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Abstract
The aim of this study is to contribute to the architectural criticism through the relationship between the text and rhetoric. In this context, the study pursues the messages rhetoric –as an effective means of persuasion– instills in the subconscious, at the textual level, and is based on providing the reader with guidance and means for interpretation in a certain vein of thought.

In architecture, the message can be conveyed not only through buildings, but also through texts. The mechanism is analogous with those of advertisements, TV series, or posters seeking ways to probe into and affect our perception systems. The architecture’s attempt at persuasion, on the other hand, can be read through discourse/textual products, as well as in the form of buildings. The persuasion, which introduce various archetypes to the vicinity of our consciousness, has a virtual reference to memory as something akin to the 25th frame of a film strip, through the visual and linguistic/textual messages extended either directly or in between the lines. In this context, the 25th frame effect, which provides substantial capabilities of persuasion, can become an object of architectural criticism, as one of the most effective methods of influencing the subconscious.

In a nutshell, the relationship between the text and the rhetoric involves critical cases and meanings, which present the potential of becoming the 25th frame effect of architecture. Therefore, the study discusses the messages installed/positioned on the subconscious of the reader in the textual world of architecture, through the critical approach it adopts.
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Introduction
Re-reading and re-interpretation efforts, thanks to their interdisciplinary stance, allow production of new knowledge and remembering/reminding existing knowledge. As a rich media of narrative offering a number of distinct perspectives, architecture texts play a huge role in theoretical works, regardless of the attitude dominating the work (descriptive, representational, prohibitive, critical etc.). One can argue that every theoretical work, regardless of the attitude, involves some kind of persuasion.

The relationship established between the theory and the criticism, various tools employed, and the selection of methodology/techniques applied provide a domain of investigation of a significant depth and potential. At this junction, writing requires a level of sobriety and responsibility beyond those required for simple speech (Akin, 2007). Therefore, working with written material requires not only a distinct emphasis for such sobriety and responsibility, but also an effective state of persuasion to match that of the word/discourse. Having been based on the art of discourse, rhetoric, on the other hand, can serve as a means of deciphering a text and interpreting the language of representation employed, as a major prerequisite of persuasion. As an advertisement of the narrative and discourse, textual representation can lead to intellectual products which can serve both the theoretical and the practical side of architecture.

Yet, what do we expect the target audience to grasp when we think of persuasion? Or, what do we want to instill in our audience? We either refuse or accept what we see or hear, through a conscious choice. Just as in the case with the relationship between the text and architecture. The message offered for the reader/target audience begins with the author’s assumption or rejection of something. The pen flows on that basis. Then, the aim is to convince the audience on that point, making use of robust arguments. In this context, contrary to general belief, the relationship between the text and architecture is not only a theoretical connection, but also one that serves the development of the architectural thought which grows through accumulation. Indeed, that is the exact reason why the relationship between text and rhetoric can be considered as a subconscious message technique. For the persuasive power of texts constructs a subconscious in the written representation of architecture and the development of architectural thought. The construct in question can operate, at times, explicitly, and at others, implicitly. In this study, Heinrich Hübsch’s (1992) In What Style Should We Build? dated 1828, presenting a different route of thought, is brought under the limelight as, arguably, the 25th frame of architecture, thanks to the disruption it produced.

Rhetoric and Persuasion
Rhetoric is the art of influence and persuasion. According to Plato rhetoric is defined as an art to persuade/convince/and of eloquence (Morrow, 1953). Persuasion, as the object of rhetoric, on the other hand, is
defined by Brembeck and Howell (1955) as ‘the attempt to alter thoughts and actions through conscious manipulation of human motives, with a view to achieving pre-determined results’ (Darici, 2013). Rhetoric is a theory, and is the most important tool of persuasion in Western thought (McQuarrie and Mick, 1996). As a technique of speech, rhetoric is employed as a tool to convince the audience to consider the issue from the speaker’s perspective. If the rhetorical device is employed for a textual material, it attempts to achieve persuasion by revealing the author’s will to make the reader think, through messages/coding/concepts. Presented through messages/coding/concepts, rhetorical device can have both logical and emotional appeal. At this junction, subconscious thoughts and memory as a form of messaging comes to the forefront. The primary province of the discipline of rhetoric, which is all about the word, the content, and the form, is how to convey expression most effectively (Batt, 2010: 73). Representing a form of coding to cover the field of persuasion as well, given its actual use, rhetoric can also be defined as an activity to convey knowledge. Another definition of rhetoric is about the art of using language for convincing others, for reasoning, and for persuasion (Ulaş, 2002).

