). Their identities as Bible-reading
Protestants meant they were familiar with the literary styles found in the Bible. The definitive minor form (minor forms include figures of trope and scheme as discussed in Section III below) contributing to the shape of the Bible story, according to Frye, is the metaphor. Just as the story is an analogy for the actual history, so the metaphoric figure is an analogy of ideas represented through images. It suggests a number of ideas quite economically. This terseness implies that the thing said needs no defense or additional explanation. Since religion relies less on reason than faith, and metaphor as a literal lie depends for understanding on guesswork and intuition, the metaphor is an effective form for expressing religious doctrine.

I would argue, however, against a study of Common Sense as a story based solely on metaphoric content. The repetitive strategy, consisting of a variety of minor forms, creates a context in which the metaphors can be understood. These minor forms, or figures of speech, are described by Richard A. Lanham, "in a most general meaning...[as] any device or pattern of language in which meaning is changed or enhanced." He divides figures into two types: figures of words (trope and scheme) and figures of thought (large scale trope or scheme such as allegory). These definitions are not new, they are as old as Aristotle and Cicero. In Figures of Speech: 60 Ways to Turn A Phrase Arthur Quinn repeats a
common description of figures as "intended deviation from ordinary language" (6). This presents us with the problem of authors' intentions. First, ordinary language is stuffed with figures, many of which occur spontaneously in speech. Second, Burke acknowledges the possibility of unintentional persuasion when he speaks of unconscious identification by either rhetor or audience. But to debate whether this or that figure was used intentionally is to miss the point: what is important is that the work either succeeds or fails in achieving identification with (and thereby persuading) an audience.

Paine's figures have limited significance when studied in isolation, for "Even the greatest works of art are couched not in the language of "mankind" but in the language of a specific cultural tradition." It is, therefore, necessary before we can examine the text of *Common Sense* to look at the cultural myths that contributed to the conflict between the British and their colonies.
Section II  The Colonial Conflict of Myths

The "carving out" of an audience, as described by Burke, includes identifying an audience by its beliefs. The American Revolution can be seen as the result of conflicting eighteenth-century perceptions about government and society. The British monarch, Parliament, and colonial Loyalists saw government as having family privileges and obligations: the king was society's father, and the people were his dutiful and obedient dependents. Colonial Rebels saw Americans, not as the children of the king, but as the children of their Puritan ancestors, Nature, and God.

Before the Revolution the prevailing view was that the monarch had a divine right to rule granted to him and his progeny by God. In Sir Robert Filmer's *Patriarcha* (1648) the origins of the divine right are explained in order to justify the absolute power of kings. The ultimate father is God, the father of Man is Adam, and the father of the nation is its king. Filmer claimed that Adam was a king and a father, and since the monarch is a king he must also be a father. He went further and insisted that the current king of England (Charles I, 1625-1649) was Adam's heir. As both Tudor and Bailyn point out, the family was the ancient model for social order through subordination. It was not difficult to show that the power in the family was held by the
father: Old Testament evidence demonstrated that the Hebrews were patriarchal, and the Greeks, Romans, as well as the English were patriarchal. Having the power of a father meant having the authority to kill one's offspring if necessary, and monarchs had openly exercised that right for centuries.

Filmer's arguments provoked John Locke to write the first of his Two Treatises of Civil Government (1689) where he repudiates paternalistic arguments in favor of those based on natural law and the concept of government by contract. Locke claimed that Filmer had misinterpreted the Bible and that men did not owe perpetual obedience to a royal family because of divine right. He explained that natural law provided certain rights (including the rights to life, liberty, and property) to all men as human beings. These were given to men by nature and, therefore, were from God (Filmer insisted that there was only one natural right—that of fathers to absolute authority as heads of their families). Under natural law, men voluntarily give up some rights so the balance of their rights will be guaranteed under civil law. Since government is the product of the consent of the governed, and not the result of their ordained subservient rank, the governed have the right to withdraw their consent if the government becomes oppressive. Simply put, men have the right to revolt against a tyrant.
Before Hobbes, Voltaire, Descartes, Hume, and several others suggested that the principles of mathematics and the physical and natural sciences be used to explain not only the physical world but also human nature and society itself, government and society were considered the result of divine mystery. The infallible Pope had a monopoly on interpretation of God's word revealed in the Bible. Ordinary believers were thought to be incapable of understanding God, or the nature of the world and human institutions, without the help of popes and priests. The Reformation of the sixteenth century eroded the Pope's religious authority and his influence in political affairs as well. Martin Luther, John Calvin, John Knox, and others maintained that the individual believer did have the power to understand God. The Protestant concept of a predestined elect, chosen by God, offered little comfort to monarchists. Because Luther argued that only God knew who the elect were, there was no way of knowing, for sure, who was chosen and who was not. Monarchists, by virtue of their secular power, had no guarantee of a reservation in Heaven. Calvin suggested that certain tests could indicate possible election (though they were not proofs) but kingship was not among them.

