McLuhan, Ramus, and Rhetoric

By T.J. Buell

McLuhan, Ramus, and Rhetoric

"Peter Ramus," said Marshall McLuhan, was "a Frenchman who rode the Gutenberg wave."[1] McLuhan was not as interested in Ramist rhetoric *per se* as he was by the way it reflected the transition from pre-Renaissance manuscript culture to post-Gutenberg typographic culture and the age of humanism. But as McLuhan's epigram implies, the history of rhetorical theory can be viewed as a mirror of the history of media technology. This paper explores this concept with specific reference to the interfaces between McLuhan, Ramus, and rhetoric.

Classical rhetoric has its origins during the fifth century B.C., the same period in which Greek culture took on the stylistic and cognitive features of literacy as opposed to orality. Whether or not one accepts that alphabetic literacy was the agent of all the intellectual and societal changes ascribed to it by Eric Havelock and others[2], the analytical and taxonomical nature of classical rhetorical theory does emerge at the same time as the spread of literacy in ancient Greece. The hierarchical nature of Artistotle's rhetorical theory, with his complex set of interrelated terms, is clearly a literary work, in the sense that Aristotle is able to look dispassionately at rhetorical discourse as an object (eg, "figures" of speech) that could be reflected upon and analyzed. Eric Havelock, speaking of Aristotle's use of the visual metaphor "to look at" when setting out the premises of a philosophical enquiry, points out: "Why choose vision as the metaphor for an intellectual operation, unless guided by the subconscious recognition that the operation had arisen out of viewing the written word rather than just hearing it spoken?[3]

Rhetorical theory was initially concerned with public speaking. Classical rhetoric's division of the rhetorical occasion into the political, forensic and ceremonial assumes an assembled audience, since this was the way in which an individual's thoughts were conveyed to the public. During the Middle Ages literacy had insinuated itself into European social and political culture to the point where written records, usually in the form of official letters, were given legal standing. In a largely illiterate society, literacy became a currency of political power, and the person who could write letters--the literate minister of an illiterate ruler, for example--had considerable access to this power. However, the use of letter writing to codify laws and record commercial information in a durable and compact form that could be easily consulted for reference depended on the development of new media technologies: First, the invention of parchment in the codex (replacing papyrus in the roll), and more significantly, the introduction of paper making from China. Harold Innis has pointed out the correlation between the commercial revolution in Europe during the late Middle Ages and the increased production of paper.[4] It is also during this period that the practice of letter writing emerges from the monastery into

---

[1] Marshall McLuhan, *The Gutenberg Galaxy,* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962), p. 144.

[2] For the most influential study of this, see Eric Havelock, *Preface to Plato* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; Oxford: Basil Blackwell. Reissued, New York: Grossett and Dunlap, 1967; Harvard University. Press, 1971). See also Eric Havelock, *The Muse Learns to Write,* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1986). In this later book Havelock explores some interesting parallels between Ong, McLuhan and his own work.

[3] Eric Havelock, *The Muse Learns to Write*, (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1986), p. 111.

[4] See Harold Innis, *The Bias of Communication*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1951), pp. 49-54.

the secular world and assumes increasing importance in commerce and feudal governments. Accordingly, we see the first treatises on *ars dictminis,* or art of letter writing, incorporated into rhetorical theory during the 11th and 12th centuries.[5]

The invention of the printing press and the spread of printing can be seen to correlate with the dwindling importance of *memoria,* and to some extent *pronuntiatio,* in rhetorical theory. As Frances Yates and others have demonstrated, the causality is not quite that straightforward; one can point to the humanistic aversion toward medieval scolasticism as much as to the printing press as the reason why the importance of "the art of memory" declined during the Renaissance.[6] Interesting as this line of thought is, it does not alter the fact that the technology of printing made the art of rhetoric possible without the reliance on memory necessitated by an oral culture, and rhetorical theory from the Renaissance to the present day clearly reflects this.

