



Uluslararası Sosyal Arařtırmalar Dergisi

The Journal of International Social Research

Cilt: 7 Sayı: 31 Volume: 7 Issue: 31

www.sosyalarastirmalar.com Issn: 1307-9581

RHETORIC READING IN ARCHITECTURE: A METHODOLOGY ATTEMPT

Serap DURMUŐ*
Őengöl ÖYMEN GÜR**

Abstract

The methodology of re-reading and re-interpretation may be included within the realm of architecture, just as they occur in various other disciplines as well. Re-reading includes a reconstruction of the past with new perspectives and interpretations. Beyond its own internal problems, architecture deals with the concepts and topics gathered from other disciplines. The main problem area of this research subject, from the perspective of architecture, is the revealing of thoughts on architecture using textual language and exhibiting this through rhetoric reading.

The purpose and scope of this study is to ascertain the need for creating a 'rhetoric' as a form of correlation between discourse with a historical content and architectural practice. The method attempt which can be seen as a new dynamic for expression and comprehension, shall discuss the role of rhetoric, in expressing architectural thought.

Having experienced its golden ages during classical Antiquity and the Renaissance, rhetoric is defined as 'an art possessed with the power of persuasion'. Historically speaking features regarding effective rhetoric have been identified and described; various canons have been determined through thinking based on the issue of style, and by adhering to various research that was conducted on this issue. Five unique canons of rhetoric (invention, arrangement, style, memory, delivery) are discussed here as stages of methodological setup. This paper shall bring forward the issue of how re-reading and re-interpretation can be achieved using these various stages.

In line with this methodology attempt, we will try to explain through 'rhetoric reading', how narrations gain insight into architectural thought how architecture can be construed as a result of changes/developments in the meaning and style of discourse. And how the theory existing within architecture with its historical and theoretical aspects, use a unique 'rhetoric' method.

Keywords:Architecture, Theory, Rhetoric, Text, Methodology.

* Research Ass., PhD Student, Karadeniz Technical University, Department of Architecture, Trabzon.

** Prof. Dr., Beykent University, Department of Architecture, İstanbul.

1. Introduction

'The philosopher strives to find the liberating word...',
Ludwig Wittgenstein¹

Every subject desires to gain meaning through its own 'liberating' words. And every question posed in discussing the subject, is, in fact, based on certain identifications. The issue of whether or not the author is right in these identifications and determinations or for what reasons these could have occurred, point out to a new opportunity for thinking (Tanyeli, 2012). The opportunity to say new things could arise only when we can question our own determinations (Tanyeli, 2012).

Recent studies indicate that architecture thought is valued more now than in the past. All opinions stated in this study originate from the presumption that architecture can be presented as a textual representation. The problem relates to how thoughts on architecture – i.e. architectural thought– can be revealed through textual language/narration; how the rhetoric canons are instrumentalized as a dynamic for expression and comprehension and how these can be used as a method.

Architectural thought and understandings with regard to re-reading, need deeper explanations. When a re-reading is made one looks for stances which could have been overlooked by the reader or which could produce a new current meaning with a current look. Therefore, re-reading made within the scope of this paper should be respected as one of the possible interpretations produced by the author in providing a scientific and academic perspective. The methodology suggested here is based on a PhD thesis.² In the methodological approach, used in this study, examples in actual analysis are provided. Such examples are considered as being appropriate due to the fact that re-reading requires an understanding of integrity. It is exactly for this reason why the later parts of this study and the text analysis should be seen through a rhetorical perspective and as a presumptive argument.

This paper aims at ascertaining whether a 'rhetoric' viewpoint can be offered in line with the aforementioned problem and recognises the fact that reading by way of rhetoric in architectural essays has been attempted previously. Issues of architectural thought and rhetoric should be explained in deeper detail to the reader in the presentation of this said reading method. Accordingly, the reader first needs an explanation as to what is meant by architectural thought.

2. On Architectural Thought

Since the existence of the individual and the structured environment, there has been a tendency for thinking to evolve on various concepts. Architectural thought, began with the emergence of humanity thus has a long historical past.

Tanyeli (2012: 92) indicates that architectural thought is not a knowledge and fiction area different the mentalities and intellectual formations we produce, read and narrate. Architectural thought has continuously been evolving, almost forming a *Zeitgeist* with its complex structure. Re-reading studies, which could be an example as to how architectural thought could be possible, suggest that intellectual patterns and thoughts should be problematized. In other words, we should keep in mind that even the methodological and narrative fictions we suggest have a potential to create a problematique situation.

