Continuity of architectural traditions in the megaroid buildings of rural Anatolia: The case of Highlands of Phrygia
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Abstract
Rural architecture has grown over time, exhibiting continuities as well as adaptations to the different social and economic conditions of each period. Continuity in rural architecture is related to time, tradition and materiality, involving structural, typological, functional and social issues that are subject to multiple interpretations.

This fieldwork was conducted in an area encompassing the villages of the districts of today’s Eskişehir Seyitgazi and Afyon Ihsaniye districts, the part of the landscape known as the Highlands of Phrygia. The purpose of the fieldwork was to explore the traces of the tradition of “megaron type” buildings in the villages of this part of the Phrygian Valley with an eye to pointing out the “architectural continuity” that can be identified in the rural architecture of the region. The methodology employed was to document the structures found in the villages using architectural measuring techniques and photography. The buildings were examined in terms of plan type, spatial organization, construction technique, materials and records evidencing the age of the structure. The study will attempt to produce evidence of our postulation of architectural continuity in the historical megaras of the region in an effort to shed some light on the region’s rural architecture.

The study results revealed megaroid structures that bear similarity to the plan archetypes, construction systems and building materials of historical megarons in the region of the Phrygian Highlands. These structures were classified in a typology that evidenced the existence of an architectural continuity of megaroid building tradition, which this study seeks to present.
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1. Introduction

Rural architecture is a type of architecture that is based on local needs and construction materials, and it reflects local traditions at the same time. The general characteristics of rural architecture are traditionality, functionality, adaptation to environmental conditions and local materials.

Rural houses are important elements of heritage that have historical and cultural continuity. They are less liable to be affected by rapid cultural changes and has grown over time, exhibiting continuities as well as adaptations to the different social and economic conditions of each period. Some part of Turkish communities preserved their nomadic lifestyle until the end of the 19th century when they began to abandon their yörük tents to build permanent houses during their transition from a nomadic existence into a settled lifestyle. It is believed that it was in this period that they must have adopted the housing plans used by the local populations in the places in which they settled.

2. The aim and the methodology of the research

The process of exploring Anatolia’s rural settlements is still in its beginning stages. There is still controversy over which parameters were influential in the choice of the house plans, materials and building systems used in the transition of the Turks into permanent settlements. The general belief is that the nomads adapted to the housing culture of indigenous societies in that period. It is for this reason that research on Anatolian rural architecture is of great importance.

This fieldwork was conducted in the area encompassing all villages of the districts of Eskişehir Seyitgazi and Afyon İhsaniye, referred to in history as the “Highlands of Phrygia” (Figures 1, 2). The main goal of this research is to reveal the similarities between the megaroid structures in the Highlands of Phrygia and the plan, spatial organization, building systems and materials used in the historical megaras, and to uncover any architectural continuity as is believed to exist in the area. This will shed some light on the question of whether there is in fact cultural and architectural continuity in Anatolian rural architecture.

To reach our goals, we investigated all of the villages in the region. All the houses were examined in terms of the plan type, spatial organization, materials, construction systems and records evidencing the age of the buildings. The samples chosen were documented
using architectural measuring methods and photography. In addition, interviews were held with the members of the households living in the houses and with village elders to learn about the age of the buildings, the history of the villages, the daily lifestyle and the use of space.

3. The historical background of the megaron

Megaron (plural megaron) refers to an elongated rectangular building with an entrance on one of the short sides, provided with a porch. In Homer, the megaron refers to the great halls of the Mycenaean palaces (Knox, 1973). Homer regards the function of the megaron as "the hall of the men". Herodotus holds it equal to the sacred room of the adyton of the temple dedicated to Helen (Işık, 1998). According to Deroy, "megaron" is a word in Sanskrit that means "a room with a hearth" (Deroy, 1948).

Dörpfeld, Schliemann and Blegen were the first to apply the term "megaron" to prehistoric remains, in the palace at Tiryns in 1885 and later for the large buildings of Troy II (Dörpfeld, 1902; Schliemann, 1885). They used the term "megaron" in the Homeric sense of a large hall or a main hall in a palace (Ivanova, 2013). In his 1953 excavation report, Blegen described the megaron as "a room of great size, the principal apartment of the palace". It is referred to as a megaron of the classic mainland type, consisting of a great hall, a vestibule, and a two-columned portico fronting a court, in most respects similar to corresponding suites at Mycenae and Tiryns (Blegen, 1953). The term has subsequently been used to refer to other buildings in Greece and elsewhere that contain a long hall fronted by a porch, as well as freestanding buildings with this alignment of rooms (Warner, 1994).

