BEN MCCORKLE

Harbingers of the Printed Page: Nineteenth-Century Theories of Delivery as Remediation

ABSTRACT: This article argues that the belletristic and elocutionary movements of the late-eighteenth/nineteenth centuries functioned as cultural mechanisms of remediation, naturalizing the fast-growing print medium so that it eventually became the de facto arbiter of discursive standards for all forms of discourse. Belletrism and elocution, usually depicted in antagonistic conflict with one another, both sought to bring the formal, aesthetic, and logical attributes of print culture and insert them into handwriting and oratorical practice as "natural" elements. The codification of the paragraph in nineteenth-century composition texts illustrates this phenomenon.

In the beginning of *Elements of Rhetoric* (1828), the British rhetorician Richard Whately explains that because of printing—and more specifically, cheap paper—what was once the province of the orator is increasingly becoming co-opted by writing. He even outright suggests that the rhetorical rules of one medium apply just as readily to the other:

> The invention of printing, by extending the sphere of operation of the writer, has of course contributed to the extension of those terms which, in their primary signification, had reference to speaking alone. Many objects are now accomplished through the medium of the press, which formerly came under the exclusive province of the orator; and the qualifications requisite for success are so much the same in both cases, that we apply the term 'eloquent', as readily to a writer as to a speaker. (14)

Following in the theoretical footsteps of Hugh Blair, Whately's treatise greatly expands the domain of rhetoric to include all written and spoken communication by directly stating that the belletristic movement was the outcome of a vibrant, growing print culture. A position contrary to Whately's medium-blurring definition of rhetoric lies across the Irish Sea, and some years earlier:

> From what has been said, it will sufficiently appear, how grossly they are mistaken, who think that nothing is essentially necessary

> to language, but words: and that it is no matter, in what tones their sentiments are uttered, or whether there be any used, so that the words are but distinctly pronounced, and with such force as to be clearly heard. (131)

Here, Thomas Sheridan discusses the primacy of speech over writing, issuing the argument throughout his *Course of Lectures on Elocution* (1762) that for England—and more specifically Ireland—writing is detrimental to language itself: it impedes proper pronunciation, makes us mistake merely competent delivery for eloquent brilliance, and constitutes an inferior mortal copy of the Divine gift of speech.

The belletristic and elocutionary developments of what rhetoric historian Wilbur Samuel Howell terms the "New Rhetoric" of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries led to what initially appears to be a schism, a polarized view of what the domain, or at least the priority, of rhetoric ought to be when faced with the hegemonic status of print technology. Central to this debate was the role delivery played in the rhetorical process, reviving a question about the canon that resonated through antiquity: is delivery a central and substantive part of the rhetorical event or merely ancillary? On the one hand, belletrism intended to treat the total sphere of human communication, encompassing oratory, writing, and criticism in its expanded scope, all forms bound together by a theory which advocated emulating both classical and contemporary works of aesthetic merit in order to cultivate the faculty of taste as it is defined by Blair, Whately, and their disciples (Miller 51-2). So revisioned, belletristic rhetoric developed a decided bias towards writing and print over oral delivery. Conversely, the elocutionary movement, exemplified in the writings of Sheridan and the more systematic John Walker and Gilbert Austin, came into parallel prominence in the late 1700s and early 1800s by eschewing writing and focusing instead on delivery—the embodied skills associated with manipulating physical gesture and voice—to return it to its once proud status atop the stack of classical rhetorical canons.

This article proposes that there is a different way of reading the belletristic and elocutionary traditions that permeate the New Rhetoric of the nineteenth century, one that suggests that the two movements are not necessarily antagonistically oriented, but instead work towards the same ends—namely, they both help to naturalize the print medium so that it becomes the *de facto* arbiter of discursive standards for all mediums of communication. Specifically, the two major strands of rhetorical theory and instruction in the nineteenth century address print culture by slightly different processes of what Jay Bolter and Richard Grusin call "remediation," or the formal logic by which new media transform or refashion prior media forms. Elocution accomplishes this remediation by re-inscribing works of print onto the body as exempla to be performed, erasing clear distinctions between oral and written discourse by

assuming a set of principles common to all modes of communication, and occupying a secondary space on the rhetorical map. By advocating that rhetoric oversees the total sphere of communication, belletrism often looks to printed discourse as the paragon of rhetorical expression, and it subsumes prescriptive rules about the material form of written texts into a framework of natural, self-evident genres bolstered by an elaborate faculty psychology. Faculty psychology's reconceptualization of language as a natural, organic outcome of the workings of the mind rather than a performative act subject to the constraints of a given medium of communication allow for the machine-printed page to determine how the handwritten page and the speaking body are to behave, both rhetorically and materially—creating, in effect, a hidden theory of delivery. This article, then, examines how the elocutionary movement and the belletristic tradition of the nineteenth century's New Rhetoric worked in tandem as parallel educational and cultural forces in order to naturalize the printed page. The collaboration of elocution, belletrism, and the New Rhetoric, along with the advent of composition, rendered the print interface invisible to an increasingly literate society via the remediation of handwriting and oral speech, thereby causing print to appear as an unmediated window into the mind of the author.

Mapping Out the Communications Environment: Nineteenth Century Developments in Print Technology and Culture

The mechanisms of remediation within the institution of rhetoric in the nineteenth century obviously feed into the much broader context of technological and cultural developments surrounding print culture, wherein similar mechanisms work together to bestow what Bolter and Grusin call "immediacy" upon the printed page. Collectively, such remediations of print result in a phenomenon where the print interface begins to influence the other modes of communication because it becomes an increasingly naturalized part of the media landscape. Consider first the changes that happen at the formal level of the print interface. It is specifically during the nineteenth century that print achieves its hegemonic status, that the familiar regularized look-and-feel of most works of print becomes more or less ubiquitous. This era stands in marked contrast to the era immediately following the advent of the printing press in the mid-fifteenth century, where the manuscript still held the most sway and even influenced the print aesthetic so that "early printers went to great lengths to produce precise imitations" of ornate manuscripts (Deibert 65). By the nineteenth century, the balance has shifted in favor of print, and the increased regularization of print results in a rather paradoxical example of remediation. The design standard of print, *because* of its ubiquitous uniformity, becomes a kind of non-design, in effect becoming an invisible template of formal standards that affects the structural, grammatical, and

logical conventions of handwritten and oral communication. As Walter Ong describes this transformation in *Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue* (1958), the design aesthetic of print, which he characterizes as depersonalized and material rather than highly social and verbal, eventually leads Western culture to develop a spatialized understanding of thought and communication rather than one based on dialogical performance (313-4).