Considering all these thoughts, we may ask: What is meant by architectural thought and rhetoric relationship? Considering the nature of this study, the most appropriate answer to this question would be that thought production can only be reflected through narrations. The ultimate aim is to make architecture visible through narrations. Just as Whyte (2006) indicated, what is meant by architectural thought is to reveal that 'architecture bears multiple meanings rather than a single meaning'.

Rhetoric emphasizes the narrative side of architectural theory and history, and serves as a means to reveal how this methodology attempt in the cross-section of this theory and history can gain a meaning in re-reading. Meaning is gained by different thoughts through diversification of different discourses and by different architectural thoughts. As the meanings attributed vary and increase, narrations also vary and transform.

Following on from these explanations on the relationship between architectural thought and interpretation, we could discuss what is meant by re-reading and how rhetorical reading can be accomplished.

3. Re-reading in Architecture: Rhetoric

The research material of a study, which intends to build a relation between architectural thought and architecture-history writing, is of course, texts. In building a relation between text and architecture, the reader is as significant as the narrations. Çelik & Favro (1988), point out that this methodology is not independent of the content and as a matter of fact, it is exactly for this reason that the audience becomes significant. If we are to mention re-reading and a methodology attempt for re-reading in architecture,

¹ WVC 77, Ludwig Wittgenstein and the Vienna Circle.

² Serap Durmuş (2009-in progress). PhD is about the relationship between architecture thought and rhetoric re-reading (under the consultants of Prof. Dr. Sengül Oymen Gur and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nilgun Kuloglu), Karadeniz Technical University, Trabzon, Turkey.

which is not independent of the history, then we should talk about historical readings.

It would not be wrong to say that reading/interpretation efforts, where the reader and audience are as significant as the narrations, have their roots in the discipline of history. In order to build a textual relation, the relation between history and literature should be considered. The reason is that reading and meaning analysis in literature overlap with the different stages of reading in history. This process in the West has been formed in three stages: the Interpretation Period, the Annales School and Deconstruction (Meyer, 2009). In the re-reading of history, there is the constructive approach, which considers that history can be narrated as it is, without any change, and the deconstructive approach, which entirely takes creative reading as the basis and offers different meanings to the reader.

It is obvious that deconstructivist reading should be valid today in the aforementioned history – text relation; the reason is that deep readings, methodological attempts and interpretation efforts are enabled by placing the reader at the center. The re-reading of texts by historians like White, Jenkins, Munslow appear to be a perfect deconstructivist approach. Similarly, philosophers like Derrida made significant contributions to deconstructivist reading. For any reading in history to be called as re-reading, it should deconstructivist in nature. The reason for this is that deconstruction is significant for the creation of an environment of free thought and meaning enabling re-reading; the existing meaning is then reversed.

A different approach, called ‘rhetorical tradition’ in thought and language, exists in conceptual structures since Antiquity (Hasle, 2006: 2). According to Gómez, ‘... You should be twice as careful with written words, because a written word is a tool for forgetting and is not real information. Real information takes place during face to face dialogue ...’ (Weddle & Neveu, 2011: 80). This is the exact reason why understanding rhetoric in architecture involves trying to understand the comprehension of what is said and how it is said. Architecture is a text and can be read as a text; however, the intent and meaning can be altered by the interpreter (Ricoeur, 1971; Whyte, 2006).

Different from how it was interpreted during the Ancient ages, rhetoric has been considered as a manipulation of mind through discourse and thoughts (Meyer, 2009). Rhetoric reading can be seen as a deconstructivist reading method in this context. This means that, this paper opens the possibility of considering rhetoric as a method in architectural discourse.

4. On Architecture and Rhetoric

‘Rhetoric; that powerful instrument of error and deceit.’,
John Locke³

Etymologic and semantic studies have shown that words have gone through quite interesting developments and variations, both within the same language, and while being transferred from one language to another (Harmancı, 2007). In fact, rhetoric as a discipline and concept with ambiguous borders, can deal with many kinds of problems for this reason. Rhetoric deals with ‘affecting’ and ‘persuasion’, also with the intention of ‘informing’ and ‘motivation’. Forms of producing discourse, called ‘rhetoric’ in the West and ‘eloquence’ in the East, can be considered as an art where two almost distinct philosophies are created with the same purpose but with different classifications.