The connection between religion and revolution is most apparent in the Millenial myth. Paine's audience was primed by the sermons of Jonathan Edwards and other preachers of
the Great Awakening (a 1720's to 1740's revival) to see themselves in the drama contained in Common Sense. According to the sermons, America was to be the site of the millenium, the event forecast in Revelations when God comes to Earth to reign for a thousand years. At the time the Devil would be bound and tossed into a bottomless pit, and all the Christian martyrs would be given a second life. The Earth would become a new Eden—at least the colonial part would. America was regarded as the logical place for the millenium to occur first because it, like Eden, was unspoiled and pure. Here it would be easy to prepare for a new society in anticipation of God's second coming, because Americans did not have to fight centuries of social tradition and stratification. Neither did they have the problems of political and moral corruption which many American colonists considered characteristic of England.

In Sons of the Fathers Catherine Albanese describes the colonists as, "traditional people...who had seen themselves as the heirs of a long and definite series of heroes and deeds which extended...beyond...to the sufferings of the ancient Hebrews" (46). The notion of the New World as a promised land was furthered by the myth of the Puritan fathers which emphasized the colonial Americans' true ancestors as the Puritans and not the English. The Puritans' arrival was considered ordained by Heaven, and they were
seen as having a mission to take a perilous journey (across the ocean) to a wilderness (America as Eden) prepared for them by God in anticipation of the second coming. Joseph Warren's Annual Boston Massacre Oration of 1775, which Albanese quotes, is an epitome of the Puritan myth, "Approving Heaven beheld the favorite ark dancing on the waves and graciously preserved it until the chosen families were brought safely to these western lands" (24).

The millenium is seen within the Puritan fathers myth which incorporates yet another myth: the myth of Norman Yoke. Tudor notes that a political myth is often targeted at an audience that feels it has lost political influence, and the myth of the Norman Yoke is just that kind. According to this story pre-William the Conqueror England enjoyed a sort of golden age of freedom. Actually, the British islands had been the site of invasion and oppression by outsiders for centuries. At different times the Scandinavians, the Romans, and the Germans had all pillaged and plundered Britain. The Norman Yoke, however, heaps English resentment onto William's shoulders because he and his marauders enslaved eighteenth-century England's eleventh-century ancestors causing the English to distrust outsiders and absolute authority forevermore. Like the Puritan fathers story, the Norman Yoke gave the colonists a history as a freedom-seeking people.
I have tried to present a case, based on intellectual developments in the Reformation and the Enlightenment, which dislodged fixed ideas about God and society, and on the eighteenth century body of myths, which would seem to shake fixed ideas about the king, to demonstrate that the colonials should have been ready to reject their English monarch. But the debate between rebels and loyalists dragged on all the way into mid-1776 and beyond. The controversy continued because the colonists' loyalty to their king was based not only on his reputation as their father, but also on their distrust of Parliament and the king's ministers. Jacob Murray Edelman describes the myth of conspiracy as a belief that the official leader is surrounded by wicked, conspiring enemies, which "serves as a powerful legitimizer of established policies...helping to forestall protests." Until the eve of the Revolution many colonists still clung to the belief that the king had their best interests at heart. Sadly, while the king was no longer responsible for making colonial policy there is evidence that suggests he enthusiastically endorsed and administered Parliament's program for the colonies. However, many Americans feared that Parliament and the king's own ministers plotted against the colonies, behind the back of their protector, the king. When Americans petitioned England it was the king they addressed, asking for his "paternal
care...paternal regard...paternal love and tenderness...[as] Our Most Gracious Sovereign and Father." Because of their loyalty to George III colonists persisted in requesting their rights as Englishmen instead of asserting their independence and guaranteeing their rights as Americans.

The metaphoric view of the king as father was perpetuated by the idea of divine right and the myth of conspiracy. It was weakened by the concept of natural law, the belief in the millenium, and the myth of the Puritan fathers. Common Sense was an overnight success, in part, because Paine incorporated many mythic references which were recognized immediately by his audience as being part of their cultural history as Americans, as British subjects, and as Christians.
Section III  Scapegoating the King

Paine's archetypal images used to recall popular myths in order to help his audience follow the inconsistent logic of his arguments cannot, alone, explain the pamphlet's success. It is also necessary to look into the rhetorical context in which his mythic references are made.

I have divided this analysis into two parts. In the first I will look at the pamphlet as a story which relies on metaphors for its content. In the second part I will examine how the repetitive form (which consists of a variety of figures) contributes to the process of identification by supplementing and enhancing the effect of the metaphors. While describing readers as both believers in stories and users of language, I am, at the same time, trying to unite the conventional and repetitive forms by demonstrating that the non-metaphoric figures are essential to an understanding of how Paine's political rhetoric worked.

I will not include analysis of his metaphors portraying government as a body or as a machine. Paine's interest in science undoubtedly influenced his thinking and his writing, but this paper considers only those rhetorical figures that contributed to the prevailing metaphoric view of government as a family upon which the doctrine of the divine right of kings relied.
Common Sense is convincing, partly, because its sequence and style are patterned after the single book most likely to be known to the general colonial population—the Bible. Like the Bible, Common Sense fluctuates in tone from didactic to prophetic to commanding; it uses a large variety of figures; its prose rhythm is sometimes conversational and sometimes lyrical; and its vocabulary is full of archetypal symbolism. It is an appeal to arms justified by Biblical authority, for Paine felt the Bible does not prove but, in fact, denies the legitimacy of the divine right of kings to rule.