There are different views about the roots of the megaron. The simplest type, namely an isolated rectangle, is attested for Thrace, Macedonia and Thessaly in Neolithic (Müller, 1944). Buildings of this type consist of a single room without porch or anteroom. They have pitched roofs, flat roof or the barrel roof.

Other early examples can be seen in Sesklo and Dhimini in Eastern Thessaly in the late Neolithic (Bintliff, 2012). Sesklo has in fact been named the earliest "megaroid-style building" in the middle of the acropolis. The structure is made up of a porch, a main chamber and a back room. In the same way, the acropolis at Dhimini boasts a megaron larger than others that stands in the middle of the circular walls. These are centrally-located structures and protected by fortification walls. They have been interpreted as the ruler's residences or the temples (Bintliff, 2012).

Poliochni and Thermi had row-houses of megaroid character during EBI. These long and narrow buildings are composed of a closed antechamber and of a main chamber. These structures have been placed on the street perpendicularly. They were constructed as row houses with common side walls (Warner, 1994). Mellink presumes that these long houses are the ancestors of the megaron (Mellink, 1986).

Lerna IV (Early Helladic II) is a small one-room megaron of classical form facing east onto a large courtyard (Warner, 1994). In the Middle and Late Helladic, the megaron plan continued to develop and a number of new types emerged, particularly in houses. In the Peloponesus, the Mycenaean palaces of ruler forts of Late Helladic III, Mycenae, Tiryns and Pylos exhibit structures of the megaron type. The most well-known is Nestor's palace at Pylos, of which we hear much in Homer's Odyssey. It consists of a hall, a forehall, and a porch with two columns in antis to support the roof. The main hall contains a large circular hearth at center, surrounded by four columns (Blegen, Rawson, 1966).

Looking at Anatolian examples of megaron-type, Hacilar IIA from the Early Chalcolithic presents buildings of megaroid character. These contiguous buildings of one or two stories have features similar to megaron type because they display a forecourt of a sort. The houses are arranged with their backs to the defensive wall. Each consists of a main room with a hearth set in the middle of the floor and an anteroom (Mellart, 1970).

Another precursor of the mega-
ron-like structure in Anatolia can be seen in Yümüktepe XVI. Here stand a series of houses of megaroid character adjoining the city walls, all with a closed porch and a main room in back (Garstang, 1953).

At the start of 4000 BC in the Late Chalcolithic, in Beycesultan XXIV, appeared a structure that may be said to be a precursor to the megaron type in Anatolia. Here, at the west end of a building, projecting walls created an open porch; from this, one entered through a doorway with a raised step into the main chamber, which had a circular hearth in the center (Lloyd, Mellaart, 1962).

An increase in megaron-type buildings appeared in Anatolia by the EB. Troia I consisted of parallel rows of long buildings of megaroid character. House 102 has one room and a porch and without rear antae. It had a hearth at the center (Blegen, 1937, Ivanova, 2013). At Troia II, large houses of the megaron-type have been brought to light on the citadel. Megaron IIA with a central hearth probably served as an assembly room or an audience-hall, and maybe in its last phase (IIb), it was a place of cultic activity (Mellart, 1959). The long-room units arranged in rows were very common in the western part of Anatolia in the EB. The coastal communities along the Anatolian littoral at Beşiktepe, Bakla Tepe and Liman Tepe VI, and on the eastern Aegean islands at Yeni Bademli, built mainly long-room dwellings arranged in a row (Ivanova, 2013). Some of these long houses may be defined as of megaroid-style because of their side wall extensions (Erkanal, 1996).

The most numerous examples of the megaron plan were uncovered in an EB village at Karataş-Semayık. The basic characteristics of these freestanding rectangular structures are two structural long walls with cross-walls inserted to form a main room and a front porch which are entered axially on the short side. The long walls end in antae at the front; the rear cross-wall is often set back from the ends of the long walls, which thus project as rear antae (Warner, 1979, 1994). Each is entered through a door centrally located in the front cross wall between the porch and the main room. The roofing system is the gabled roof.

In all of the occupation levels dated to the EB at Beycesultan, megaroid houses and shrines are quite prevalent. They have main rooms with hearths, sometimes with small rooms in the back and with a porch. This continued to be a feature of megaron-type buildings right up to the end of the LB at site (Lloyd, Mellaart, 1962).

The Antalya Bademağacı, Eskişehir Külüboğazi, Demircihöyük and Keçiçayıırı settlements of the EB had two-roomed structures in the megaron style. They contained a central open area around which there were examples on a radial plan adjoining the city walls. In Bademağacı, the EBA II town were megaron-like houses with open-porched and with rear rooms (Duru, 2003; Korfmann, 1983). Küülüboğazi in Early Bronze II consists of an upper city, at the center of which there are two megara complexes that have public functions. Surrounding these structures on three sides are long houses and two- or three-roomed houses in megaroid shape, their rear rooms abutting against the fortification wall (Efe, Ay-Efe, 2001; Efe et al. 2011).