With its most dominant meaning being ‘the art of using language effectively and persuasively’ or ‘the art of elocution’, rhetoric comes from the concepts of *Belâgat* in Ottoman, *Rhétorique* in French and *Rhetorike* in Ancient Greek (Hançerlioğlu, 2005; Batı, 2012). According to Hançerlioğlu (2005: 327) ‘it particularly points to the elocution aspect discovered and developed by the ancient Greeks’. Resources available at hand suggest that rhetoric had been shaped as an art by two Sicilians, Corax and Tisias, during the 5th century B.C. (Booth, 2004; Meyer, 2009; Hançerlioğlu, 2005). Rhetoric was used by the Romans between the 2nd and 1st centuries B.C. to create an artistic effect. Rhetoric is said to be mentioned for the first time as a term in Plato’s *Georgias* dialogue (385 B.C.) and commenced to be used during the age of Socrates (Kennedy, 1994).

Apart from the aforementioned processes and definitions in the emergence of rhetoric, the concept of rhetoric has deviated and has become fragmented within time. It could be said that rhetoric re-emerged as an implicit item, with the intention underlying it, as well as a figurative item (Meyer, 2009). Within this fragmented world of definitions, how could it be possible to come up with a united definition for rhetoric? The meaning of rhetoric has been defined by various authors in the past. For instance, Booth (2004), places the definitions of rhetoric into two separate categories, pre-modern and modern. According to him, the most popular pre-modern definitions are as follows (Booth, 2004: 4-6):

- ‘Rhetoric is the counterpart of dialectic. It is the faculty of discovering in any particular case all of the available means of persuasion.’ (Aristotle)

³John Locke (1690), *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, in Lanham, R. A. (1991). *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms*. London: University of California Press, p: 3.

- 'Rhetoric is one great art comprised of five lesser arts: inventio [usually translated as invention but I prefer discovery], dispositio, elocutio, memoria, and pronuntiatio. It is speech designed to persuade.' (Cicero)
- 'Rhetoric is the application of reason to imagination for the better moving of the will. It is not solid reasoning of the kind science exhibits.' (Francis Bacon)

Besides the pre-modern ones, modern definitions of rhetoric used with an extended meaning are as follows (Booth, 2004: 7-8):

- 'Rhetoric is the study of misunderstandings and their remedies.' (I. A. Richards, 1936)
- 'Rhetoric is rooted in an essential function of language itself, a function that is wholly realistic and continually born anew: the use of language as a symbolic means of inducing cooperation in beings that by nature respond to symbols.' (Kenneth Burke, 1950)
- 'We should not neglect rhetoric's importance, as if it were simply a formal superstructure or technique exterior to the essential activity. Rhetoric is something decisive in society. . . [T]here are no politics; there is no society without rhetoric, without the force of rhetoric.' (Jacques Derrida, 1990)
- 'Rhetoric is often "degenerated" discourse, it is often 'creative' (Umberto Eco).

To summarize the foregoing, rhetoric can be interpreted as not only 'the art of removing the misunderstandings', but also 'the symbolic art of producing such misunderstandings' (Booth, 2004; Lanham, 1991). For instance, Aristotle took rhetoric seriously and attributed a positive meaning to it by equipping it with noble qualities. According to Quintilian, on the other hand, rhetorical study is not merely a study on words, but has the capability of quoting a subject/issue and providing the most appropriate expression for it (Hasle, 2006).

Rhetoric has been said to have five canons throughout the history and within the framework of its extended meanings. These canons, which could also be indicated as the stages of rhetoric, are defined as follows (Aristoteles, 1995; Lanham, 1991: 165-166; Booth, 2004; Meyer, 2009; Hasle, 2006):

- Invention (L. inventio), (G. heuresis): Managing and sequencing the inventions.
- Arrangement (L. dispositio), (G. taxis): Looking through a perspective which distinguishes the weight of each proof/argument.
- Style (L. elocutio), (G. lexis): Sequencing these on the decors of the style.

- Memory (L. memoria), (G. mneme): Preserving these in your memory.
- Delivery (L. actio), (G. hypocrisis): Distributing them with effect and praise.