During the Renaissance, there were significant changes to rhetorical theory which went far beyond a de-emphasis of *memoria* and *pronuntiatio*, just as the spread of the printing and literacy has been seen to have wrought one of the most crucial changes in human thought and perception. As Walter Ong said, "Since the beginning of the twentieth century, the feeling had been growing that the Renaissance, and especially the sixteenth century, was somehow or other a critical period for linguistic attitudes, that during this period something happened in the way man talked about things"[7]

This brings us to the two main actors in this paper: Marshall McLuhan, whose account of "the making of typographic man" did more than any other theory to firmly place technological determinism into the scope of the history of cognition and cultural studies, and Peter Ramus, whose reforms of the rhetorical curriculum were a bellwether for the effects of printing on the Renaissance mind.

For Walter Ong, the revisions of Peter Ramus (that "furious pedagogue," as Marshall McLuhan put it[8]) to rhetorical theory and their place in the curriculum could be considered a function of the spatial and visual orientation created by literacy and printing. Ramus's method of organizing his dialectic in a series of dichotomies can be viewed as a direct result of the refinement of the printing process which allowed the placement of tables and charts into the printed book.[9] The placement of printed tables and the ability of the letterpress to uniformly lay out the position of the text in school textbooks

---

[5]For an extensive discussion of the medieval *ars dictaminis,* see James J. Murphy, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974).

[6]Yates suggests that "[F]ar from waning, the art of memory had actually entered upon a new and strange lease of life. For it had been taken up into the main philosophical current of the Renaissance...Renaissance Neoplatonists were not so averse to the Middle Ages as were some humanists, and they did not join in the depreciation of the ancient art of memory." Frances A. Yates, *The Art of Memory,* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1966), pp. 127-128.

[7]Walter Ong, *Ramus, Method and the Decay of Dialogue,* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1958), p. 4.

[8]Marshall McLuhan, *The Gutenberg Galaxy,* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962), p. 183.

[9] Ong, p. 128.

allowed the teacher (of rhetoric or any other subject) to refer to the material in terms of spatial, as opposed to aural, arrangement (ie, "page three, second line, fourth word," etc). Before uniform printing, such directions would not have been possible. Learning, as exemplified by the curricular reforms of Peter Ramus, had become a visual process. As Ong points out, "the orator is perhaps not extinct, but he is now permanently eclipsed."[10]

Ramus, of course, occupies a rather ambivalent place in the history and practice of rhetoric. Some rhetoricians have never forgiven Ramus for depriving rhetoric of *inventio* and *dispositio,* "an error," as Perelman says, "that was fatal for rhetoric."[11] Yet Ramus enjoyed a considerable vogue during his lifetime, and Ramism became an influential force in the history and practice of rhetoric, to the point where it became a defining moment in the history of rhetoric and the development of humanism in the Renaissance.

Between 1550 and 1650 there were over 1,100 separate printings of individual works by Ramus (including those by his collaborator Omer Talon), a phenomenal amount.[12] The influence of Ramism extended throughout Europe and especially into Elizabethan England. It has been suggested that Ramism influenced some of the greatest intellects of the day, including Shakespeare, Hobbes and Milton.[13] Ramism then insinuated itself into Calvinism and eventually into the curriculum at Princeton and Harvard in the seventeenth century.

During his lifetime, Ramus had a rather uneven academic reputation, celebrated in some circles and attracting a loyal coterie of disciples, while condemned in others as an intellectual lightweight. Ong reports that to his contemporaries Ramus was known as the *usuarius,* a usufructuary, or one who lives off the fruits of the ideas of others (his enemies were less charitable). As Ong states, "Ramus is no Aristotle or Boole or Frege, to be credited with findings which open new logical horizons. He is not even a Descartes, discovering if not logical, at least mathematical theorems of paralogical interest.[14]

For both McLuhan and Ong, Ramus was not as important for his particular revisions to the rhetorical curriculum as he was a reflection of *how* things were done. As Ong says, "the deepest meaning of Ramist rhetoric is to be found in the general framework of man's changing attitudes toward communication, with which rhetoric is so inextricably involved."[15] Their common evaluation of

---

[10] Ong, p. 314

[11] Chaïm Perelman, *The Realm of Rhetoric,* trans. William Kluback, (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1982), p. 3.

[12] Ong, p. 5.

[13] Wilbur Samuel Howell, *Logic and Rhetoric in England (1500 - 1700)* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1956), p. 217 - 219.

[14] Ong, p. 7

[15] Ong, p. 288.