In part, the highly regularized evolution of the print interface at the formal level involved a series of technical and technological advancements in print culture during the nineteenth century. Even though we cannot speak of a distinct shift in writing technologies during the nineteenth century *per se*—the printing press has been in existence for nearly four centuries, after all—the rapid changes in the mechanization of the printing process, along with notable growth in the bookseller and newspaper trades and ever-expanding literacy rates in Great Britain and North America, make the nineteenth century an important site of investigation for technological and rhetorical interaction. As S. Michael Halloran explains in "From Rhetoric to Composition: The Teaching of Writing in America to 1900," the nineteenth century experienced profound changes in what we might call the infrastructure of print technology, and, by extension, handwriting. The technical innovations of the Industrial Revolution made the production of paper, pencils, metal type, and the machinery of the press much easier to produce. Halloran writes,

> Discussions of the connection between technology and writing usually focus on one or more of three "revolutions": the development of alphabetic literacy in Ancient Greece; the invention and diffusion of the printing press during the Renaissance; and the development of electronic media, the word-processing computer especially, in our own time. But another revolution in writing technology occurred during the nineteenth century, […] important in its consequences for writing and writing instruction. (169)

Halloran's remarks indicate the need for contextualizing the nineteenth-century rhetorical tradition within the concurrent technological history of the printing press, as he sees each of the two spheres necessarily dependent upon the other. Rather than offer an exhaustive history of nineteenth-century print culture in framing such a context, however, I shall instead briefly gloss some of the more notable technological achievements of the period, as much more extensive work has already been accomplished on the subject.

For several centuries following the inception of Gutenberg's movable type printing press in the mid-fifteenth century, the technological apparatus did not change substantially; the printing press was a fusion of preexisting technics such as the screw press (used for winemaking and olive oil) combined with the punch-and-block method that Gutenberg used to create movable, reusable wooden type. These machines were then combined with well-established

techniques for producing durable oil-based ink, and methods for making paper and parchment that involved drying and flattening pulp gathered from linen rags. Production was still an expensive endeavor, and so the products of the press continued to reflect the status quo of manuscript culture: incunabula (or early printed works) often used multiple typefaces that mimicked handwriting, texts were rubricated (glossed with red-inked passages), and content predominantly consisted of religious and philosophical matter (Baron 42).

The handcraft processes associated with printing remained virtually unchanged until the industrial revolution gave birth to machines and mechanical processes that displaced such labor, among them the steam engine, Linotype and Monotype casting systems, and half-tone printing techniques. Of the many print-related technological developments of the nineteenth century, perhaps the biggest of them was the mechanization of paper production. The need for more raw material to produce paper led manufacturers to eventually abandon recycled linen rags and adopt the much more abundant wood pulp, which decreased paper prices and further increased production (140).

My intention in stressing the importance of the technological developments of nineteenth-centuryprint culture is not to minimize the impact of the printing press during its first four hundred years of existence, and it should be conceded that the attributes we commonly associate with print culture begin to emerge during the period roughly spanning 1450 to 1800. It was during the nineteenth century, beginning in the early 1800s but more so during the latter half, that we see the technology of the printing press adapt to meet increasing demands for printed material, creating a truly hegemonic status for the medium. The changes in print culture during the nineteenth century, however, go beyond merely those of degree—this isn't simply a case of significantly greater dissemination of printed materials. A change in *kind* takes place as well, one wherein the nature of printed works comes under closer scrutiny; in a society where people are more likely to be literate, suddenly *what* one reads becomes vastly more important than *that* one reads.

Framing the rise of print culture as a simple causal relationship where new technology yields more production, however, oversimplifies the complexity of the supply-and-demand logic behind this shift. John Feather reminds us in *A History of British Publishing* that it was "not only in technical matters that the industrial revolution had a profound effect on the British publishing industry. […] The trade's market also underwent a dramatic transformation as did the means of reaching it" (134). Feather situates this shift initially with the newspapers, because increases in trade activity over greater geographical distances led to a growing demand to know about the goings-on in remote places; also, the rather new phenomenon of the urban space created a new cultural community—the city, a built-in customer base complete with a new sense of communal identity (135).

Additionally, the growth of the new mercantile economy spread to outlying provinces, where rural inhabitants developed the need for functional literacy in order to participate in it—among such early provincial printed works were instructional manuals in accountancy, simple legal procedures, and assorted business-related documents (Feather 130). In *The Formation of College English*, Thomas Miller identifies this popular explosion of literacy with the creation of English studies curriculum in higher education, in effect challenging "the tendency of disciplinary histories to assume that change begins at the top among major theorists and is then transmitted down to be taught in less influential institutions" (6). Growth in practical, work-based literacy evolved into widespread interest in reading for aesthetic or recreational reasons. Consequently, the nineteenth century heralded an explosion of markets for printed material, from penny press newspapers to pamphlets, journals, pulp fiction serials, and exquisitely bound, gilt-edged works of "high" literature. This demand, in part goaded on by technical innovations, led to a growing need for even more technological innovations. Ronald Deibert calls such a symbiotic relationship of cultural and technical dynamics a "communications *environment*" (emphasis added) to underscore the social embeddedness of a technology, and to undercut the technological determinist model of analysis that maintains the illusion that "technologies enter society and generate specific social forces and/or ideas *de novo*" (29). By shifting focus to see technologies as part of a social environment or ecology, Deibert argues, we come to understand more fully how a particular technology is a contextualized outgrowth of a particular social epistemology.

The cultural, philosophical, and epistemological influences that pervade the nineteenth century in North America and Great Britain, ably discussed in other scholarly accounts, had a profound effect on shaping the communications environment of the era. The technology of print came of age in the Western world at a time when the intellectual climate was tied to the scientific model of empiricism, which stood at the helm of the industrial revolution. As Ong explains, the advent of the press coincided with, and even helped propagate, the procedural scientific method of Ramism in the sixteenth century which later influenced Cartesianism; this constituted a paradigm shift that would unsettle the long-standing dialectical schema established in rhetorical theories of antiquity (225-6). Writing in the shadow of the philosophical zeitgeist cast by Descartes' 1647 treatise *Principia philosophiae*, specifically his bifurcated model of subjectivity, were thinkers like Locke and Hume. In particular, John Locke's *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690) articulated a new kind of philosophical empiricism founded on the idea that human experience of the physical world is filtered through a complex web of sensory associations ordered by various mental faculties termed understanding, judgment, and the will. Locke's ideas were well received by the philosophical and scientific

communities of Great Britain (and later The United States), and further contributions by Scottish natural language and Common Sense philosophers such as Lord Kames, Thomas Reid, and Alexander Bain lay a foundation for a long-standing faculty psychology that would survive as philosophical/scientific fact for over two hundred years, although some might argue that this philosophical shift was more concerned with supporting a nascent national identity through punctuation, grammar, and even thought than it was with outlining a genuine, disinterested epistemology. In other words, the faculty psychology tradition developed a topographical treatment of the terrain originally established by Descartes, in effect rendering the philosophical physiological and thus serving to naturalize this particular model of subjectivity even further. With such a model in place, print stands as an effective medium for reinforcing it, both as a vehicle for disseminating language in its empirically "proper" form and as a manifestation of the linguistic workings of the inner mind, unadorned with the superfluous ornamentation of a performing body.