Textual representation is able to address the features of all these canons (invention, arrangement, style, memory, delivery) which are required for rhetoric; rhetoric is an effective instrument in creating a narration based on persuasion.

The probable relation between architectural theory and architectural history with involve defining a rhetorical method through narrative fiction. Architecture inevitably has to deal with the available common aspects between narration and rhetoric. It could be said that there is rhetoric where there is narration; this is because ambiguous questions give rise to ambiguous answers.

4.1. Canons of Rhetoric: Textual Analysis

Within the scope of this study, as canons of rhetoric, the textual world of "*Usul-i Mimari*" dated 1873, is the first theoretical text of the Ottoman. It was taken as a basis by using the actual examinations in the thesis⁴ which deals with the textual construction of architecture and the rhetoric relation as its subject. We can explain in more detail and provide examples for the canons of rhetoric and the textual meaning they contain.

- **Invention:** Invention, which is the first of the five canons of rhetoric, means to 'discover', 'find'; and attempts to find appropriate proofs for the issue to be discussed (Booth, 2004).⁵ According to Cicero⁶, invention 'comes from *invenire* in Latin, meaning to find/discover/setup/arrange and from *heuresis* in ancient Greek and is about *stasis*' (Sönmez, 2008).

Invention brings forward the argumentative and persuasive sides of rhetoric; this is the reason why Aristotle considered rhetoric as equal to invention (Sönmez, 2008). According to Hermagoras, invention involves four steps: Conjecture, Definition, Quality and Objection (Kennedy, 1994: 98-99; Sönmez, 2008: 125).

These steps include various clues on ways of narration and the quality of the subject in narrating to the reader with reference to aspects such as regression, loss of style, nostalgia and tradition, against the background of *Usul-i Mimari*. For instance, with the loss of style in textual context, the entrance of Ottoman in the regression era is emphasized. As alleged, degeneration and deterioration were experienced accordingly in architecture. Ottoman is mentioned to have a column order tradition. These determinations can be observed

⁴Serap Durmus PhD.

⁵ Cited from Cicero.

⁶ Cited from Cicero.

through invention stages in the "Introduction" part and in the "Architectural History" part of *Usul-i Mimari*, where the content is detailed. The text attempts to persuade the reader by presenting the phenomenon(s) it presumes, 'as if'⁷ these are real. For instance, the following paragraph manifests the canon of invention:

'First of all, it should be known that, the way of construction of large buildings which create an appearance of beauty and decoration, particularly the mosques and many others, implemented since the times where the roots of the ever-lasting Ottoman Empire's robust structure were founded, is a requirement of the nature and the worthiness of Turks which has spread throughout the world. Showing this characteristic by reflecting it on architecture has served a basis for a tremendous development in Architectural science. Indeed, great masters such as Mimar Sinan, Hoca Kâsım and Mimar İlyâs, whose fame have reached the skies, were brought up.' (Edhem Pasa, 2010: 3) (Introduction)

According to the above paragraph, issues such as faith in the Ottoman Empire, and the 'superior characteristics of the Turks' are related with architectural discipline. The buildings and even their construction ways are presented as a 'feature of nature', trying to emphasize the point architecture has reached. In another perspective, this text could be presented as an attempt to involve the of Turks in international exhibitions in the Western World.

The following citation could also be given as an example of the canon of invention:

'Great architectural buildings and therefore, various architectures and masters have developed in time. Although they had succeeded in the construction of great structures during the reign of Sultan Selim I, a very talented architect among these, called Mimar Sinan had stepped forward and his name has spread all over the world... Mimar Sinan had started to demonstrate his technical capabilities by building the Sultan Selim Mosque in Istanbul. Then, he produced very elegant pieces of art during the reign of Suleiman the Magnificent and deserved his high reputation...' (Edhem Pasa, 2010: 6) (Architectural History)

In this citation, the most important attribute of the book is the implementation of the Ottoman architectural styles. Some buildings named in the book were not built in accordance with the technical procedures of the *Ottoman Architectural Styles*, but with the procedures reimplemented during the reigns of various sultans. The argument that great architects and masters had emerged during the implementation of these procedures is based upon major architectural structures and therefore, on Mimar Sinan. At the time when this text was written, it formed the basis for the conception of Mimar Sinan today.