According to Frye the Bible shows human history as part of a pattern: "The narrative of the Bible is a sequence of events in human life, it becomes a series of ups and downs in which God's people periodically fall into bondage" (The Great Code, 192). The story of the loss of freedom at the hands of an oppressive villain is described by Frye as being U-shaped, and all the Bible stories, collectively, can be seen as representing this basic pattern. At the start of the U the story begins with Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden, living their lives in peaceful harmony until, at the Devil's coaxing, Eve tempts Adam into eating from the tree
of knowledge, whereupon he and Eve are thrown out of Eden to live in guilt and despair. This fall is represented by the bottom of the U. Fortunately for mankind Christ makes the ultimate sacrifice, through suffering and death, and man is redeemed as marked by the upswing of the U.

Following the metaphors in *Common Sense* should enable us to see Paine's re-creation of the U-shaped story, if, as Frye says, metaphor is the language of narration. Paine divides the pamphlet into four parts, the first of which is entitled, "Of the origin and design of government in general. With concise remarks on the English Constitution." He immediately identifies the protagonist as society, "a patron," and the antagonist as government, "a punisher." Government, he reasons, is a necessary evil because men's virtues are not strong enough to control their vices. Government as punisher recalls God's angry response (ejecting Adam and Eve from Eden) to Adam's disobedient yielding to temptation. Further on, "Government, like dress, is the badge of lost innocence; the palaces of kings are built on the ruins of the bowers of paradise" (13). By referring to the government as a sign of lost innocence the reader is reminded of Adam and Eve who, after eating the forbidden fruit, were no longer innocent. "Bowers" refers to a garden; it would be un-Christian for a colonial reader to entertain any other notion of paradise. These metaphors
spare Paine the necessity of stating overtly that government is bad which would have minimal impact.

Society, already established as representing the goodness in man, began when a "first peopling...settled in some sequestered part of the Earth" (14). To a Christian audience the "first peopling" would call to mind the first people, Adam and Eve, and the sequestered part, once again, recalls the safe and secluded Eden.

In the second part, "Of monarchy and hereditary succession," he makes a direct appeal to scriptural authority in arguing against divine right. Government under a monarch is "the most prosperous invention the Devil ever set on foot," and the monarch is "a worm who in the midst of his splendor is crumbling into dust" (19). These Biblical images represent death and decay, and identify the monarch as a worm—the symbol for Satan. The reader is now subjected to lengthy quotations from the Bible which, Paine insists, prove that monarchism was the beginning of men's fall away from their natural status as equals. On page 22 monarchism is further described as "the Popery of government." This cannot fail to appeal to the anti-Catholic bias in a Protestant audience and should ensure, lest any reader fail to make the connection, that monarchism is understood to be wicked.
If government is the result of moral weakness and instituted to control men's vices, and monarchism is the Devil's work, then monarchs must be wicked as well. Nature "disapproves it, otherwise she would not so frequently turn it into ridicule by giving mankind an Ass for a Lion" (22). Equating the king with a slow-witted beast of burden at this early stage will prove useful in the third part when Paine dehumanizes him further by calling him a brute.

Next, Paine begins his attack on individual monarchs, specifically on the founder of the current line of English kings, William the Conqueror. William was "A French bastard landing with an armed banditti" (24). Here the element of illegitimacy is combined with criminality to undermine the audience's respect for the royal line. On page 27, subsequent kings (William's descendents) are "crowned ruffians." The audience now begins to feel the Norman Yoke and to see that their problems with George III are part of a continuing problem that repeats itself over and over again throughout history.

In the third part, "Thoughts on the present state of American affairs," we experience the final descent to the bottom of the U. Life under the present king has left the colonists in "ruin" and "wretchedness" where they must "beg and starve" are "endangered by fire," and are "plundered" (28-31). Here Paine begins a frontal attack on the king-as-
father analogy. The king becomes the "Pharaoh of England," recalling the exoduses of the Hebrews and, by association, the Puritans; he sleeps with the colonists' "blood upon his soul," wants to "keep this continent as low...as possible," and endeavors "to make us less" (36). The king will accomplish this "by craft and subtilty," consequently colonial government "hangs but by a thread...tottering on the brink" of civil unrest (37). Clearly, the Devil hopes to reduce men to a low level (Hell), and he does so by his sneaky use of temptation. Colonists would recognize the image of men's souls dangling precariously over the pit of Hell in Paine's use of the thread and brink images. Far from being a protective father, the king is actually "the Royal Brute of Britain" (41). Now completely dehumanized, the king appears as some deformed creature, perhaps even with a tail and horns?

Paine next presents a brilliant metaphor which illustrates his republican sentiments. After explaining that in monarchies the king is law, and in republics the law must be king he adds, "let the crown...be demolished, and scattered among the people whose right it is" (41). In these few words he is able to suggest that the murder of the king is justifiable because power belongs to the people collectively. The verb "scattered" implies that the
pieces must be picked up off the ground, so obviously the lower ranks of society are to share in the power.