Strange Bedfellows: How Elocutionary and Belletristic Theories Extended the Reach of the Printed Page

If the early print period, or incunabula, of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries was a close remediation of the illuminated manuscript, this new age of print in the nineteenth century ushered in a heavily regularized, mechanical product, one with which we remain familiar today in its several forms: the newspaper, the novel, the academic journal, and so on. Black ink on white paper, a clear separation of graphical illustrations from text, a consistent and legible typeface, and regular margins and indentations became par for the course, the status quo of the written word. While one reason for the ubiquity of this regularized interface results from the "accident" of the technology itself—i.e., mass-produced machinery did not facilitate much customization in text design—print also became naturalized thanks to broader cultural forces such as changes in social epistemology and philosophy, national identity, and the interrelated structure of social institutions. Just as previous cultures had come to terms with other technologies of writing, nineteenth century culture explained this new aesthetic by naturalizing it, and rhetoric was a major cultural site responsible for generating such explanations. In particular, rhetorical theory's treatment of delivery plays into the process of print's naturalization. Resurrecting the canon of delivery in the elocutionary movement places emphasis upon the embodied aspects of rhetorical performance in order to provide a "natural" site for remediating printed matter—namely, the body. Concurrently, the writing end of the New Rhetorical spectrum which eventually gave rise to the discipline of composition supported what we might consider an invisible theory of delivery, prescriptive measures that applied

"natural" rationales to compositional forms and techniques that increasingly resemble the medium of print.

As this article argues, the fusion of mental activity and alphabetic text is not solely the product of years of habitual exposure to print at the formal level. The New Rhetoric helps reinforce this fusion by minimizing distinctions between a particular medium of expression, privileging instead the *manner* of expression. For example, the compositionist David J. Hill expressed the prevalent sentiment of the day, that the theory of rhetoric was founded on principles that transcended medium, in effect conflating print, handwriting, and oral delivery by saying that each is subject to the same set of governing rules. Establishing elocution's ancillary status within the rhetorical domain, he writes, "Elocution has long been regarded as a part of Rhetoric, but it is by itself too important and extensive a subject to be treated as a division of rhetorical science. It does, indeed contribute to render spoken discourse more effective, but so does elegant chirography or clear typography improve the effectiveness of written thought. Rhetoric treats of discourse in general, not written or spoken discourse in particular" (qtd. in Johnson 148). Hill's opinion was paradigmatic among most of his contemporaries: the rules governing how language is used for rhetorical purpose are first and foremost based upon establishing *mental* harmony between audience and author. The paratextual elements of a given discourse (i.e., penmanship or physical gesture) are thought either to naturally align with that harmony, or are to be attended to only *after* universal skills are mastered (148-49). For the empirically minded pedagogues of nineteenth century rhetoric, medium and message are two quite separate beasts, not intimately conjoined as Marshall McLuhan would later so famously declare.

An overview of how the elocutionary movement affects, and is affected by, the rise of nineteenth-century print culture reveals that the relationship was far less contentious than Thomas Sheridan's impassioned advocacy for the spoken word indicated, if not in name, then in deed, and in a number of manners. The elocutionary movement that pervaded both academic and popular spheres of nineteenth-century rhetorical life actually began some decades before, in the latter half of the eighteenth century. Works such as Sheridan's *Course of Lectures on Elocution* (1762), John Walker's *Elements of Elocution* (1781), and Gilbert Austin's *Chironomia, or a Treatise on Rhetorical Delivery* (1806) were not only influential as originators of the movement, but stood on their own rights as popular elocution texts throughout the 1800s, each making their way into several editions. On the whole, the elocutionary movement drew upon classical theories of delivery as a means of tempering the psychological assumptions of the New Rhetoric—that is, that the focus of the discipline should be on language production conceived as verbalized thought rather than as an embodied, performative practice (Fredal 284). Champions of elocution sought to elevate delivery's status, claiming as Sheridan did, "And

if the language of nature [i.e., verbal language] be possessed of such power, in its present neglected and uncultivated state, how immense must be its force, were it carried to the same degree of perfection that it was amongst the ancient Greeks and Romans"(xii). Similarly, Gilbert Austin invocated the "ancients" in his defense of the canon of delivery when he called it "not the least important division of the art [of rhetoric]" (x).

The elocutionary movement was more than just a recapitulation of classical theory, more than just a reactionary answer to the neglect that characterized how most contemporary rhetorics treated voice, gesture, and the like. It is at least somewhat curious that a revived interest in delivery manifests in and around the same moment as the heyday of print culture. The nineteenth century was a period that saw an unprecedented expansion of printed material. A flood of penny press newspapers, serial sheets, periodicals, political pamphlets, and pulp fiction emerged concurrent with the increased popularity of parlor recitals, speech competitions, and similar oratorical practices—how might we explain this coincidence? Perhaps the antagonistic tone taken by those like Sheridan and Whately on both sides of the spoken/written divide doesn't accurately or completely reflect the rhetorical landscape of the 1800s. Perhaps instead of both sides defending their own clearly defined disciplinary spaces, they were each in their own way addressing the cultural tensions of an ascending writing technology, utilizing different processes of remediation that helped render the unique attributes of print invisible by enfolding them into the culturally naturalized practices of oratory and handwriting.

It is clear that the printing industry aided in fostering the popular and academic interest in oratory that lasted through much of the nineteenth century, and vice versa. Ironically, standards of oral pronunciation and bodily gesture central to the mission of the elocutionists were disseminated through works of print. Leading the charge to standardize English pronunciation were Thomas Sheridan and dictionarists such as John Walker and William Johnston, who used arguments based on patriotism and social mobility in order to entice students to strive towards "proper" speech patterns; their books proved quite successful in the marketplace (Baron 128-9).

Both in Great Britain and North America, the first half of the century enjoyed an explosion of publications specifically directed at oratorical culture in the academy, while the later decades saw an increase intended for private oratorical performances (Clark, Halloran 1-6, 156). In addition to popular British elocutionists such as Austin, Sheridan, and Walker, the elocutionary movement also included William Russell's *Orthophony, or Vocal Culture* (1846), Ebeneezer Porter's *Analysis of the Principles of Rhetorical Delivery as Applied to Reading and Speaking* (1827), George Raymond's *The Orator's Manual* (1879), Merritt Caldwell's *Practical Manual of Elocution* (1845), J.W. Shoemaker's *Practical Elocution* (1886), and a slew of others ranging from

very theoretical treatises to simple anthologies for recitation. The potential for increased dissemination afforded by the enhanced printing technology of the 1800s fueled the popularity of oratorical culture by providing a desirable medium for packaging oratorical content. Likewise, elocution's popularity in the first place provided a burgeoning print market with an already established demographic upon which to capitalize. In this very material respect, the reciprocal nature of the relationship between print and the elocutionary tradition is quite clear—each reinforced the other. Furthermore, the associative bond between print and oration is reinforced by this upsurge of texts, positioning print as a necessary aid to, and hence an indispensable component for learning the theoretical principles behind, verbally delivered speech. This particular mechanism of remediation contributes to the naturalization of print by conflating the growing technology with the long-familiar, more natural, medium of verbal speech, in effect minimizing the differences between the two.