Eventually, all superior Ottoman characteristics are presented to the reader as an illusion of degeneration. According to the citation below, this issue could have

been resolved by looking into and by recourse to our own essence and by using our own procedures:

'Although having such a high level of knowledge and capability, this astonishing knowledge and capability of the Ottomans, still existing in various beautiful pieces of art today, have reached a point of almost entire extinction for some time, that is since they started to show interest in the European art and textiles. However, had the Turks shown the interest and respect as required in their own art and artisans as they did in the past, they could gain back their former reputation in the area of art within a short time. This capability and merit is possessed by nature and is inborn.' (Edhem Pasa, 2010: 35) (Sultan Ahmed III Fountain)

In this way, the authors of the text set forth the inimitability of the Ottomans. The production of discourse, which is done in almost every part of the book, is based on invention and the formation of an order via buildings. The assumptions set forth by the text and the persuasion strategy developed upon them shows exactly that invention is being projected.

- **Arrangement:** Arrangement, the second canon of rhetoric, is derived from the words *disposito* in Latin and *taxis* in Greek; it is translated as *disposition, arrangement, and organization* into English (Sönmez, 2008: 139; Booth, 2004).⁸ Used as *tanzim* or *tertip* in Arabic, the canon of arrangement is the part which should take place in a speech just as a 'living body and its part' for Platon, and points to synthesizing (Kennedy, 1994; Booth, 2004). According to Aristotle, arrangement is 'a union of pragmatic purposes of rhetoric'; whereas it is 'the center of a speech' for Cicero.

According to Sönmez (2008), invention is explained as 'the original opinion' where arrangement is the state of 'organizing the original opinion'. According to rhetoric research, determination of how the issue to be discussed is compatible with the canon of invention, 6 generalizations are mentioned under this canon: introduction, statement of facts, division –showing what's approved or objected, proof, refutation and conclusion (Sönmez, 2008: 141). Similarly, Cicero and Quintilian also categorized arrangement in certain parts.

In *Usul-i Mimari*, which is examined in this study, the meaning as to the creation of a column tradition by the Ottomans is dominant. For supporting the belief that this tradition is an invention, the arrangement canon of rhetoric is required. Therefore, two arrangements can be mentioned in the search for rhetoric within the text; the first of which is the organization of the book and the second is the column order. In the first kind of arrangement; information on the fiction of the book (creation stage, authors, subjects, etc.) and overlapping of the selected buildings with the alleged arguments are observed. The fictional arrangement of the book seems

⁷ The concept 'as if' (pretend) comes from the concept "Pseudo" in its original language. Includes the meanings of 'being deceptive, fake, false...' etc.

⁸ Cited from Cicero.

to be organized in a way that it presents the reader with a different subject on every building. In the second kind, the quality of 'column orders', which is the search of arrangement as suggested by the book is given through narrations, buildings and drawings. Therefore, it could be said that there exists a narration and a search of arrangement within the scope of rhetoric.

The point coming to the forefront from the very beginning is the notion of changing the reader's direction of thought on architectural procedures. In the subsequent sections, various information, techniques, orders, comparisons with other nations on architectural history and procedures and various information on Ottoman architectural rules are provided and proof of this information through the buildings was targeted. For instance, the book mentions the significance of the construction procedures called 'Tarz-ı İnşa' and their relation with the architectures as follows:

'Arrangement of various sections of a building meticulously and skillfully and verification of its geometric calculations entirely is called 'Tarz-ı İnşa' (Construction Procedures) in architectural science. Building shapes determined within the science of architecture are defined according to the columns which are the permanent pillars of various structures. The architect creates a new building by adding building shapes to one another in the way he desires.' (Edhem Pasa, 2010: 9) (Various Architectural Procedures)

In the "Architectural Styles" section of the book written by Montani Efendi, the concept of 'tarz-ı inşa' was explained before proceeding with the construction procedures. In explaining this concept, architectural styles of other nations are provided through comparisons made with Ottoman architecture and architectural style. For instance, the significance of Ottoman styles is expressed in the following lines:

'When one looks at the elegant and major buildings of Ottoman architecture created during the eras when the fine arts learning has reached its paramount, a special architectural style is seen to have been implemented in these structures which are the visible productions of human thought and dreams. There exist admirable, large and beautiful buildings constructed with the architectural styles implemented in architectural buildings, with the unique construction styles reflecting the thoughts and soul of nations and communities.' (Edhem Pasa, 2010: 9) (Various Architectural Styles)