It is possible to argue that the first theoretical works on persuasion appears with Aristo’s Rhetoric. The rhetoric activities which took place in the agoras of the antiquity can perhaps be considered as a staging of all means towards persuasion. The behavioral sciences function of the rhetorical construct, persuasion, is a matter of rhetoric thanks to its traits of memorability, ease of learning, and discernibility, giving it the substantial persuasive power in terms of conveying the message from the source to the audience. (Özerkan, 2001: 108; Batt, 2010: 74). The primary purpose of persuasion is to affect the desired impact on the target audience. The persuasion has nothing to do with coercion. Moreover, the existence of mutual will and equal terms on a theoretical basis is what makes persuasion stand apart from subliminal message (Darici, 2013).

One of the options to help with achieving the objective of persuasion is to focus the message on a specific idea with a view to conveying it to the recipient in the classical process of persuasion. The stronger the message, the higher the chance of persuasion. Jammiesson (1996), on the other hand, argues that persuasion has two sides: an explicit and an implicit one. While it is possible to see its explicit side in advertisements which opt for a clear expression, the implicit side is apparent only in the messages concealing intentions. Subconscious messages constitute the sneakiest aspect of the implicit side. That is why one should note that the primary purpose of subconscious messages is to persuade.

A glance at the relationship between the duo of rhetoric and persuasion leads to the assumption that the relationship between the text and rhetoric also entails some persuasion. For, persuasion exists as long as communication does, regardless of its actual form (textual, verbal, visual etc.). As the visual and linguistic/textual expression of the message, rhetoric is capable of extending various messages to its readers, through the texts. Issues such as the sentence structures employed in the text, the usage rates of such sentences, concepts, and associations provide the reader with opportunities to interpret how messages are structured. Therefore, all processes, attitudes and approaches taking one from a starting point to the destination can be considered persuasion (Darici, 2013).

The archetypes hidden in the textual expression/construction of architectural thought are effectively the 25th frame of architecture, each acting as a message for the subconscious. The hidden common denominators of textual expression in the relationship between the subconscious message and persuasion include the archetypes of style, retrogression, corruption, loss etc. The present study, in turn, provides examples of the traces of such archetypes with reference to a text. At this junction, one should have a few words about the subconscious message techniques and archetypes as the 25th frame effect of architecture.

**Subconscious Message and the 25th Frame Effect**

Every second we are subjected to subconscious messages. The concept of consciousness has its roots in the Latin words *con* (with) and *scire* (to know), while the concept of subconscious reflects a black box residing hidden in consciousness (Gennaro, 2007). Murphy (1963: 45) on the other hand, in his seminal work *The Power of Your Subconscious Mind*, introduced the view that subconscious mind removes images and events from memory, and is even inspiring.

However, it is crucial for consciousness and subconscious to be directed towards perception and persuasion. The more critical and logical perspective of human mind towards stimuli leads to differences in terms of the scale and reflection of reactions among people. Subconscious messages are designed towards the senses which act as intermediaries for the perception of the external world. In other words, the strength, form, and repetition of the stimulus in the message vary by the sense it is directed towards. For instance, while the techniques directed towards sight focuses on the nature of the eye and the impact of the image on the brain, the examples employing hearing may take emphasis, toning and dosage to the forefront. Message techniques dating back to as early as 1900s had always been about seeking answers to the question ‘how can we influence the audience?’ (Taylor, 2012). Since late 19th century, on the other hand, various forms of the stimulant of the subconscious, and their impact on the individuals had been analyzed (Küçükbezirci,
2013). The subconscious messages initially considered as the means to achieve commercial objectives and a tool of marketing, had later on spilled over to a multitude of fields such as advertisements, cinema, debates, computer games, television, packaging, posters, videos etc. In short, the subconscious messages and persuasion emphasize the transformation of thoughts, and allow the production and dissemination of new information.