Elocution also helped naturalize print by more theoretical means, influenced primarily by the belletristic rationale of Hugh Blair's *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres* (1783). As with its belletristic counterpart, the elocutionary movement relied upon a fount of literary passages meant not only to demonstrate rhetorical principles to the student, but also to serve as models appropriate for oral performance (Johnson 43-45). These passages were typically a combination of classical and contemporary sources. Just to offer a few examples representative of the field, John Walker's manual *Elements of Elocution* is replete with sources from the Bible, Virgil, Ovid, and contemporaries like Hume, Pope, and many selections from *The Spectator* in order to provide the student reader with ample literary examples to aid in the development of skills in oratorical punctuation (the verbal counterpart to grammatical punctuation). *Chironomia* also has several annotated passages, among them Gray's "Elegy Written in a Country Church Yard," Milton's *Paradise Lost*, Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, and several classical passages from the likes of Pliny, Homer, and Ovid. Russell's *Orthophony, or Vocal Culture* includes several poetic passages meant to illustrate various moods such as sorrow, anger, or joy; literary figures such as Tennyson, Byron, Shakespeare, Browning, Coleridge, and others are employed throughout as a means of supplementing what Russell deems a highly scientific study of voice with examples showing "high standards of literary excellence" (Russell vi).

As scholars such as Nan Johnson, Thomas Miller, Naomi Baron, and Thomas Conley have explained, the enmeshing of classical and contemporary literary traditions served to elevate the status of British and North American literature in order to help establish a strong national/cultural identity. But the elocutionists, like the rest of the New Rhetorical movement, were doing more than simply borrowing the status of the classical tradition as a foundation for their work. Rather, as they saw it they were extending the tradition, improving

it through the progressive addition of psychological and epistemological principles embodied in the works of contemporary literature (Johnson 14-15). I suggest that we might extend the insights of this historical scholarship by positing that at the level of media interaction, the function is similar: to elevate the cultural cachet of print by borrowing from the status of well-established media forms. Comparing the works of popular authors that were received by audiences as printed texts with works from the classical manuscript era is one mechanism of remediation; making printed matter stand as the *de facto* exemplary standard for oral delivery is another. Together, these two mechanisms of remediation erase distinctions between the different logical, aesthetic, and formal framework of each communications environment. Moreover, by virtue of its placement at the top of the technological mountain, the culture of print becomes the "natural" disposition of language production, be it written or spoken. In other words, this conflation creates conditions by which print *as interface* becomes invisible while simultaneously influencing the shape of discourses in every medium. If this hegemonic ordering is only implicit when discussing elocution, it is certainly more explicitly stated in the belletristic and composition areas of the rhetorical landscape, which will be discussed later in this article.

Yet another mechanism of remediation, the elocutionary movement advocated the mechanical standardization of delivery in a manner quite different from the audience-centered, contextual canon of classical times. An emphasis on mechanical regularity with respect to delivery borrows a central tenet of the logic of print culture and applies it to the speaking body, implying that there is a universally proper or natural way to deliver a speech of a particular species. Although Sheridan was a proponent of the natural style, claiming that proper and effective elocutionary style is more the result of vocal tone coinciding with the ideas contained within a discourse than adhering to a set of arbitrary rules, many of the other elocution theorists developed highly encoded notational systems to precisely regulate vocal inflection, gestures of the arms, hands, and legs, and even facial countenance as a means of directly manipulating different faculties in the minds of listeners. Austin's *Chironomia* is perhaps the best example of this prescriptivism, with a series of engravings depicting classical and contemporary orators performing various gestures and postures. In addition to these diagrams were annotated reading selections with diacritical marks indicating differences in tone, pitch, and cadence. John Walker's *Melody of Speaking* (1787), a staple textbook well into the 1800s, employed a similar notational system, emphasizing accents and pauses meant to "express the passions" underlying the words in each selection. Similarly, Russell's *Vocal Culture* even uses a version of musical notation in some examples; Russell explains that his treatise depends upon "systematic cultivation" because, "The art, like all others, is founded on certain principles, the knowledge of which

constitutes science" (xiii). Additional works such as James Rush's *Philosophy of the Human Voice* (1827) offered a detailed theory for studying vocal expression as a writable method of manipulating faculties of understanding and passion; this theoretical rationale, which extended or even supplanted the classical influences of Quintilian and Cicero by making the study of delivery a scientific, universalizing affair, subsequently influenced many of the important American elocutionists to follow (Johnson 155). While many nineteenth century manuals gave primary attention to the voice, Caldwell's *Practical Manual*, John Broadus's *Treatise on the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons* (1889), and similar manuals placed normative status not only on vocal performance, but on bodily aspects of delivery as well. Perhaps the pinnacle of elocution's preoccupation with normalizing the body, Jonathan Barber, author of *A Practical Treatise of Gesture* (1829), taught elocution at Harvard with the aid of a hollow bamboo globe; students were made to stand inside the wooden hoops in order to learn the proper angles for various gestures. Collectively, sources like these maintained that natural elements of bodily delivery—smooth movements of the limbs, unexaggerated movement of the face and eyes, a stately and solid stance with feet placed squarely apart, should be systematically cultivated so as to sympathize with appropriate moments in the oration. Again, the rationale for such systematic attention was based on the epistemological rationale—vocal and bodily gestures directly and universally affect the faculties of the listener, and they should function in concert with the meaning of the delivered text.

How are we to read this highly prescriptive movement to encode bodily delivery specifically as a means of remediating print? In one sense, elocution is part of a printing-centered communications environment, one that values the mechanical regularity of print and reinscribes the attributes back upon processes of oral delivery. In McLuhan's view, the rise of the printing press ushered in a new paradigm of mechanization that reached into other technologies and other communications media, eventually leading to electronic mechanizations such as radio and television. The mentality associated with these developments resonated in the cultural and ideological values of the time, creating McLuhan's figure of the "literate equitone," a figure whose speech is consonant with the regularity of print. For example Philippa Spoel sees the elocution manual as a function of the modern episteme, arguing in a Foucaultian analysis that "the technologies of discipline that Austin inscribes have a normalizing effect in the sense that they define and code standards of polite bodily action against which improper standards can be identified" (27). Elocution, then, naturalizes print in part by adopting the formal qualities associated with print culture—its uniformity, its iconic fixity—and explaining this adoption as a natural outcome of an epistemological rationale. This process of remediation helps print lose its status as a unique medium through which we

experience language because the attributes we associate with print increasingly envelop all other mediums as well.