Rhetoric, mentioned as the second kind of arrangement, can be explained through the Ottoman orders. Before explaining the Architectural styles which are believed to exist, as Mahrûti (Conical), Müstevî (Flat) and Mücevherî (Ornamented), we need to provide a definition of with theoretical information on the conformity of styles in architecture and on various Ottoman architectural procedures. Subsequently, these three styles/orders according to the authors are briefly defined according to the quality and shape of ornamentations:

'Ottoman Architectural procedures are comprised of three different shapes: The first is Mahrûti (Conical), the second Müstevî

(Flat) and the third Mücevherî (Ornamented) architectural shapes... There are only a few projections as ornamentation in Mahrûti Architectural procedure. In the Müstevî Architectural procedure, only external ornamentation is made. In the Mücevherî procedure, the projections made are very elegant compared to the other and is ornamented by carved ornamentation.' (Edhem Pasa, 2010: 9-10) (Various Architectural Styles)

Thus, it can be said that the environment in which the book was prepared, coincides with a period where the Ottoman Empire suffered the pains of Westernization and also where there was at the same time an enthusiasm for Westernization. It could also be said that the text, in which Ottoman architecture is promoted. Satisfies the canon of arrangement in rhetoric reading.

- **Style:** The third part of rhetoric, Style (Elocutio) means *lexis* or *hermeneia* in Greek (Sönmez, 2008: 139; Booth, 2004).⁹The word Elocutio has been used in the meaning of style for classical rhetoricians. 'The style related with 'the artistic aspect of ideas' deals with how ideas are expressed. The state of style being the center in rhetoric studies might seem to be related to ornamentation only, however, rhetoric is not only about ornamentation.

Many of the classic rhetoricians like Aristotle, Cicero and Quintilian defended the idea of an integral relation between the theme and the form; the reason is that the theme-form relation is considered to be the basis of style's function in rhetoric. When we speak of style in rhetoric, the following classification is taken as basis: Virtues of Style, Levels of Style, Qualities of Style, Figures of Speech and Content/Form.

In *Usul-i Mimari*, the style stage dealing with the things which the authors try to relate, uses various analogies and metaphors regarding certain themes while making various references to memory and history. 'Virtues of Style' is divided into sub titles, namely correctness, clarity, evidence, propriety and ornateness. Authors use plain language and also sometimes make use of analogy in their description. For instance, this can be observed in the descriptions made with regard to the Süleymaniye Mosque fountain:

'A very plain fountain, coated with zinc, with four parallel directions is built in the middle of the courtyard in front of the door. Iron fences painted in emerald green constitute its elegant ornamentation. The borders over these fences are made of white marble. Large leaf figures are carved into these borders, the middle of which is also painted in emerald green.' (Edhem Pasa, 2010: 22) (Süleymaniye Mosque)

While the significance of the buildings is emphasized, the authors describe the building as spacious for the narration of Süleyman the Magnificent's

⁹ Cited from Cicero.

Tomb. This points to the existence of a correctness convention on the one hand, while on the other it accommodates an aspect of sentimentality:

'...Inside, the Mausoleum is very spacious and refreshing. The objects contained inside are far from glitter, are plain and free from situations exposing resentment in every aspect and are made with the characteristics of Ottoman tombs.' (Edhem Pasa, 2010: 31) (Süleyman the Magnificent's Tomb)

It could be understood from the following citation that the rules of the Ottomans regarding the selection of the building site is considered a tradition requirements:

'It is known to everyone that selection of a large and convenient site for every architectural work to be produced by Ottoman architects has become a tradition and a procedure...' (Edhem Pasa, 2010: 37) (Azap Kapı Fountain)

Levels of Style are observed in three levels in rhetoric; namely High/Grand, Middle and Low/Plain styles. In the text under consideration, the author uses the Middle Style level, strongly emphasizing features from time to time but generally carrying a didactic purpose as well. For instance, according to the text, the Sultan Ahmed III Fountain is described more due to various novelties it encompasses; while the Selimiye Mosque is the most 'admirable' among all mosques according to the authors.