The areas and forms of use of subconscious message techniques include the use of still images, video files, audio files, emotional sense method, smelling, and tasting (Darici (2012; 2013: 165-166).

- Still images: Through figures, texts, symbols and numbers hidden in posters, logos, product packaging, billboards, curtain walls, magazines, books etc.
- Video files: Through the use of yazi lim, manipulated images and effects on TV, movies, computer games, videos etc.
- Audio files: Through the use of audio files and other tools, below the perceptual hearing threshold or targeting brainwaves.
- Emotional sense method: This is a relatively newer method. The use of chemicals to penetrate human skin and enabling the secretion of happiness hormones, in extremely expensive products. Moreover the tactile feedback received upon touching the materials used in the packaging of the products.
- Smelling: Smell cards, packaging and product smells, smells used in specific spaces.
- Tasting: Through the use of chemicals including artificial happiness hormones, in food products.

Another matter that can be employed as a technique to send messages to the subconscious is the perceptual organization. According to the psychologists who embraced the Gestalt Theory, which was developed in the first half of the 20th century, a large number of distinct perceptual phenomenon can be expressed with reference to the form of the relationship between one part of the stimulus and another. The desired messages can be sent to the subconscious through the application of Gestalt principles (figure and ground, closure, continuity, proximity principles). From the second half of the 20th century on, on the other hand, American psychologists James Lefkowitz and Dylan Verrechia’s 25th frame effect idea had been developed in the field of advertising, and came to influence the debate on perception and subconscious messages.

25th Frame Effect Technique

As a technique to send messages to the subconscious, the 25th frame effect is developed as an analogy to movies. Movies as shown in movie theaters are presented in reels comprising 24 frames per second. That number is also what the eye can perceive in a given second. One cannot perceive the image shown in the 25th frame, however, even though the subconscious stores that piece of knowledge. This would enable the conveyance of the required message to the target individual/audience. In the literature, the system based on the frame interjection technique on top of the image frames perceptible to the eye is often called the 25th frame effect technique.

The 25th frame effect technique is applied by removing the control intervals between every 24 frame covering a second. Once these control intervals are removed, a gap enabling the placement of a further frame would arise, which allows the placement of a momentary image, which would not otherwise be part of that second of the movie (Figure 1). The figure below represents the message placement state by carving a space for one frame which would, for all practical purposes be imperceptible to the eye, given the second and shooting plans.
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Figure 1. Drawing depicting the 25th frame effect technique
The momentary image thus observed is comprised of 24 small frames. The 25th and last frame appears only momentarily, and is duly removed. It is rarely observed, but is often kept as an impression on the subconscious. In other words, the prevailing use of the 25th frame is to send messages to the subconscious.

The momentary message which we would not be aware of cannot be glossed over by the consciousness. Such a conveyance of the message happens often with promotional and marketing related arrangements or commercial channels such as advertising panels, posters, logos etc. Having a substantial persuasive power, the 25th frame effect technique is one of the most effective methods in terms of influencing the subconscious. Today the advent of digital technologies rendered the technique virtually obsolete. Nonetheless, the theoretical essence of the 25th frame technique merits further investigation under the present study. The 25th frame can arise through a re-reading of a text, and provides, in effect, an example of the instilling of the text’s potential meanings in the subconscious (through secondary concepts). Indeed, that is what makes it a practical means of reading applicable to the relationship between the text and the rhetoric in the context of architecture.