Now "the weeping voice of nature cries 'TIS TIME TO PART" (31) because the "last cord is broken." He suggests the family analogy again, this time by using a reference to natural law. Reconciliation is impossible because you cannot "give to prostitution its former innocence" (42). Here reconciliation is pictured as morally wrong. Additionally, the colonists, like Adam and Eve, cannot go backward up the U and return to the past but must proceed forward toward the millenium which the revolution will ensure.

The element of time is important, "The present winter is worth an age of rightly employed" (33) because this is the "seed time" (27,29). Winter not only describes, literally, the present season but also describes, figuratively, the time of privation before the rebirth of spring and, by extension, of Man. "Seed time" suggests life renewing itself and, possibly, recalls the millenial rebirth of Christian martyrs as well.

Redemption is possible if sacrifices are made, and in the case of the colonial readers that meant a willingness to surrender life and property as demanded by war. Paine challenges his audience to make the same sacrifice that God's son made when he defeated the force of evil for the sake of others. Frye notes that Christ was not physically
superior to other men, only morally stronger, and it is to this moral strength that Paine appeals. The colonists must "fix a memorable aera for posterity to glory in" (49). Not to fight for independence is both "fatal and unmanly" (33). The accusation of unmanliness could refer not only to cowardice but also to immaturity. Just as Christ died for others, so the colonists, as responsible parents, should make the supreme sacrifice so that future generations of Americans can enjoy freedom.

And what should happen if the audience fails to make the choice which appears to be inevitable? "Ye that oppose independence now, ye know not what ye do, ye are opening the door to eternal tyranny" (41). Once again he combines family metaphors and Biblical references. First, "ye know not what ye do," implies that the colonists are childishly innocent and do not understand the importance of the warnings they have been given. Next "opening the door" suggests that the home, rather than serving as a sanctuary from danger, may, in fact, be inviting danger if colonists reject revolution. Finally, earthly things are not thought of as eternal but as transitory, and in speaking of tyranny as eternal Paine reminds the audience of that other eternity--eternal damnation. Certainly, any Christian would prefer to avoid that and, as Paine says, the only way to do so is to make sure the Devil does not rule over America in
the person of George III. If colonists still hesitate to take up arms against their father, "there is no punishment...[that men] will not deserve" (33). With the word "punishment," again he insinuates that a moral element underlies the debate.

Common Sense as a story does not have an ending because the end depends on whether or not the audience accepts revolution as a predestined step in a series of similar conflicts which Christians have, in the past, always risen to meet. It was essential that Paine establish "consubstantialness" with his audience as believers in the Bible's truth, for as Burke notes, "Identification allows for a ritualistic kind of historiography in which the poet could by allusion to a Bible story "substantially" foretell the triumph of his vanquished faction." By paralleling the Bible story Paine presents revolution as the only choice possible if his Christian audience is not to deny its faith.

As mentioned before, many of Paine's critics praise his metaphors for their vividness. I would like to retell the story in Common Sense quoting from the metaphors:

Government is "a punisher...like dress [it] is the badge of lost innocence." Government by kings is "Popery" and "the most prosperous invention" of the Devil. The king is a "worm...crumbling in the dust." Nature disapproves of monarchies "by giving mankind an Ass for a Lion." The head of the royal line was a "French bastard" whose successors were "crowned ruffians." The current king is a "Pharaoh" and a "Royal Brute" who has left colonists in "ruin endangered by
fire...plundered." "The present winter" and "seed time" is "worth an age if rightly employed," but if you choose not to fight you are "unmanly," and "ye are opening the door to eternal tyranny," for which "there is no punishment [you] will not deserve."

In the pamphlet these metaphors are not arranged in exact U-shaped order. In all four parts, for instance, Paine discusses William the Conqueror's wickedness and illegitimacy. Likewise, the plan for the colonists' redemption does not appear only in the fourth part (as a reader might expect) as simply a conclusion to the story. However, both Burke and Frye point out that there is more to sequence than simple linear progression; there is also a momentum created by the rhythmic patterns of sounds, words, sentences, and paragraphs. The next section of this paper is an examination of patterns Paine created by his repetitive use of particular figures to ease George III's transformation into the Devil.
Are archetypal metaphors enough to explain the impact of *Common Sense*? Would people who see themselves as rational be likely to accept a political argument stated primarily in metaphors? I.A. Richards says metaphor is a device that conveys meaning without stating it, "But what is often needed for the wholeness of the experience is not always naturally present, and metaphor supplies an excuse by which what is needed may be smuggled in" (Foss, 34). Paine's metaphors had several accomplices to help them "smuggle in" meaning. This section looks at the metaphors in their rhetorical contexts as aided and abetted by their helpers--the rhetorical figures that amplify, negate, and establish balance which characterizes the repetitive form in the pamphlet.

While a large variety of figures contribute to the organic unity of *Common Sense*, it would be too ambitious to attempt an exhaustive review of all the repetitive patterns which add impact to the metaphoric suggestion of a Bible story within the work. Therefore, I have chosen to look at a small number (excluding all figures of sound) which occur regularly. These complement the conventional form by permitting Paine to create a dualistic vision of the world.
cleanly divided into good and evil parts, with the king always appearing on the side of evil.