In "The Language of Nature and Elocutionary Theory," G.P. Mohrmann defines the implicit philosophical underpinnings of the pedagogically oriented elocutionary movement, its inevitable growth from a post-Descartes Enlightenment as it was filtered through the eighteenth century Scottish "common sense" philosophers Thomas Reid, Lord Kames, Alison, and others. Mohrmann stresses the influence of incorporating natural language into elocutionary theory when he writes:

> Certainly other forces were vital to the [elocutionary] movement, the role of science being one of special consequence. […] With natural language deemed important in so many areas of thought […] nothing would have been more appropriate than that reason should have subjected tones, looks, and gestures to empirical observation. The rhetorical tradition having prior and most obvious rights to the domain, it is quite understandable that the elocutionary movement should have resulted. That result was not an adventitious distortion of the tradition. Only when understood as a response to the accepted epistemology and psychology of the era will the elocutionary movement fall into proper perspective. (124)

Mohrmann's observations stop short of acknowledging the technological resemblance between the elocutionary movement and the print paradigm as well. This is understandable, given that the ubiquity of the print interface is precisely what causes it to escape scrutiny *as* an interface. We've become culturally habituated to accept the interface as language in its purest form—the expression of interior thought. As a result of this quality of print, elocution was a mechanistic, highly standardized approach to delivery. Additionally, the type of discourse deemed worthy of delivering in the first instance was more often that of the highest literary order. The elocutionary movement achieved its prominence thanks in part to the increased reach of print, which fed a healthy market of orators looking for further instruction in vocal inflection and more material to recite in the parlor. Thomas Sheridan's protests aside, elocution existed as a support to belletrism by legitimizing the rationale, by incorporating its logic into the realm of embodied performance. The two traditions were united in forwarding a nationalistic and cultural agenda served up by the printing press that masqueraded as empirically solid rules for language production. Part of that agenda involved naturalizing the print interface, rendering it a transparent window into the mind of the writer.

While the elocutionary tradition throughout the 1800s served to remediate print through processes that reinscribed print-like attributes back onto the more culturally familiar form of oratorical delivery, then the belletristic

tradition of the New Rhetoric, as well as the newly minted sub-discipline of composition heavily influenced by belletristic values, advocated rhetorical principles that further remediated print via the handwritten word. Just as Richard Whately stated, the printing press greatly extends the "sphere of operation" of the nineteenth century writer; so too does a primary rhetorical focus on writing extend the domain of the press. Specifically, belletristic rhetoric and its counterparts remediated print by several processes: 1) it bestowed ancillary status upon elocution, establishing the literary word's dominance over oratory; 2) it greatly expanded the domain of rhetorical theory to include newly emerging genres in the print world; 3) it conflated different mediums of communications by suggesting a certain universality of rhetorical principles based on the concept of language as the external product of internalized thought; and 4) it incorporated design elements associated with typographic writing back into handwriting by using a rationale founded on "natural" principles of discourse. These naturalizing processes allow for the development of prescriptive rules concerning the extratextual elements of discourses other than embodied speech that do not explicitly acknowledge the canon of delivery. They instead constitute an *invisible* theory of delivery, termed so because the rationale is subsumed by the other rhetorical canons of invention, style, and arrangement. The formal, aesthetic, and logical dimensions of the printed page dictated newly developing standards that determined the shape of writing across the board. The influence of print brings not only a formal, fixed linearity but also reinscribes the values associated with print culture—in *Writing Space*, Bolter associates the values of print culture with the logical habits of homogenization, spatialization, and hierarchical systems of order–onto language production at all levels, disregarding distinctions of medium (10-13).

In spite of the popularity of elocution and oratorical culture throughout the nineteenth century, rhetorical theory on the whole, strongly influenced by the belletristic rationale and leaning more and more towards writing, considered traditional notions of delivery ancillary or peripheral to general rhetorical principles at best, and a potentially contaminating influence at worst. As previously mentioned, Whately's highly influential *Elements of Rhetoric* called attempts to teach proper delivery "hopeless," and like his predecessor Hugh Blair, gives far less treatment to delivery or oratorical eloquence than writing-related topics. The compositionist movement influenced by Blair and Whately treated oral delivery in similar fashion. For example, in the preface to *Principles of Rhetoric*, A.S. Hill makes a clear distinction between the principles associated with both writing and speaking and those associated with writing alone, and he arranges his book accordingly: Part I, which "discusses and illustrates the general principles which apply to written or spoken discourse of every kind" extends seventy-three pages, while Part II, dealing with principles

exclusive to "the several kinds of prose writing which seems to require separate treatment," lasts for three hundred and twenty-six pages (vi). Alexander Bain's *English Composition* refers to elocution as the naturally occurring mode of delivery brought forth by the proper understanding of the passions and human nature; he acknowledges that Eloquence—the "impassioned mode of address"—"usually supposes a certain energetic delivery, and elevation of manner which distinguishes it from common speech" (212). Likewise, Henry Day describes delivery in *Elements of the Art of Rhetoric* (1866) as the last element in rhetorical understanding, to be considered only "until the mental states to be communicated are actually conveyed to the mind addressed. It, therefore, may properly comprehend delivery" (6). This bias of logic over performance remained a long-standing one, and it even influenced more contemporary interpretations of the era. In *Eighteenth Century British Logic and Rhetoric* (1971), Wilbur Samuel Howell characterized this negative reaction to elocution, describing it as "a futureless idea that was destined against logic and common-sense to have a two-hundred year future in England and America" (146). The efforts of these rhetoricians effectively marginalized elocution within the domain of rhetoric by either stigmatizing the teaching of the practice as Whately did, making it the natural bodily outcome of an inherently affective speech, or conflating it with a generalized set of rhetorical principles applicable to all manner of discourse. Not only does this theoretical climate help support a hierarchy atop which sits the printed and written word, it also reifies a narrow definition of delivery concerned with bodily performance that obscures or detracts from a separate, invisible theory of delivery aimed at written discourse. Even though rhetoric pays attention to the extra-textual features of writing, these elements are not specifically theorized as performative aspects of textual production, but as a necessary component to achieving perspicuity of expression.

As with the explosion of printed matter on oratory, so too did belletristic and composition-themed rhetorics reciprocally take advantage and extend the power of the press. Many notable rhetorical texts and treatises—among them, seminal works by Blair, Whately, Genung, Newman, A.S. Hill—became mainstays of the nineteenth-century university curriculum, and were consequently reprinted in multiple editions. Arguably, Hugh Blair's 1783 *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres* stood as the most influential work by the New Rhetoricians, both as a course text in itself and as a theoretical influence for most composition handbooks and treatises of the 1800s; in the U.S. alone, *Lectures* was reprinted in sixty-five editions from 1784 to 1873 and was a cornerstone of British and American booksellers' catalogues published after 1800 (Downey 19).