The 25th Frame Message in Architecture Text: In What Style Should We Build?
The 25th frame effect technique claims to offer the potential or possibility of thought over texts against the background of architecture. In this context, this study provides an analysis of the codes shaping the architectural text and criticism, as instilled by the text on the subconscious. The 25th frame is a practically invisible frame, which nonetheless conveys a subliminal message. In architecture, on the other hand, the 25th frame effect represents the messages between and/or behind the lines, the author wishes to extend. The rereading in the present study is that of Heinrich Hübsch’s theoretical text In What Style Should We Build? (1828), published in the collection titled In What Style Should We Build? The German Debate on Architectural Style. The book is a compilation of texts by Hübsch (1828), Wiegmann (1829), Rosenthal (1844), Wolff (1845), Bötticher (1846) and Hübsch (1847), and was published in 1992, with the translation and an introduction by Wolfgang Herrmann. As a text deserving investigation regarding the stylistic coherence debates, which still rage on, In What Style Should We Build? (1828) was chosen as it provides an example of the subconscious message provided by the architectural text, and constitutes a major breaking point.

The text relays the message to instill the view that all value judgments conceptualizing the architecture of the 19th and 20th century architecture had indeed been observed in modern architecture as well. Hübsch’s text provides a coherent picture with its formulation and narrative, and arguably provides an emphasis on the relationship between romanticism and nationalism. For the existence of a negotiated mental attitude regarding the materialist principles (climate, technique, materials etc.) makes itself felt. The text is consistent with respect to the integrity of style and the perfection of the Greek architecture of the antiquity, and concurs on this matter with Wiegmann and Rosenthal, the other authors the texts of which are included in the compilation. The text points at qualitative proliferation and diversification, paving the way for Hübsch to discuss the need to avoid subjectivity and an artistic perspective.

The text authored on the basis of the unsatisfactory state of architecture, laid the initial seeds to impose a conscious perspective towards architecture, which came to dominate the debates from the first half of the 19th century on. The text follows an intellectual succession of arguments and counter-arguments: Traditional values are supported against radical proposals, while the materialistic approach is set against the idealistic perspective (Herrmann, 1992).

The crux of the debate presented in the text, on the other hand, is about the style problematic reminding the Zeitgeist code. That very problematic would thereafter be revealed through quotations and interpretations under the label Code 1: Zeitgeist.

**Code 1: Zeitgeist**
The term Zeitgeist can be interpreted as a case befitting and representing the times. The term Zeitgeist, used frequently by Heinrich Hübsch and his contemporaries in their texts, roughly means “the spirit of age”. Modernists envisaged a theory or a language based on the 19th century’s notion of “the spirit of the age”, called Zeitgeist by the Germans in reference to the belief that the spirit of the age could only have been expressed via art and architecture (Durmuş, 2012: 30).

The strongest inference that we can take from Hübsch’s text today is that the discussion of manner and the visualization of being in a period of crisis are valid for the practice of architecture, too (Tanju, 2010). That is why the concept of Zeitgeist, which entails an interest in developing a coherent whole as well as a reference to the style problem, provides a code that can serve in the context of the 25th frame effect of architecture. The words and/or 25th frames reminding the concept of Zeitgeist, on the other hand, can be pondered with reference to words such as essence, major, base, soul, truth, and origin (Figure 2).
In What Style Should We Build? (1828) presents the debates revolving around the major theme of the question of style. The other problems which are deemed closely related to the question of style, on the other hand, are construction, material, customs or religion and aesthetic values. Hübsch refers to material, technical experience, climate, and present needs as the major defining factors of style. In the mindset aiming for a new style, Hübsch was content with focusing on these four factors hitherto delineated through major styles only. The first thing Hübsch did was to list the major elements of a building: walls, ceiling, roof, supports, windows, and doors. These are the elements of style and their shapes present a variety affected by the use of materials (Herrmann, 1992: 4). Hübsch (1992: 68) reached to the conclusion that there are just two original styles: one with straight, horizontal stone architraves; the other with curved vaults and arches. According to Hübsch, all these are details required for the development of the new style:

“The principal formative factors, as can be deduced a priori as well as confirmed historically, are climate and building material. In the first place the climate, as already mentioned, gives a uniform character to the needs of one country as compared with another. Thus, a mild southern climate makes less exacting demands than the rough climate of the north; all eastern buildings appear to be somewhat open in contrast to the anxiously closed-in buildings of the north…” (Hübsch, 1828 [1992]: 67).