Generally, books on rhetorical figures divide the figures into tropes and schemes and/or figures of thought. Tropes are usually understood as those figures which alter a word’s ordinary meaning through metaphoric comparison. These figures include metaphor, simile, metonymy, synecdoche, irony, and hyperbole. But difficulty arises when discussing schemes and figures of thought. For example, in his Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres (1783), Hugh Blair divides all figures into tropes and figures of thought, where the latter, "...supposes the words to be used in their proper and literal meaning; and the figure to consist in the turn of the thought" (148). In his handlist, Lanham summarizes figures of thought as large-scale tropes or schemes or a combination of both (e.g. allegory). Schemes he describes as figures where words’ literal meanings are preserved and emphasis is achieved through rearranged word order: these are figures involving syntax (e.g. hyperbaton). A scheme may incorporate non-literal meanings (tropes) within larger figures of thought based on unusual sentence or paragraph structure (e.g. analogy or periodicity as described below). Quinn adds to the confusion by arranging figures by what they contain or omit. For instance, he groups all figures involving
effects rather than by their similarity of composition. Polyptoton, hendiadys, and synonymia, for example, are discussed together because they contribute to Paine's portrayal of a two-part universe. I hope to demonstrate, in the following analysis of some of Paine's figures of emphasis, negation, and balance, how the influence of repeated sentence and paragraph structures serves to enhance his metaphoric vision of the king.

Probably the most prevalent structures in Common Sense are those of balance, specifically parallelism and antithesis. In Counter-Statement, Burke considers comparison, contrast, and balance as basic ways of thinking because these symmetrical patterns create a rhythm to which humans respond. The following membrum (parallelism of elements in a sentence [Taylor, 159]), appears on page 22:

To the evil of monarchy we have to add that of hereditary succession; and as the first is a degradation and lessening of ourselves, so the second, claimed as a matter of right, is an insult and an imposition on posterity.

By coordinating the nouns used to describe monarchy and hereditary succession Paine produces a symmetry that lures the reader into accepting the proposed comparison: if the reader agrees with the first premise the form encourages him to agree with the second.
conjunctions (or lack of) together so that asyndeton, polysyndeton, paradiastole, and hendiadys appear in one group.

These authors are aware of the problem of classifying figures. Of figures of thought and tropes Blair says, "This distinction, however, is of no great use, as nothing can be built upon it in practice" (148). On the elusive goal of order and regularity among figures, Lanham says in his preface, "A work of this kind would perhaps most naturally fall into two categories, figures and other terms...It simply proved too difficult to decide what was a figure and what was not" (ii). And from Quinn's conclusion:

After the figures of repetition there is little left...particularly of the distinction between literal and figurative usage. Little left except the guidance they gave us through the jungle of style (97).

Having failed to settle the problem of how to classify figures I would like to move on and consider the particular "jungle of style" in Common Sense. Richard Ohmann writes, "style...rests on syntactic options within sentences...these syntactic preferences correlate with habits of meaning that tell us something about [the writer's] mode of conceiving experience." Paine's syntactic choices influenced readers by directing and confining their attention in particular ways. Consequently, I have grouped his figures by their
Depending on a reader's opinion, a parallel argument either emphasizes actual similarities, or it invents questionable likenesses. On page 24 Paine constructs a lengthy parallel argument beginning with, "For in Adam all sinned," and ending with, "hereditary succession and original sin are themselves parallels." By comparing sovereignty to Satan and hereditary succession to original sin he is asking the sympathetic reader to regard both kingship and hereditary succession as immoral.

The antithesis (the contrast or opposition of two objects [Blair, 187]; conjoining contrasting ideas [Lanham, 12]) is an especially useful device for Paine because it allows him to emphasize the goodness in the good (republicanism, the common man, colonial rebellion) and the badness in the bad (monarchism, English administration, the king) by setting them side by side so that their contrasting elements amplify each other. The following antitheses occurs on page 13 where he explains, "Society is produced by our wants, and government by our wickedness; the former promotes our happiness positively by uniting our affections, the latter negatively by restraining our vices." He has isolated society and government at opposite poles (representing mankind's dualistic nature), and by this contrast he has amplified the qualities of both institutions as he sees them.
Upon close analysis an antithetical argument may not seem reasonable, but the form of the antithesis makes the argument appear reasonable as with this example from page 17 where Paine claims that:

[Monarchism] first excludes a man from the means of information, yet empowers him to act in cases where the highest judgment is required. The state of the king shuts him from the world, yet the business of the king requires him to know it thoroughly.

This example makes the questionable presumption that monarchism places contradictory demands on monarchs. But as Burke observes about antithetical figures:

Once you grasp the trend of the form, it invites participation regardless of the subject matter. Formally, you will find yourself swinging along with the succession of antitheses event though you may not agree with the proposition that is being presented in this form (*A Rhetoric of Motives*, 58).

Parallel construction and antithesis are important not only because they emphasize contrasting elements or establish relationships, but also because they suggest completeness in pairs. This discourages an audience from considering a third alternative. In the case of political
rhetoric that third alternative may mean compromise, and Paine did not have to consider that when he used figures of balance.