Ramus is partly due to the fact that it was McLuhan who initially directed Ong to Ramus as a topic for research. In fact, why and how the "pop Guru McLuhan"[16] was acquainted with the work of what his biographer calls an "obscure Renaissance theologian" is important to a proper understanding of McLuhan's thought.[17]

Following a bit of a hiatus, Marshall McLuhan's reputation has undergone somewhat of a rehabilitation during the past few years (unlike that of Ramus). Lewis Lapham has written a laudatory forward to the reissue of *Understanding Media*[18]. McLuhan has been adopted by the "digerati" of WIRED magazine as their "patron saint:" his picture appears on the masthead of each issue along with a McLuhan quote of the month. The fact that McLuhan died before the age of the Internet, I-Way and World Wide Web has not stopped WIRED from pronouncing what he *might* have said about these subjects, as in Gary Wolf's recent "interview" with McLuhan.[19]

Rhetoric is never mentioned once in the WIRED article, although messages, media and technologies (or "human artefacts." to use McLuhan's more encompassing term) frequently are. This suggests that Wolf, has not researched his subject too thoroughly. Many commentators on McLuhan overlook fact that McLuhan's discourse on technology is firmly grounded in rhetorical theory and cannot be fully understood without employing its terms of reference. McLuhan encapsulated this when he said "All human artefacts are human utterances, or outerings, and as such they are linguistic and rhetorical entities."[20]

McLuhan's first detailed study of rhetoric began when he was a graduate student at Cambridge, researching his thesis on Thomas Nashe. McLuhan was initially drawn to Nashe as a stylist, but he soon discovered the crucial influence of the theory and practice of rhetoric on Nashe and on Renaissance English prose generally, especially the debates over Ciceronian rhetoric and the

---

[16] As he was commonly called, though perhaps first by Tom Wolfe. See Tom Wolfe, "What if He's Right?" in *McLuhan: Hot and Cool,* ed. Gerald Emanuel Stearn (New York, Dial Press, 1967), p. 42.

[17] Philip Marchand, *Marshall McLuhan: The Medium and the Messenger,* (Toronto: Random House, 1989), p. 59. One wonders where Marchand got the characterization of Ramus as a "theologian," especially since his theological work is limited to the posthumous, textbook-like *Commentary on the Christian Religion in Four Books.* As Ong points out, the "theologian" Ramus had never touched theology before writing this work, "having had in his entire huge library not even a Bible, but only a New Testament...and a Roman breviary." (Ong, p. 33).

[18] See Lewis Lapham's Introduction to the MIT Press Edition, 1994, p.xi. Essentially, Lapham provides an unqualified "yes" to Tom Wolfe's question "What if he's right? States Lapham: "Much of what McLuhan had to say makes a good deal more sense in 1994 than it did in 1964, and even as his book was being remanded to the backlist, its more profound implications were beginning to make themselves manifest on MTV and the Internet, in Ronald Reagan's political image and the re-animation of Richard Nixon, via television shopping networks and e-mail—all of them technologies that McLuhan had presupposed but didn't live to see shaped in silicon or glass."

[19] Gary Wolf, "Channelling McLuhan: The Wired Interview with Wired's patron saint." *WIRED,* January, 1996. pp. 129-131, 186-187.

[20] Eric McLuhan and Marshall McLuhan, *Laws of Media,* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988), p. 128

accompanying revolt against scholastic logic and traditional rhetoric. But what really captivated McLuhan's imagination in all this was the realization that the cultural history of the West are reflected by the shifting emphases on grammar, dialectic and rhetoric, and the intellectual combat that often took place between the proponents of each. For McLuhan, this process was still ongoing in the present day. In his last book, *Laws of Media*, McLuhan suggests that "A complete history of the three arts together does not exist and is badly needed, for all three are reasserting themselves now, at the close of the second millennium, as never before."[21]

McLuhan's study of Nashe would have led him directly to Ramus. Ramism had enormous influence in Renaissance England, as Howell has extensively documented.[22] The dispute between Ramism and scholasticism is directly implicated in a controversy between Thomas Nashe and his rival Gabriel Harvey, which resulted in an exchange of printed invectives during the last decade of the sixteenth century. Nashe insults Harvey by placing him in a kind of rogues gallery of intellectual pretenders--in which he includes Ramus-- who discredit their disciplines through their arrogance and ignorance:

But as hee that censureth the dignitie of Poetry by *Cherillus* paultry paines, the maiestie of Rethorick
by the rudenesse of a stutting *Hortensius,* the subtiltie of Logique by the rayling of *Ramus,*
might iudge one a foole in writing he knew not what...[23]

As a result of McLuhan's realization that the history of rhetoric and the trivium could be read in terms of the evolution of perception in western culture, his Ph.D research tilted away from Nashe and more toward the world of classical rhetoric and grammar. McLuhan's completed Ph.D thesis, titled "The Place of Thomas Nashe in the Learning of His Time," ran more than 450 pages. The work was not so much about Nashe as it was a history of the trivium and its influence on literature from ancient Greece and Rome up to the time of Nashe.[24]

McLuhan's first published reference to Ramus occurs not long after, in a 1948 review of Rosamund Tuve's book *Elizabethan and Metaphysical Imagery.* McLuhan had clearly understood the deeper implications of Ramus's separation of *inventio* from rhetoric when he stated:

By means of his [Ramus] rhetoric the numerous tropes of Scripture were handled in a summary and
rationalistic spirit. The doctrine of transubstantiation was necessarily the crux. For the Ramist

---

[21] Eric McLuhan and Marshall McLuhan, p.10.

[22] See Wilbur Samuel Howell, *Logic and Rhetoric in England: 1500-1700,* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1956).

[23] Howell, 1956, p. 198.

[24] See Philip Marchand, *Marshall McLuhan: The Medium and the Messenger,* (1989). Marchand's biography contains an interesting account of this phase in McLuhan's life. McLuhan's thesis as such was never published: he did submit an article based on it to the *Journal of the History of Ideas,* but they were not interested in McLuhan's account of the trivium and suggested he rewrite the article, concentrating instead on his references to Francis Bacon.

theologian the metaphors and similes of the New Testament were only *elecutio.* The doctrine lay not in, but under the figures.[25]

It was about this time, when McLuhan was teaching at St. Louis University, that he began working with Walter Ong, directing Ong's M.A. thesis on Gerard Manley Hopkins. Later, McLuhan suggested that Ong would find Peter Ramus a fruitful topic for further research. The result of that suggestion was Ong's classic work on Ramus, *Ramus, Method and the Decay of Dialogue*, which established Ong's academic reputation and was the foundation of his further research into orality and literacy. The majority of Ong's book is a systematic and detailed investigation into the specifics of the reforms Ramus made to the dialectic and rhetorical curriculum and the development of his *Method,* which he discusses and places in a detailed historical context. To a large extent, Ong confines his general statements about the significance of Ramism as an expression of a new cultural perception wrought by literacy and printing technology to a fairly short final chapter entitled "The Diffusion of Ramism." The chapter (and book) end with this speculative summary:

> This parallelism between the physical and the intellectual worlds remains to be developed in a future study. At the stage to which this present book extends, one can hope only to have indicated how the Ramist reworking of dialectic and rhetoric furthered the elimination of sound and voice from man's understanding of the intellectual world and helped create within the human spirit itself the silences of a spatialized universe.[26]

With *The Gutenberg Galaxy,* McLuhan provided the "future study" anticipated by Ong. Ironically, McLuhan's book--as well as his others that followed--lacked the systematic and comprehensive scholarship of his former pupil Ong, in favour of the rhapsodic prose and non-linear style for which McLuhan was famous (and was often condemned)[27] For McLuhan, Ramus personified Gutenberg man, and Ramism demonstrated the western world's shift from the acoustic realm of an oral culture to the visual, spatially-oriented world of a literate culture.

But there is also a more significant relationship between McLuhan and Ramus. When Ramus threw out Aristotle's distinction between analytical and dialectical argument, thereby depriving rhetoric of *inventio* and *dispositio,* he created a rhetoric consisting only of *elecutio* and *pronuntiatio.* Or, as Ramus put it in his syllogistic refutation of Quintilian:

The parts of the material which belong to the art of rhetoric are only two, style and   delivery. However, the parts of the art of rhetoric are the parts of its subject matter and they   correspond completely to one another.

---

[25] Marshall McLuhan, "Tradition and the Academic Talent," [article review of Rosamund Tuve, *Elizabethan and Metaphysical Imagery], Hudson Review,* Vol.1, 1948-49, p. 270-273.