“The materials that chiefly affect the form of the architectural elements are wood and stone. Even in countries where stone is scarce, the more important buildings use stone not only for walls and piers but also for the members that connect the piers or span the openings, wherever these are exposed to weathering. Often, even large interior ceilings are made of stone so as to last…” (Hübsch, 1828 [1992]: 67).

“In countries where the available varieties of stone are brittle and not found in great lengths, attempts were soon made to span the opening with more than one piece of stone. The crowning result of these attempts was the vault… Thus almost every architectural element changed—in other words the whole style—so that it may be said that essentially there are only two original styles: one with straight, horizontal stone architraves; the other with curved vaults and arches.” (Hübsch, 1828 [1992]: 68).

Upon returning to Rome from a visit to Greece, Hübsch noted that her ideas had been completely revolutionized. The plain style of and lack of degeneration in Greek architecture had impressed him immensely. Noting that we need Greek architecture and monuments to cover our extensive needs, he seems convinced of the need to establish a new style:

“… Now, since the size and arrangement of every building is conditioned by its purpose, which is the main reason for its existence, and since its continued existence depends on the physical properties of the material and on the resulting arrangement and formation of the individual parts, it is obvious that two criteria of functionality, fitness for purpose (commodity) and lasting existence (solidity)—determine the size and basic form of the essential parts of every building…” (Hübsch, 1828 [1992]: 64).

“… If we take a more practical view, our courage revives. Though it is true that this uncertainty and arbitrariness make art into a plant that easily runs to seed, there are limits; and the danger is really not so great as may appear at first glance. The beauty of a building, like the beauty of a
landscape or a symphony, is composed of many elements, all of which are not of equal importance in relation to the whole…” (Hübsch, 1828 [1992]: 65).

According to Hübsch, style essentially means belonging to a nation; the required integrity of style should be constructed in one way or another. The starting point of the text discusses degeneration and ruin of architecture, whereupon it proceeds to present the reactions to imagine contemporary architecture from the vantage point of architecture of the antiquity. For Ancient Greek architecture is an unsurmountable summit. The roots of the “style” problem which dominates the Western architectural thought, stem from the waning dominance of the classical architecture (Civelek, 2003). The rational thought, or in other words the continuity of the understanding extending from Ancient Greek to date in the Western architectural tradition, affects Hübsch’s view of architecture, and presents itself as the zeitgeist of 1830s —what had collapsed or left incomplete due to external factors:

“…Like false prophets, they claim the privilege of an inspiration—that of beauty—for which they claim to need no justification. Other architects, it is true, admit that it must first be proven that the architecture of the ancients, as universal architecture, can be as appropriate and beautiful to us as it once was to the Greeks…” (Hübsch, 1828 [1992]: 64).

“…Finally, it is evident that specific needs also affect the style in that those of one nation, despite local variations, display a common character when compared to the total needs of another country…” (Hübsch, 1828 [1992]: 66-67).

“If we wish, therefore, to attain a style that has the same qualities as the buildings of other nations that are accepted as beautiful and are much praised by us, then this cannot arise from the past but only from the present state of natural formative factors—that is: first, from our usual building material; second, from the present level of technostatic experience; third, from the kind of protection that buildings need in our climate in order to last; and fourth, from the more general nature of our needs based on climate and perhaps in part on culture…” (Hübsch, 1828 [1992]: 71).

Hübsch noted the need for the smart man to place emphasis on the material while discussing the material and constructive characteristics of architecture. In this context, Ancient Greek is not related with a form of rationalism, for the temples had been defined by cults and myths. In other words, it is not the style Hübsch described, or one comparable to it. This enables a renewed probe into the universal reason. What depends on elements such as material, climate etc. is the style of architecture. Anything else is art. Personal mannerisms do not define the style, but rather act as its flavoring:

“Painting and sculpture have long since abandoned the lifeless imitation of Antiquity. Architecture alone has yet to come of age and continues to imitate the antique style. Although nearly everybody recognizes the inadequacy of that style in meeting today’s needs and is dissatisfied with the buildings recently erected in it, almost all architects still adhere to it. Most of them really believe that the beauty of architectural forms is something absolute, which can remain unchanged for all times and under all circumstances, and that the antique style alone presents these forms in ideal perfection…” (Hübsch, 1828 [1992]: 63).