Paine’s universe requires that any subject be reducible to two parts, “Male and female are the distinctions of nature, good and bad the distinctions of heaven” (19). To help him emphasize this binary perspective he uses synonymia, hendiadys, and polyptoton. While these figures do not polarize two ideas as do the antithesis and parallel, they do add to the impression of balance and completeness in two’s by allowing Paine to discuss a concept by using pairs of related words or two forms of the same word. Synonymia (amplification by synonym [Lanham, 97]) pop up in abundance as when he speaks of monarchism as a “degradation and lessening” (22) of everyone but the monarch, or when he chastises the loyalist reader to “divest himself of prejudice and preposition” (27) because our “feelings and affections” (33) should disprove all monarchical claims. These synonyms contribute nothing substantial to his meaning but reflect, as Ohmann suggests, patterns in the way Paine portrayed the world.

Polyptoton (repetition of the same word or root in different grammatical functions of forms [Quinn, 103]) is also handy, for it allows Paine to bombard his readers with doubles in yet another form. A sampling from the pamphlet
includes, "Mankind being originally equals in the order of creation, the equality could only be destroyed by some subsequent circumstance" (18), and so "the givers of those honors [to kings] could have no power to give away the right of posterity" (23) through the practice of hereditary succession because monarchism "instead of making for peace, makes against it" (25). Therefore, "Ye that oppose not only tyranny, but also the tyrant, stand forth!" (42). The last example encourages the reader to oppose not only the concept of tyranny but also the individual, George III, who embodies that form of government.

Dualism continues to appear as a basic way for Paine to depict the revolutionary conflict as his inclusion of hendiadys suggests (addition of a conjunction between a word such as a noun, adjective, or verb and its modifier [Quinn, 102]). On page 34 he ridicules the colonists' petitioning of the king as "folly and childishness" rather than childish folly. He does not criticize the undecided reader whose timidity delays independence, but entreats the audience to free themselves from England lest America "conquer herself by delay and timidity" (33). On page 51 he offers neither strikingly strong nor strongly striking reasons for separation but rather "many strong and striking reasons." Essentially, the hendiadys allows him to pack his argument with twice as much evidence. Why should the notion of
independence be simply agreeably familiar, when it can be both "familiar and agreeable" (52)?

While these figures which amplify are useful to create contrast and multiply evidence, they pale in comparison to Paine's use of negatives to distinguish "us" from "them," so the audience would not be swayed toward compromise which, he argued, was debilitating colonial efforts to gain independence. Massive doses of negatives helped counteract the colonists' reflexive and unquestioning obedience to George III. Litotes, paradiastole, double and implied negatives, and the ever-adaptable antithesis occur with nearly every reference to hereditary succession, monarchism, and monarchs in the pamphlet. He tries to weaken the belief that the king is the colonists' protector with this antithesis, ", [George III] will scarcely refuse his consent to a bill for putting England into as strong a state of defence as possible, and in America he would never suffer such a bill to be passed" (37). Here he encourages the colonists to see themselves not as Englishmen but as Americans by implying that the king has not been fair to them. But the following deadly pronouncement is more to the point, "That the Almighty hath here entered his protest against monarchical government, is true, or the scripture is false" (22). He claims that if scripture does not invalidate monarchism then the Bible must be wrong. But since
Christians understand the Bible to be God's word; it must be true, therefore, monarchism cannot be justified by appealing to scripture.

Litotes (affirming a thing by denying its contrary [Taylor, 107]) permits Paine to use understatement and sarcasm in defining the opposition. A king is "nothing better" (22) than a gangleader. Monarchism "hath no divinity in it" (24), and hereditary succession has "no glory" (24). Paine, who associates kingship with illegality and immorality, now sounds quite restrained. On page 23 he writes that hereditary succession "once established is not easily removed." This understatement allows him to sugarcoat his appeal to arms: "not easily" sounds less intimidating than "with difficulty."

To add to the effect of negativism, Paine uses double negatives rather than affirmatives as on page 23, when he insists that men under the rule of kings "could not without manifest injustice to their children" continue to support monarchists' hereditary claims. In disgust he condemns the king's power because "the people there can make no laws without his consent" (36). And if the double negatives are not enough he heaps implied negatives onto the monarch's supporters who, he insists, are "unworthy...incomprehensible...unfit...unmanly...ungenerous...unfeeling...unwise...improper...worthless."
Another negative device used regularly is the paradias-
tole (putting together of dissimilar things [Lanham, 70];
addition of a disjunctive conjunction [Quinn, 103]).
Paine's paradiastrales occur as combinations of neither/nor,
neither/either, never/neither, never/not, and not/neither.
For example, when inquiring as to what work King George
does, Paine answers his own question: the king does no work
at all because "he is neither a judge nor a general" (26). With a 'father' like this, "home should afford neither
friendship nor safety" (32). In exposing the veneration of
the king by those who believe in his divine right to rule,
Paine vows, "I shall neither copy their humility nor disturb
their devotion" (24). By combining pairs of nouns, pairs of
verbs, and so forth the paradiasstole reinforces Paine's
depiction of a polarized twofold universe.