[26] Ong, *Ramus, Method and the Decay of Dialogue,* p. 318

[27] "The style [McLuhan's] is a viscous fog, through which loom stumbling metaphors." Christopher Ricks, "Understanding Media," in *McLuhan: Hot and Cool,* (1967), p. 215.

Therefore there are only two parts of rhetoric, style and delivery.[28]

Earlier in this paper, I stated McLuhan's discourse on technology cannot be fully comprehended without an understanding that it is firmly grounded in rhetorical theory. We should now amend that statement to say "Ramist *rhetorical* theory," When McLuhan said that "all human artefacts are human utterances, or outerings, and as such they are linguistic and rhetorical entities," he was surely referring to *electio.* And when McLuhan proclaimed that "all words, in every language, are metaphors," he was saying in effect that we orient ourselves in the world first through the tropes that constitute the rhetorical *electio.*

When McLuhan came up with the most famous of his epigrams, "the medium is the message," he could have substituted "the *pronuntiatio* is the message." (though had McLuhan put it like that he probably never would have been interviewed by Playboy). This, of course, is what rhetoricians from Aristotle on had always been saying, but it took McLuhan's rhetorical genius to invent such a trope and imbed it in our cultural consciousness. McLuhan's self-referenial punning title for his 1967 book, *The Medium is the Massage,* provides a further implication of *pronuntiatio.* McLuhan's use of the massage metaphor was intended to evoke the sensual tactility of the acoustic environment (wrought by electronic media), which in turn leads us back to the oral culture in which rhetoric was born and in which *pronuntiatio* was a crucial part of rhetoric. It also demonstrates McLuhan's love of paronomasia (*electio,* again). McLuhan loved the pun for the way in which its acoustic abilities allowed free semantic play: hence his love of James Joyce.[29]

At the time of his death, McLuhan was working on a new book, which he had begun as a revision of *Understanding Media.* The result was the posthumously-published *Laws of Media,* in which McLuhan proposed that any human "artefact" (by which he meant an idea, technology or any other human innovation) is a form of media and as such is subject to four immutable laws, which he called a "tetrad." Posed as questions, these "laws" are:

• What does it [a medium] enhance or intensify?
• What does it render obsolete or displace?
• What does it retrieve that was previously obsolesced?
• What does it produce or become when pressed to an extreme?[30]

Ramist dialectic, for example, enhances visual orientation, ie spatial models.[31] It "displaces" the distinction between analytical and dialectical argument; it "retrieves" the concept of the "art" vs a

---

[28]Peter Ramus, *Arguments in Rhetoric against Quintilian,* trans. Carole Newlands, ed. James J.Murphy (De Kalb: University of Northern Illinois Press, 1983), excerpted in: Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg, eds., *The Rhetorical Tradition,* (Boston, St. Martin's Press, 1990),p. 567.

[29] One of McLuhan's favourites was Joyce's "abced-minded man," from *Finnegan's Wake.*

[30] Eric McLuhan and Marshall McLuhan, *Laws of Media,* (1988), p. 7.

"natural" ability (a concept common in the Middle Ages); and finally, when "pressed to an extreme," it becomes a rigid system of dichotomization, or *ex post facto* statements, the antithesis of logical disputation.

Analysing the effects of media might appear to fall into the jurisdiction of dialectic (or cultural studies), but not according to McLuhan: "The laws of media in tetrad form belong properly to rhetoric and grammar, *not philosophy*. [my italics]. Our concern is etymology and exegesis. This is to place the modern study of technology and artefacts on a humanistic and linguistic basis for the first time."[32] The "realm of rhetoric"[33] in which McLuhan's tetrad clearly resides is that of Ramus.

In some respects, it might seem that McLuhan had acted as a kind of *agent provocateur* for Ramus. Certainly, it is the *inventio*-deprived rhetoric of Ramus which seems to be the principal concern of many media journalists today (ie, *what* is said is not nearly as important as *how* it is said and by *whom*). And in the academic sphere, Derrida's assertion that extralinguistic knowledge is not possible, and the general claim of deconstructive criticism that all language is referenial (ie, metaphorical), could be seen as a reflection of television's ability to instantaneously juxtapose images and by doing so create visual tropes that in a literary world would never be found within the same denotative frame of reference. So again, we return to *elecutio* and *pronuntiatio,* or the rhetoric of Ramus.