Perhaps Blair's most influential contribution to rhetoric is his development of a theory of taste, or an innate appreciation of the beautiful. The way

this particular intellectual power is cultivated is by having contact with the beautiful—in Blair's case, this meant the study of *belles lettres*. Belletrism operated on the principle, and it eventually became the commonly accepted belief, that contact with the best works of literature would help improve not only one's mental faculties, but one's moral standing as well. Due in no small part to the help of Blair's *Lectures*, a heirarchical structuring of literacy developed that helped establish national identity as well as social positioning; with more people knowing how to read, simple literacy is no longer a demarcation of social class, and so distinctions were made between more and less cultivated types of writing. This striation, at least partially, can be seen a result of the growth of print. Further, Blair assigns universality to this power. In his second lecture, "On Taste," Blair writes, "In every composition, what interests the imagination, and touches the heart, pleases all ages and all nations" (Corbett and Golden 46). Blair looks to the masters of English literature—Milton, Pope, Shakespeare, and the like—for examples of the kind of writing designed to foster the faculty of taste. The effect of assigning this kind of importance to the cultivation of taste through belletrism is twofold. On one hand, this sets in motion a growing privilege of composition over oratory, which affects not only the reception goal of rhetorical training (reading the Great Books not so much as models of emulation, but in order to hone the sensibilities of the faculties and better one's social station), but also the production goal (increasingly the end product of the rhetorical process becomes a written one, leading to the eventual establishment of a composition discipline in North America). On the other hand, the canon of style becomes especially important—Blair devotes fifteen of his forty-seven lectures to the canon, more than any other. Style for Blair is a writing-centric canon, as he devotes his stylistic analyses to the writings of Dean Smith and several of Addison's *Spectator* essays. As a result, a particular *kind* of discourse gets explicitly privileged over others, a discourse whose structural, stylistic, and material components are influenced by the culture of print. Moreover, with so much attention placed upon how the stylistic effects play in the minds of the audience, the notion that handwritten texts imitate printed ones on a material level—what we might call a nascent form of delivery—is not given overt treatment. Rather, these rules get hidden, conflated with principles of style and arrangement, and are theorized as "natural" elements of persuasive writing.

Literature was but one model of writing with which nineteenth-century rhetoric was concerned. The profusion of printed works beginning in the late 1700s and greatly increasing in the 1800s—novels, poetry, and drama, certainly, but also travel literature, scientific treatises, political pamphlets, journalism, and so on—gave rhetoric an entirely new field of writing forms upon which to capitalize. By expanding its domain to include (or even define) these new forms, rhetoric established itself as the general discipline to account for

a much wider field of communication, securing its position in colleges and universities in Great Britain and North America and taking on what Thomas Miller would characterize as a "cosmopolitan" function by bridging the elite and popular cultures (Miller 11). The rationale for discussing these various genres was predicated on the concept that writing genres—rather than social, performative types of discourse that take their shape from cultural habituation—correspond to the natural processes of the mind. With each purpose facing a writer, a matching prose genre existed that exhibited the best natural form, according to much of the rhetoric and composition theory emanating from the nineteenth century. In *Nineteenth-Century Rhetoric in North America*, Johnson describes the theoretical attitude that rhetoric applies to the growing world of print:

> When discussing argument, description, narrative, and exposition as species of prose, nineteenth-century theorists had in mind compositions in which proof of a proposition, representation of an object, narration of a plot, or definition of an idea or object correspond to the formal subject of the discourse. These genres of prose were defined in terms of the dominant inventional process employed in the development of subject matter and the overall epistemological aim of appealing to the understanding and the imagination. Nineteenth-century rhetoricians viewed argument as both an oral and written form, but they linked description, narrative, and exposition primarily with prose composition. […] By applying the generic categories to a broader range of subjects and popular writing forms, nineteenth-century rhetoricians extended the formal range of prose genres. (199-200)

For compositionists like A.S. Hill, Samuel Newman, David Hill, John Genung, G.P. Quackenbos, and others, such a theory results in a taxonomy of the new forms of writing that either first emerge or gain cachet in the 1800s, a rendering of natural, self-evident categories (i.e., narration, description, exposition) upon designed cultural products. For example, John Genung's *Practical Systems of Rhetoric* (1886) draws a direct link between the mental process of invention and the modes of composition; he writes, "The discourse is to be not a mere agglomeration of statements, but an organism, fitted to move as one thought, and be incorporated into the reader's mind" (218). Consequently, many different species of writing and oration become collected into the same genre; A.S. Hill concludes *Principles of Rhetoric* (1878) with a catalogue of the kinds of writing that he classifies as argumentative, ranging from the political orations of Daniel Webster and Richard Cobden to a chapter from John Stuart Mill's *Principles of Political Economy* and Matthew Arnold's literary criticism essay "Last Words" (399-400). While some scholars rightly argue that rhetorical theory's preoccupation with defining and codifying genres is a

move designed to elevate the relevance of rhetoric in a highly literate period, my interpretation builds upon that argument by suggesting that another effect of this trend is the increased naturalization of newly emerging print forms. In other words, rhetoric not only names these new forms of writing, it also bestows a kind of *a priori* status upon them, recursively suggesting that their existence is dictated by the specific mental operations facilitated by each form. The reciprocity of the dynamic between the institutional discipline of rhetoric and the broader culture of print during the nineteenth century is such that each feeds upon and feeds into the status of the other.

We can also see the remediation of print at work in the processes involved in producing handwritten text. Just as a paradigm of mechanical prescriptivism took hold of the elocutionary movement in the nineteenth century, so too did it pervade instruction in handwriting. Baron mentions the growing popularity of penmanship manuals in Great Britain and North America such as H.C. Spencer's eponymous *Spencerian Key to Practical Penmanship* (1869) and various works by the popular Austin N. Palmer (113). Such texts emphasized the imitative, repetitive process of learning in order to write in a particular script—the imprinting of muscle memory—through highly structured exercises where the instructor would verbally tell students what motions to make with their pens, sometimes going so far as to use metronomes (112). Baron finds this highly systematized, scientific approach ironic, given that prevailing theories of the time (Johann K. Lavater's *Essays on Physiognomy* (177?), E.A.P. Hocquart's *The Art of Judging the Mind and Character of Men and Women from their Handwriting* (1812), and similar analyses) saw a person's handwriting as a reflection of his or her mental state, moral character, and sense of taste—in short, a mirror of the soul (111-12). While Baron's reading of the standardization of handwriting equates the trend with the philosophical paradigms of the day, we might also read it as part of the hidden or invisible theory of delivery at work. In other words, rules directly concerned with the material, formal aspect of text production instead masquerade as rules pertaining to the intrinsic epistemological nature of discourse. Once again, we see the familiar phenomenon of remediation at work: a technological approach to writing, emulative of print, bolstered by a naturalizing rationale.

As we have seen, the rhetorical domain of the nineteenth century helped facilitate the rise of print culture by a number of methods. In general, the New Rhetoric extended the notion of human nature by thoroughly schematizing an elaborate faculty psychology, making conditions ripe for a kind of logocentrism that sees the written word as a less contaminated means of transmitting ideas between human minds. The belletristic tradition begun in seventeenth-century France and brought to England and the Americas by Hugh Blair set standards of taste founded upon culturally sanctioned works of literature; coming in contact with sublime writing causes transformations in one's faculties,

subsequently affecting the ability to communicate in any medium. On the whole, rhetorical theory greatly expanded its domain, staking its claim on the newly expanding print landscape, bringing the multiple genres, literatures, and critical forms into its purview, arguing that general rhetorical principles are applicable to all forms and mediums of expression. The newly developing sub-discipline of composition studies adopted not only literary examples and for emulation, but also the look-and-feel of print in the design of handwritten texts. Finally, although delivery once again receives professional attention in the form of elocution, it continues to be seen as auxiliary to (written) rhetoric and is propped up with a multitude of literary exempla. And all of these communications media are subject to similar methods of mechanization that mimic the technical processes of printing, an irony given the emphasis rhetoric on the whole placed on nature in the rhetorical process.