As stated before, antithesis and negatives tend to
amplify the bad qualities of the British system. Paine also
used hyperbole which, like litotes, distorts but with over-
statement rather than understatement. The hyperbole
(excess, exaggeration [Blair, 169]) on page 42 describes the
British administration under the nominal control of George
III as hurting colonists who are "wounded through a thousand
pores," and "the injuries we sustain are without number"
(31), but independence is worthwhile because "The sun never
shined on a cause of greater worth" (27). To resolve Ameri-
can-British differences "nothing but blows will do" (34) because to remain under monarchical rule only assures "perpetual arguing" (36). Contrary to royalist claims Paine insists that wars are more prevalent in countries with monarchs than in republics, as "monarchy and succession... have laid the world in blood and ashes" (26). It is true that war is a spectacle of blood and ashes, but by saying that the whole world is involved, he is able to suggest the religious implications of the Last Judgment wherein the entire Earth will be ruined (not just the colonial part) should colonists fail to seize the opportunity to fight the Devil. This battle with evil is not only global in scope, but will affect posterity "even to the end of time" (27). Hyperbole helps Paine project a sense of urgency which puts pressure on the audience to take immediate action.

In Common Sense the world consists of absolutes; everything or nothing, everyone or no one, all or none, always or never. Paine uses other figures which lead the reader along in such a way as to discourage questioning this perspective. Asyndeton and catachresis are two figures which prevent the reader the leisure to question what is being presented. Asyndeton (omission of conjunctions between words, phrases, or clauses [Lanham, 18]) builds tension by pushing the reader along, or as Longinus wrote, there is "...a clear suggestion of action tripping the reader and hurrying him
along the chase. Such is what the poet achieves by the lack of connectives." On pages 23-24 Paine uses asyndeton to equate wisdom and justice with nature by describing monarchism as an "unwise, unjust, unnatural compact," and in doing so suggests that the three are complementary. Later he depicts William the Conqueror as "a very paltry rascally original" (24). In this example he not only omits the conjunction but also the comma so the reader senses an urgency which is not even slowed by punctuation. Sometimes he will omit a conjunction when using a clause to paraphrase a preceding opinion as when, regarding the privileged status of kings, he writes, "Where there are no distinctions there can be no superiority, perfect equality affords no temptation" (38). On page 31 he combines an asyndeton with a zeugma (the omission of a verb [Quinn, 103]), "The blood of the slain, the weeping voice of nature cries, 'TIS TIME TO PART." Not only does this combination of figures imply that nature justifies separation from a parent, but also that those who have died were not simply unlucky victims but, in fact, chose to sacrifice their lives. Those dead now demand that other colonists do the same.

Paine’s catachreses, like asyndetons, establish a pace which discourages leisurely reflection. Catachresis (implied metaphor [Lanham, 21]; apparently inappropriate
substitution of one word for another...as in 'cold war' [Quinn, 102]) tends to de-emphasize the metaphoric nature of the figure by insinuating a comparison rather than overtly stating one. It is an example of what Lakoff and Johnson, in their book *Metaphors We Live By*, would consider a good metaphor because it passes largely unrecognized as such. On page 45 Paine writes a catachresis within an argument for the building of a colonial navy with which to fight the King's Navy. He writes that building a fleet is a "natural manufactory." By inserting the word "natural" before "manufactory" he implies that God sanctions this military-industrial enterprise. Catachresis lets Paine express an opinion in a form which suggests fact, for as Richard M. Weaver argues, "The adjective is...a word of secondary status and force. Its burden is an attribute...an attempt to gain maximum effect. Our intuition of speech seems to tell us that the adjective is question-begging." Overt metaphors of the "A is B" type are more likely to be challenged by a careful reader than is a catachresis. On page 26, for example, the catachresis "republican virtue" is less likely to draw attention or criticism than a declaration like "republicanism is virtuous" might have done. This catachresis helped counter frequent attempts by some loyalists to equate republicanism with anarchy.
Like catachresis and asyndeton, polysyndeton (use of a conjunction between each clause [Lanham, 78]) sets up relationships by creating a "catalogue of roughly equal members" (Quinn, 11). Unlike catachresis and asyndeton, however, polysyndeton slows the reader down, as seen in this example from page 25:

Men who look upon themselves born to reign, and others to obey, soon grow insolent; selected from the rest of mankind their minds are early poisoned by importance; and the world they act in differs so materially from the world at large, that they have but little opportunity of knowing its true interests, and when they succeed to the government are frequently the most ignorant and unfit of any throughout the dominions.

This seemingly endless sentence joined together by three "and's" forces the reader, in an effort not to get lost in the sentence, to pass over the weak logic of the argument. Just because monarchs are arrogant it does not necessarily follow that they do not understand the interests of the rest of the population, as Paine claims.