Was McLuhan a Ramist? Perhaps, on a superficial level, he might appear to be. That McLuhan placed his discourse on technology within the framework of *elecutio* and *pronuntiatio* would   tend to support this suggestion. There are also some other interesting correspondences. Ramus's penchant for dichotomization, illustrated in his *Grammar*, his *Rhetoric*, and most significantly his *Dialectic,* was more than matched by McLuhan's: hot vs cool media, figure and ground relationships, linear vs holistic, acoustic vs visual, tribal vs urban man, scribal vs typographic culture, and finally, the left hemisphere/right hemisphere split-brain hypothesis, which McLuhan discovered in the 1970's and which he believed confirmed much of his earlier work.[34] In this respect, McLuhan's arrangement of his material was very much Ramistic.

However, it seems fairly clear that the dichotomies of Ramus were a pedagogical device, brought on by practical exigencies. Ramus, along with his fellow professors, was teaching young boys, the typical age of the "university student" of the time.   Moreover, the students were being instructed in Latin, which for them was a "second language," in a subject (Rhetoric) which was by then a rather abstract field of study. By contrast, the student of rhetoric in classical times would have received a

---

[31] See Ong, *Ramus, Method and the Decay of Dialogue* (1958), p. 199-202.

[32] Eric and Marshall McLuhan, *Laws of Media,* (1988) p. 128.

[33] Chaïm Perelman's phrase, not mine: cf. *The Realm of Rhetoric* (1982)

[34] McLuhan was much influenced by, for example: Julian Jaynes, *The Origin of Consciousness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind,* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1977.

much more "practical" education, since the ideal was to produce an orator or public lecturer. As Ong points out, "the simplified Ramist rhetoric represents in great part an adjustment to the changed linguistic situation."[35]

McLuhan's dichotomies, by contrast, were not pedagogical but were analytical and exegetical. For McLuhan, the Ramist curriculum (and its accompanying dichotomies) was a result of a new technology (the book) imposing itself on an older curriculum based on orality. One of the most intriguing parts of McLuhan's *The Gutenberg Galaxy* is where he suggests that "Had any of our current testers of media and various educational aids been available to the harassed sixteenth century administrator [read Ramus] they would have been asked to find out whether the new teaching machine, the printed book, could do the full educational job.[36]

McLuhan was a Ramist in the sense that for him, understanding media was all about understanding a rhetoric consisting of *elecutio* and *pronuntiatio.* And to that extent McLuhan (perhaps unwittingly) has provided a conduit for Ramism into the global village. Still, while Ramus advocated the incorporation of the textbook into the curriculum (ie, "mass production" of students), McLuhan has advocated the opposite.[37] But the essential difference between McLuhan and Ramus is in their treatment of *electutio.* For Ramus, tropes and figures were a necessary curricular evil, nothing more. To quote Walter Ong:

The Ramist treatment of individual tropes and figures is uneventful and undistinguished by comparison with other rhetorics of the time. It is not insensitive, as when it gives high marks to metaphor. But, like most rhetorics, it maintains the low theoretical level enforced on the subject (in postclassical times) by its place in the lower reaches of the curriculum, and evinces no real understanding of the semantic importance of metaphorical or of any similar processes.[38]

By contrast, McLuhan's treatment of individual tropes and figures lies at the very heart of his media theory. For when McLuhan says that "all words are metaphors," he is challenging us (and Ramus) to find a word that doesn't meet his definition. McLuhan's tetrad, by his own admission, is itself a trope--or metatrope--which (at least for McLuhan) occupied acoustic space and obsolesced dialectic. *Electio,* then, formed the core of McLuhan's intellectual inquiry. In this respect he is the antithesis of Ramus, for whom *elecutio* was embellishment, and *visual* embellishment at that. For McLuhan, this was a crucial Ramification.

---

[35] Ong, *Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue*, (1958), p. 275.

[36] Marshall McLuhan, *The Gutenberg Galaxy* (1962), p. 145.

[37] See, for example, Marshall McLuhan, *City as Classroom: Understanding Language and Media.* With Kathryn Hutchon and Eric McLuhan, (Agincourt, Ontario: The Book Society of Canada, 1977). (now out of print)

[38] Walter Ong, *Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue* (1958) p. 273-274.