Reading the Paragraph as Intersection of Rhetorical Theory and Technology

Nineteenth-century rhetoric subsumed the formal elements of print by applying a natural-language justification to them. This dynamic is illustrated dramatically by the codification of the paragraph. By the time we arrive at the latter half of the nineteenth century, the paragraph stands as the structural measure of *written* discourse, taking a position it really had not enjoyed before. Even though the paragraph has been traced back to post-Homeric Greece, the act of physically separating units of written discourse with spacing or a system of diacritial markings was originally meant to serve the oral delivery of a written text, as Richard Enos and Elizabeth Odoroff argue in their article "The Orality of the 'Paragraph' in Greek Rhetoric." They write that the paragraph "as are all features of early Greek scripts—is an aid to memory in the transmission of oral discourse. As such, the paragraph functions as an oral delimiter, a graphic instrument to facilitate verbal expression" (53). Furthermore, paragraphs were meant more as pausing-cues for orators and listeners alike—"determinants of spatial, temporal, and acoustic separation"—and were not necessarily codified to the point that they were meant to represent a single, discrete thought (57). As writing gained prominence throughout the western world, the paragraph remained more of a spatial separation of text and not a consistent logical separator; unlike chapter or section divisions, the paragraphing system much as we know it today was not always used to indicate a change in the topic (Baron 179). Further, the physical manner of paragraphing changed greatly from the manuscript to the print era. Baron details these changes:

> Take the paragraph marker. Division of written text into argument-sized chunks dates back to the second century BC [also known as a *capitulum*]. In early Insular manuscripts, the beginning of a new *capitulum* was set off by the notation ".K." By the twelfth

> century, the *K* had been replaced by a *C*. With the addition of a vertical line to indicate a *littera notabilior*, this *C* evolved into the paragraph symbol used in contemporary editing [¶]. Rubicators, who developed and began using the symbol by the end of the twelfth century, typically colored it red. […] The eventual solution [to the time and expense associated with rubrication] was to use indenting to indicate a new paragraph. (179-80)

In fact, in and around the nineteenth century the printed page got its now-familiar look for reasons associated more with technological constraints than with aesthetic or logical ones. Because the page becomes more and more crowded as smaller typefaces were printed onto it, regular indentation served readers and typesetters alike, in the former case promoting legibility, in the latter functioning as placeholders to facilitate faster production (Rubinstein, "Printing"). As the formal characteristics of print become increasingly codified, they begin to seep into prior media forms, bolstered by a prescriptive set of rules that don't acknowledge them *as* formal, but as constituent of proper style, organization, or logic—in other words, an invisible theory of delivery embedded in the other rhetorical canons. Because of the growing ubiquity of this change in the technical interface, what better way to create an argument for its "natural-ness" than by translating the technical elements of print back into speech and handwriting, where the same technological constraints don't apply and new reasons for their use can be invented?

The initial reasoning behind paragraphing as a mnemonic device for orators becomes inverted during the nineteenth century to become a highly structured logical unit of writing that delineates a main idea, and no longer Enos and Odoroff's "graphic instrument to facilitate verbal expression." Heavily influenced by the New Rhetoric, the nineteenth century compositionist pedagogues predominantly advocated that communication be perspicuous, linear, and unified. The paragraph exemplified these criteria, and the forefathers of composition went to great lengths to codify it in their textbooks. Among the more popular composition texts used in colleges and universities in North America was Alexander Bain's *English Composition and Rhetoric* (1866). In it, Bain describes the paragraph as "a collection of sentences with unity and purpose" which should resist digression and from the very first sentence announce its intended trajectory" (142). Bain continues by marking these qualities as "essential" and applicable to "all kinds of compositions"; he concludes his discussion on paragraphs by "[a]dapting an old homely maxim[:] Look to the Paragraph and the Discourse will look to itself," further emphasizing the natural, almost essential character of the paragraph (151).

Some years later, John Genung's 1886 *Practical Elements of Rhetoric* similarly upholds the virtue of unity—cohesiveness—in the paragraph's design, and goes so far as to rewrite Bain: "And certain it is that care about the

structure of the paragraph is one of the best of influences to induce care and skill in building the entire plan" (194). He goes on to outline three requisites for ideal paragraph construction: "hence, a fundamental quality is unity[;] hence, another requisite is continuity of thought[;] hence a third requisite is proportion between the parts" (194). For Genung, these requisites are met by developing a point in your argument in a linear, logical progression—a language-based rationale mapped onto a technical element of print.

In Adam Sherman Hill's *The Principles of Rhetoric* (1878), we find a more detailed treatment of the paragraph. Like his predecessors, Hill lauds the concept of Unity: "Unity, on the other hand, is essential to the excellence of every paragraph, whatever the subject-matter or purpose; without it, a collection of sentences may be a paragraph in form, but it cannot be one in substance" (238). That isn't to suggest that form isn't a concern for Hill, though, for the first insight he offers about the paragraph mentions its formal value: "The usefulness of division by PARAGRAPHS as a mere mechanical device is apparent to every one who has tried to read pages of print or of manuscript that are unbroken, or that are broken into many small fragments. The unbroken text tires the eye in one way; the text too frequently broken, in another" (230). He goes on to outline an architecture for the ideal paragraph, wherein he considers it—not unlike Bain and Genung—a natural extension of the sentence on one end, and a version in miniature of the entire composition on the other. In addition to unity and its mechanical value, Hill's paragraph must also exhibit "Clearness" (an initial topic sentence wherein the subject matter is fully realized by paragraph's end) and "Ease" (a "flowing style" on the level of each individual sentence as well as on the level of their interaction as a unified paragraph). The regularity of paragraph length, which has more pragmatic than aesthetic or logical origins, was a central concern to more than just A.S. Hill.

The argument of ideal paragraphs exhibiting organic cohesiveness is common to most of these definitions, and it is in keeping with an epistemological viewpoint run through with Cartesianism via common sense philosophy and faculty psychology that was central to composition pedagogy. The paragraph is an extension of (and a support for) what Ong describes as "the increased use of spatial models in dealing with the processes of thought and communication" that grew out of the Ramist tradition (314). It presupposes a landscape of interiority, a physiological space from which language emanates. Nan Johnson identifies this conflation between the character of a composed text and the model of mind it seeks to engage. Two principles of the New Rhetoric which greatly influenced composition theory and pedagogy were "(1) dynamic responses of the mental faculties predispose the effects that content, arrangement, and style will have on a reader; and (2) generic elements of prose form and style enable the writer to engage the type of intellectual, emotional, or aesthetic response appropriate to the aim of the discourse" (174). The axiom

held by Genung, Newman, Hill, and others that "the order in which ideas are presented in a discourse must respect natural logic and the writer's epistemological purpose" extended not only to global issues of arrangement or choice of genre, but all the way down to the constituent building blocks of the discourse as well—the sentence and the paragraph (181). As such, these smaller units of discourse, shaped in part by formal components of print technology, are supported by a theoretical rationale that draws attention away from this formal resemblance and helps naturalize print.