Qualities of Style follow the requirements of correct syntax and sentence patterns. In *Usul-i Mimari*, it can be concluded that in some sections a functional narration takes place (on issues such as Tarz-ı İnşa, Architectural Measurement Unit and Ottoman Orders) whereas an ornate narration is used in others (in descriptions, analogies and metaphors of significant buildings).

Figures of speech emphasize that the development of language and thought should point to a technical glossary. Within the context of the *Usul-i Mimari* text, it should be indicated that a terminology unique to the Ottoman and a literal language are used. For instance, the text includes analogy and metaphor samples as follows:

'The person guiding the journey stops the traveler at the peak of a hill, at a moment where he desires to reach the destination right away, just as how an old man would desire to die due to the grief and misery of his long life; after all the pain the traveler has suffered during continuing such a journey for about three days, and shown him the Sultan Selim Mosque in the distance. Just as the old man sees the doors of heaven underneath his eyelids as his eyes are blinded with approaching death, travelers, too, are overwhelmed by admiration in the visage of such a splendid building enlightening their souls.' (Edhem Pasa, 2010: 25)

Content/Form is interpreted within the scope of rhetoric as the creation of a new content by copying the form of a model or creation of a new form. In the text, the authors give a new name to this model. They adapt the content of Western origin even if the form has changed; in other words, it can be said that the Western orders are

included in the background information. Consider the following citation:

'... The window glasses (stained glass) known as a produce of Ottoman have not been painted afterwards with various colors like the window glasses of grand European buildings... The procedure known and adopted by Ottoman artisans is as follows: First, when various colorful glasses are combined, the colors are not mixed with each other as done in Europe. Second, in European procedure, various colors are processed onto a piece of glass as defined above. However, when these are kiln-dried, these colors lose their vividness and specialties and merely darken...' (Edhem Pasa, 2010: 19) (Green Mosque)

In summary, the text of *Usul-i Mimari* attempts to create a style with various repetitions, emphasis, metaphors and literary language.

- **Memory:** Memory, 'the treasury room of eloquence', memoria; is *mneme* in Greek and means memorizing the speeches (Sönmez, 2008: 157; Booth, 2004).¹⁰ Along with delivery, memory too, as the least remarkable among the five canons of rhetoric, is one of the parts which is rarely mentioned, and sometimes even excluded from rhetoric (Meyer, 2009).

Many authors have pointed out the importance memory. For instance, Socrates defines memory as a physical formation, where Freud sees it as a deep layer of remembrance. Aristotle, on the other hand, does not explicitly mention memory, but rather underlines its visual image (Draaisma, 2007). Called the 'treasure of non-invented things', memory is matched with the invention canon (Sönmez, 2008). Memory in a textual representation, refers to the memory of the object rather than the word, meaning that various references¹¹ are regarded.

Memory within the examined text suggests that it is directly connected with the past experiences of the author; where the learnt and experienced are brought forward. Various references are observed with various identities in the text such as sultans, architects, carvers, nations, etc. Moreover, there are references to memory even in the selection of the buildings included in the text; each building is described with specific features and the 'excellence' of Ottoman architecture is mentioned in each of them.

At the same time, memory in text is an indication of preparing the reader for another phenomenon. Memory can be seen as a sort of allegory. In this context, it can be concluded that the text has two types of memory: cognitive and imaginary; for instance, issues such as which structural types and buildings are selected, which persons are mentioned, architects and various techniques they use, and structural innovations they use

¹⁰ Cited from Cicero.

¹¹ References, Drawings, Buildings, etc.

representing cognitive memory. Imaginary representation, on the other hand, indicates references in figural and visual terms, drawings and detailed expressions.

In conclusion, the text conveys the background memory knowledge to the reader, so to speak. References made to Greek and Egyptian orders and various comparisons, show that the authors recall various prototypes. In other words, we can say that the authors merely adapt the West to Eastern reality and create an East-West synthesis.

- **Delivery:** This canon dealing with oral elocution has been considered significant, yet it is not valid for a text reading method. The reason is that it is not considered appropriate in oral narration, through written information.

Conclusion

Today, is the era of rich explanations and infinite productions of meaning. This study attempted to put forward architectural thought and theory through rhetoric method and showed that the canons of rhetoric enable sensitive interpretations. The method of rhetoric reading reveals the real meaning by exposing the implicit. It could be said that there exist rhetoric tools in the rhetoric reading method which can be used to present the real meaning of the architectural work, the meaning it had for the relevant period and the meaning it might have today.