Polysyndeton also leaves the impression of an unstoppable progression which, according to Frye, suggests ordained inevitability. As a regular feature in the Bible, polysyndeton imparts a narrative quality where one event
occurs after another, and, therefore, implies inevitability rather than speculation. This sentence appears on page 14 where Paine hints at man’s early republican origins:

Thus necessity, like a gravitating power, would soon form our newly arrived emigrants into society, the reciprocal blessings of which, would supersede, and render the obligations of law and government unnecessary while they remain perfectly just to each other; but as nothing but heaven is impregnable to vice, it will unavoidably happen, that in proportion as they surmount their first difficulties of emigration, which bound them together in a common cause, they will begin to relax their duty and attachment to each other; and this remissness will point out the necessity of establishing some form of government to supply the defect of moral virtue.

Again Paine endorses republicanism but this time by presenting his argument in a style frequently found in the Bible, and in doing so lends religious sanctity to his statements.

I have argued from the start that the metaphors in Common-Sense were not in themselves entirely responsible for their impact on the audience. The last figure I will consider is one of the most significant in the pamphlet,
because it enables Paine to incorporate his philosophy, which relates human nature to God, into a rhetorical strategy. This scheme involves periodicity where he summarizes parallel or antithetical passages with a metaphor.

In the first paragraph of the pamphlet he presents an antithetical argument for government as a necessary evil and society as a natural good. The antithesis is summed up in a metaphor which describes the roles of society and government as "The first is a patron, the last a punisher." Again, on page 22, he concludes his case against hereditary succession with the metaphor that nature disapproves it "by giving mankind an Ass for a Lion." These examples demonstrate that his metaphors received emphasis because he used them to summarize a series of ideas or arguments.

Often Paine precedes his argument with a request that the reader be reasonable and unprejudiced but then concludes the passage with an emotion-laden metaphor. This, he claims, "is not inflaming or exaggerating matters, but trying them by those feelings and affections which nature justifies" (33). Emotional responses are good, because "The Almighty hath implanted in us these inextinguishable feelings for good and wise purposes. They are the guardians of his image in our hearts" (42). Periodicity culminating in a metaphor makes it difficult to tell whether a narrative
is embedded in an argument or an argument is embedded in a narrative. In any case, emotions are necessary to "provoke us to justice" (42), and periodicity allows him to reconcile religion with reason and thereby attract the widest audience possible.

Paine's figures served to counter his audience's ingrained willingness to affirm their dependency on and loyalty to the king. As seen in his repetitive form, Paine divided the world into two parts; reasonable and prejudiced, right and wrong, white and black, good and bad, us and them. Figures of balance, amplification, negation, and periodicity contributed to the effect of the metaphors by contrasting 'good' natural law and millenial arguments against 'bad' divine right and king-as-father arguments. His figures defined the enemy by describing monarchism and its supporters in negative terms, and this, by reducing the chance for third choices, helped him to engage his audience in the struggle.

In A Rhetoric of Motives, Burke says:

...the expressing of a proposition in one or another of these rhetorical forms would involve "identification," first by inducing the auditor to participate in the form...and next by trying to include a partisan statement within the same pale of assent (59).
Paine's figures in Common Sense were his partisan statement. The recurrence of the same forms, figures, and ideas lead to an inevitable transformation: the object of public love, Our father the King, became the object of public scorn, Their father the Devil.
Conclusion

*Common Sense* by itself could not have changed colonists' minds about independence, but it may have provided one impetus necessary to move the Americans, who resented the heavy-handed British administration, toward a military solution.

Certainly for colonists already committed to the cause, the pamphlet could have been used to justify their decision to oppose British authority by force. This is, perhaps, an example of what Burke meant when he spoke of identification becoming an end in itself. However, for the undecided, who wavered between their identities as Englishmen and their identities as Americans, Paine's rhetoric may be regarded as a weapon used against them rather than as a tool used by them. Among historians there is doubt that a military confrontation was the colonists' last alternative, as there are indications that the Americans were neither politically nor economically oppressed by the British. Americans exercised considerable autonomy over their internal affairs, and many classes in the colonies enjoyed a higher standard of living than their European counterparts did. Additionally, the distance between England and America made administration of the colonies both expensive and inefficient. Paine himself admitted, "I have never met with
a man, either in England or America, who hath not confessed his opinion, that a separation between the countries, would take place one time or another" (42-43).

Consequently, it may be argued that war was an extremely high price to pay in lives and property for a separation which, all agreed apparently, would occur eventually anyway.

The choice to risk life and property, however, is not ordinarily made out of a dispassionate respect for objective logic. People risk all for love, hate, fear, principle, or belief. And for every audience that believes in a particular religious or ideological system there is, most certainly, a skillful rhetorician who can exploit those beliefs by combining cultural myths with figurative language to direct his readers toward conclusions which may conflict with their best interests.

Paine took advantage of his readers' tendencies to respond to figurative language in a recognizable sequence first by associating George III with the image of the Devil, and second by involving his audience in a familiar battle against evil. Michael Osborn observes, "protagonists of reform literature are portrayed as victims of society in metonymic association with the Christ figure." The unended story within Common Sense called upon each Christian colonist to assume the role of savior by opposing King
George. And while his audience had been gratified by the sequence in the pamphlet, Paine, in turn, was gratified by the audience who, by July 1776, had begun to act out the story ending that he had argued for so vigorously throughout Common Sense.
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