This epistemological groundwork also allows for a heirarchical re-structuring of the media landscape, privileging writing (and by extension, its idealized print form) as a mode of communication that *directly* gives voice to the workings of the inner mind, while subjugating delivery wholly to the elocutionary movement and restricting its conception to the auxiliary realm of embodied speaking. The space for considering how the manipulation of extratextual features of handwritten discourse contributes to overall rhetorical goals simply doesn't exist. In *A Pedagogy of Possibility*, Kay Halasek argues that the development of paragraphing instruction in current-traditionalist pedagogy results in a merging of the canons of invention and arrangement, blurring distinctions between the types of mental work going into each. She writes,

> Generally speaking, current-traditional textbook authors also followed Bain by presenting induction and deduction as two patterns of unified paragraph development, leading [Sharon] Crowley to argue that what classical rhetoricians developed as methods of inquiry became for current-traditionalists organizational and developmental principles. (146-147)

Here, again, is a reiteration of the point that an unarticulated theory of delivery as it applies to the written form is obscured by the argument that language is a natural, transparent phenomenon. Importing elements that resemble the look and feel of print via an epistemological rationale into handwritten discourse, a media form itself long regarded as transparent, is a means by which print becomes a naturalized fixture on the media landscape. In this new model of nineteenth-century composition, then, writing is not seen as a delivered performance (the domain of elocution), but rather as an externalization of internalized thought, a common view expressed in Samuel Newman's *A Practical System of Rhetoric* when he writes that "the productions of the pen [should] exhibit the characteristics of the mind" (157).

***

In the nineteenth century, rhetoric undergoes significant shifts in the theory, practice, and teaching of both oral and written communication, shifts which ironically create a renewed interest in delivery in the face of an

amplified print culture. We can read such shifts as a dynamic combination of print culture's growing influence on rhetoric, as well as active measures within the rhetorical tradition to instantiate print as the hegemonic medium of communication. Although we might generally say that the printing press (and the culture of writing) has historically relegated the canon of delivery to the background of rhetorical scrutiny, it is in part the influence of the printed page in the nineteenth century that resurrects the lost canon of delivery in the incarnation of elocution, a movement that remained popular throughout the nineteenth century. If elocution exists to treat delivery *as such*, we see in the continued tradition of belletrism a kind of *hidden* theory of delivery. By laying claim to virtually the entire corpus of printed matter as objects of rhetorical criticism and then codifying prose writing into distinct and self-evident genres, belletrism in effect superimposes the material dimension of printed works—the look-and-feel of the printed page—upon written discourse. In the nineteenth century, speech and writing alike were subject to formalizations that leaned in the direction of print: a formal logic comprised of mechanical repeatability, subsumed into a rationale of "natural" language production, and illustrated by models of high literary merit suitable for emulation. It is by such mechanisms of remediation that print has long enjoyed its status as a transparent medium of expression, a status that remains unchallenged well into the twentieth century.

Department of English
The Ohio State University-Marion

Works Cited

Austin, Gilbert. *Chironomia, or a Treatise on Rhetorical Delivery*. Facsimile edition, M. Robb and L. Thonssen, eds. Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1966.

Bain, Alexander. *English Composition and Rhetoric (1871).* Facsimile edition, Charlotte Downey, ed. Delmar, New York: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1996.

Baron, Naomi S. *Alphabet to Email: How Written English Evolved and Where It's Heading*. New York: Routledge, 2000.

Bolter, Jay D. and Diane Gromala. *Windows and Mirrors: Interaction Design, Digital Art, and the Myth of Transparency*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2003.

Broadus, John. *A Treatise on the Delivery and Preparation of Sermons*. New York: Armstrong, 1889.

Clark, Gregory and S. Michael Halloran, eds. *Oratorical Culture in Nineteenth-Century America*. Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1993.

Day, Henry N. *Elements of the Art of Rhetoric*. New York: Barnes and Burr, 1866.

Deibert, Ronald J. *Parchment, Printing, and Hypermedia: Communication in World Order Transformation*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.

Eisenstein, Elizabeth. *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Enos, Richard L. and Elizabeth Odoroff. "The Orality of the 'Paragraph' in Greek Rhetoric." *PRE/TEXT* 6:1- 2 (1985). 51-65.

Feather, John. *A History of British Publishing*. New York: Routledge, 1988.

Fredal, James. "Beyond the Fifth Canon: Body Rhetoric in Ancient Greece." Diss. Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1998.

Genung, John. *The Practical Elements of Rhetoric.* Boston: Ginn & Co., 1886.

Halasek, Kay. *A Pedagogy of Possibility: Bakhtinian Perspectives on Composition Studies*. Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1999.

Halloran, S. Michael. "From Rhetoric to Composition: The Teaching of Writing in America to 1900." *A Short History of Writing Instruction: From Ancient Greece to Twentieth-Century America*. Davis, Ca.: Hermagoras Press, 1990. 151–182.

Howell, W. S. *Eighteenth Century Logic and Rhetoric*. Princeton: Princeton University Press: 1971.

Johnson, Nan. *Nineteenth Century Rhetoric in North America*. Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1991.

Miller, Thomas P. *The Formation of College English: Rhetoric and Belles Lettres in the British Cultural Provinces*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1997.

Mohrmann, G.P. "The Language of Nature and Elocutionary Theory." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 52 (April 1966). 116-124.

Myers, Robyn and Michael Harris, eds. *A Millennium of the Book: Production, Design, & Illustration in Manuscript & Print 900-1900.* Winchester, Delware: Oak Knoll Press, 1994.

Newman, Samuel P. *A Practical System of Rhetoric*. New York: Dayton and Newman, 1834.

Ong, Walter J. *Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

Porter, Ebeneezer. *Analysis of the Principles of Rhetorical Delivery as Applied in Reading and Speaking*. Andover, Mass: Flagg and Gould, 1831.

Rubinstein, Geoffrey. "Printing: History and Development." *Jones Communications & Multimedia Encyclopedia*. 3 March 2001 <http://www.digitalcity.com/encyclo/update/print.html>.

Russell, William. *Orthophony, or Vocal Culture*. Publisher unknown: 1884.

Sheridan, Thomas. *Course of Lectures on Elocution (1762)*. Facsimile edition, Charlotte Downey, ed. Delmar, New York: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1991.

Steinberg, S.H. *Five Hundred Years of Printing:* Typographia, Ars Artium Omnium Conservatrix. London, New Castle, Deleware: The British Library and Oak Knoll Press, 1996.

Walker, John. *Elements of Elocution (1781)*. Facsimile edition. Menston: Scholars' Press, 1969.

—. *Melody of Speaking(1787)*. Facsimile edition. Menston: Scholars' Press, 1970.

Whately, Richard. *Elements of Rhetoric (1846)*. Facsimile edition, Howard Coughlin and Charlotte Downey, eds. Delmar, New York: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1991.

Copyright of RSQ: Rhetoric Society Quarterly is the property of Rhetoric Society Quarterly. The copyright in an individual article may be maintained by the author in certain cases. Content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.