“The decoration of buildings will depend on the imagination of the individual artists and will therefore be manifold. However, this will not endanger the new style, as was pointed out in the first section. Even in countries where a uniform and consistent taste has prevailed, there is a great variety in decoration. This will be even more so with us, who know all things past and present and are so fond of novelty and diversity…” (Hübsch, 1828 [1992]: 99).

The relationship the Renaissance established with Ancient Greek is rejected. According to Hübsch, establishment on the basis of the logic attributed to Ancient Greek does not make any sense. Hübsch argues that we lack the marbles and stones Ancient Greek had access to. Whenever a hybrid system arises, a really gross architecture arises. According to Hübsch, Roman architecture is exactly that. That is how the shortcomings of Roman style presents itself in the text:

“However, the genius of Greek beauty was not to give way so easily. We can still enjoy the unity of even very late Greek monuments—where at least the horizontal covering was maintained—and also their tasteful, though too profuse, decoration, especially when we compare them to the distortion that Greek architecture endured at the hands of the Romans. Even before the conquest of
Greece, the Romans had employed the arches that proved so advantageous to the construction of their extensive aqueducts and roads... Although the Greeks were slavishly imitated in everything, including their architecture, the horizontal covering was bound to be unsatisfactory, especially because, for the multitude of Roman needs, the types of stone available were unsuited to this form of construction (at that time the Romans did not yet use marble for building)...” (Hübsch, 1828 [1992]: 78-79).

“Among the churches known to me that were built in the basilican style, the church of Santa Balbina on the Aventine in Rome is the only one where no antique fragments were used and where the vaulting style appears in its purest and simplest form. This moderately sized church originally had a nave and two side aisles. The piers as well as the arches and walls are built of brick. They are square and rather thick and are set wider apart than are the ancient columns in the other churches. The walls that rise above the piers, wherever an intermediate tie or principal rafter rests on them, are strengthened by piers or pilasters projecting from the outside face of the wall. The windows are almost as wide as the span of the arches. The cornice of the nave is embellished by a course of small corbels; that of the choir is formed, as is usual in this style, with several courses of brick laid in different directions.” (Hübsch, 1828 [1992]: 86).

Epilogue
The texts as elements bearing a code to relay a message, as the proverbial 25th frame effect of architecture, are in effect rhetorical representations thanks to its persuasive capability. The relationship between the text and rhetoric, investigated through the work titled In What Style Should We Build? entails messages to recall the concept of zeitgeist as a code encrypted in the 25th frame effect of architecture.

The text develops quasi-objective criteria regarding the selection of style, and supports the plurality of historicism (URL-1). The historicist perspective attaches import to two issues: developments are linked organically, and local conditions and differences have an impact on results. Even 188 years after the publication of the text in 1828, one can forcefully argue that we have yet to wander away from the contents of the production of discourse in architectural text.

The style problem, which had hitherto dominated Western architectural thought is based on the loss of the authority of the classical architectural doctrine. The continuity of the perspective which had dominated the Western architecture from Ancient Greek to date had begun to lose the foundations it had been built on, with the advent of the 19th century and the developments it brought along (Civelek, 2003). Hübsch’s textual attempt regarding this issue culminates in a text exhibiting the earliest examples of an intellectual infrastructure where a link between ethnic and cultural characteristics and geographical conditions is established. The style issue in question, in turn, finds itself embedded in the memories, as a code serving zeitgeist.

In conclusion, In What Style Should We Build?, claiming that architecture itself changes as the system of construction and materials change, and hence the style problem always retains its place in the agenda, is a crucial piece shaping architectural narrative thanks to its search for a totalitarian lingua franca. This paper, which interprets the relationship between the text and rhetoric as a technique of persuasion –as the 25th frame effect–, in turn, strives to remind that meaning in the performance achieved by the author and the reader is not monolithic. Indeed, this provides a renewed emphasis on how texts diversify as they proliferate and are reread with different means.
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