Different from deconstructivist reading, rhetoric reading examines what the text says with rhetoric tools rather than examining the text in terms of oppositions. Still, this kind of reading should be considered that a part of deconstructivist reading. The reason is deconstruction is the state of preparation of the favorable conditions of re-reading, meaning that it is a sort of inquiry method. The method attempt is an example of semiotic inquiry.

If we are to reach a conclusion within the framework of the selected text, we could say that the purpose of the authors in *Usul-i Mimari* text is persuasion. The reason is the text plans out a route for the reader with the meanings it attributes. The problematiques suggested arbitrarily by the book are in fact the seeds of initiation for various problems which still exist today. When architectural thought is mentioned, thoughts such as 'desire' and 'emulation' would once more be invited to the stage.

Re-reading is made with the purpose of indicating that a significant portion of the writing method of this text is focused on persuasion. The traces of the canons contained in the rhetoric and which can be named as stages/tactics/strategies, can be followed in the selected sample text.

In conclusion, the method compiled under this study can be considered a contemporary re-reading method as per the aforementioned reasons and also the method that is hidden in the implicit structure of rhetoric itself.

REFERENCES

- ARISTOTELES (1995). *Poetika*, (trans. İsmail Tunalı), İstanbul: Remzi Yayınları.
- BATI, Ugur (2012). *Reklamın Dili*, İstanbul: Alfa Yayınları.
- BOOTH, Wayne C. (2004). *The Rhetoric of Rhetoric: The Quest for Effective Communication*, USA: Blackwell Publishing.
- CELİK, Zeynep., and FAVRO, Diane (1988). "Methods of Urban History", *Journal of Architectural Education*, V. 41, no 3, p. 4-9.
- DRAAISMA, Douwe (2007). *Bellek Metaforları, Zihinle İlgili Fikirlerin Tarihi*, (trans. Gürol Koca), İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- EDHEM PASA, İbrahim (2010). *Osmanlı Mimarisi (Usûl-i Mimârî-i Osmânî-1873)*, (ed. Selman Soydemir, haz. İlhan Ovaloğlu, Raşit Gündoğdu, Cevat Ekici, Ebul Faruk Önal), İstanbul: Çamlıca Basım Yayın.
- HANCERLIOĞLU, Orhan (2005). *Felsefe Ansiklopedisi, Kavramlar ve Akımlar*, İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- HARMANCI, Mehmet (2007). *İslam Felsefesinde Metaforik Üslup (İbn Tufeyl (ö.581/1185)'in "Hay İbn Yakzân" Eseri Örneği)*, Unpublished Ph.D.diss., Konya: Selçuk University, Turkey.
- HASLE, Per Frederik Vilhelm (2006). "The Persuasive Expansion-Rhetoric, Information Architecture, and Conceptual Structure", *Conceptual Structures: Inspiration and Application Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, V.4068, p. 2-21.
- KENNEDY, George A. (1994). *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- LANHAM, Richard A (1991). *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms*, London: University of California Press.
- LOCKE, John (1991). *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, in Lanham, R. A. (1960). *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms*. London: University of California Press.
- MEYER, Michel (2009). *Retorik (La rhétorique, Presses Universitaires de France, 2004)*, Ankara: Dost Kitabevi Yayınları.
- RICOEUR, Paul (1971). "The Model of the Text: Meaningful Action Considered as a Text", *Social Research Journal*, V. 38, no 3, p. 529-562.
- SONMEZ, Aykar (2008). *Batı Retoriğinin Genel Terimleri Üzerine Bir Araştırma*, Unpublished Ph.D. diss., İzmir: Ege University, Turkey.
- TANYELI, Ugur (2012). "Günümüz Mimarlık Düşünceleri ve Tasarım Yansımaları: Türkiye'de Mimarlık Düşünce-Tasarım-Uygulama Pratiklerine Dair", *Arredamento Mimarlık Journal*, V. 6, p. 90-105.
- WEDDLE, Saundra., and NEVEU, Marc J. (2011). "Interview with Alberto Pérez-Gómez", *Journal of Architectural Education*, V. 64, no 2, p. 76-81.
- WHYTE, William (2006). "How Do Buildings Mean? Some Issues of Interpretation in the History of Architecture", *History and Theory Journal*, V. 45, p. 153-177.