The megaron-type in Marmara however can be seen at the end of the EB. The acropolis of Kanlıgeçit has three adjacent large megara arranged linearly. These buildings are observed to be of the type that has a single main room with an open porch in front with rear antae (Özdoğan, 2002).

Phrygian architecture represents the period in which the megaron plan prevails as the most characteristic plan type. The buildings in the citadel in Gordion are freestanding and each consisted of a large hall with central hearth and a porch and anteroom, and with a flat or double pitched roof (Young, 1960).

The megaron-type can also be established in central Anatolia. In the period of Phrygian expansion to the east, the Iron Age of Büyükkale, small megaron houses are typically of Phrygian construction and plan. The most frequent type displayed an open entrance hall/porch in antis. There are also other variations with semi- or completely closed porches (Neve, 1996).
At Kültepe in the EBIII, a megaron-shaped architectural complex is a temple. In the middle of a large room lies a round hearth, surrounded by four posts. Smaller rooms are grouped around this central hall (Özguç, 1963). A megaron-shaped architectural complex was also found on Stratum IIa in Kaman Kalehöyük. The structure was surrounded by corridors (Omura, 1999).

At Kerkenes Dağ, some structures that can be identified as megaron have been uncovered. They are freestanding buildings that have one main room with a central hearth and an open porch (Summers et al., 2004). They have double-pitched roofs and served some special public function or the residences for the ruling elite (Summers et al., 2004).

Tell Tayı'nat Building XVI was a long room divided into a portico, a main hall and a shrine. It is a temple complex and its plan is in antis style (Harrison, Osbourne, 2012).

Besides these examples, some researchers assert that there are buildings of the megaroid character in the Near East as well. Some have named the long-axis corridor house/pier-house type of house found to be widespread in the southern Levant in Middle PPNB “megaron” (Wright, 1985; Garstang, Garstang, 1940). A central hearth is a common feature of the plan.

Wright states that the PPNB temple at Jericho E is a megaron since the flank walls project as antae (Wright, 1985). Wright also claims that the Langbau type of temples in the Near East in the LB and Iron Ages are of the megaron style (Wright, 1985; Davey, 1980). They have a single long room and a shallow entrance porch designed in antis (Hun-dley, 2013).

4. A history of the settlement of the region

The Highlands Phrygia cover the whole of the districts of Afyonkarahisar and the districts of İhsaniye, Işıcehisar and Bayat as well as a part of Bolvadin and Seyitgazi and Han in Eskişehir, and a part of central Kütahya and Tavşanlı (Aşşıoğlu, Memlük, 2010; Haspels, 1971; Kortanoğlu, 2011) (Figure 3). The region has been named after the Phrygians. Ancient Phrygia was a neighbor to Cappadocia to the east and later to Galatia, the regions of Lykaonia, Pisidia Kabalıs, Milyas Kibyrratis in the south, and Mysia, Lydia, Karia to the west and the regions of Bithynia and Paphlagonia to the north (Sevin, 2007). The capital Gordion, Pessinous, Mideon, Dorylaeum, Lodikeya and Kolossai may be mentioned as the most important cities of ancient Phrygia (Sevin, 2007).

The oldest name for Afyon was Akronio. In the period of the Hittite Empire, Afyon gained importance because of the campaigns of Murshilish II against the kingdom of Arzava. It was after the fall of the Hittite Empire and following the ensuing Dark Ages that the Phrygians entered the scene. The region was known as Phrygia thereafter up until the end of the Byzantine Era (İlaslı, 2004).

As a result of the Cimmerian attacks, dominion over Central Anatolia passed from the Phrygians to the Lydians (Akurgal, 2000). From the middle of the sixth century BC, the Persians captured sovereignty over the Afyon region. From 30 BC onward, Anatolia was under the leadership of Rome. During the Roman Era, new towns and cities were established in the region. The city of Amorium gained importance in the Byzantine Era and Phrygia was divided in two, one part becoming

Figure 3. The Highlands Phrygia (https://www.academia.edu/1670748/Highlands_of_Phrigia-Map).
annexed to Galatia, the other remaining as Phrygia Salutaris. During 1275-1343, Sahipataoğulu was established in Afyonkarahisar (Karazeybek, 2004). Yıldırım Beyazıt annexed the region to the Ottoman lands in 1390. After WWI, Afyon too was invaded by the Greeks. The city was liberated on August 27, 1922 in the Great Offensive.

Seyitgazi is a small district of Eskişehir, 4 km. to its south. The oldest settlements in the area dates back to the EB (Altınsapan, 1999). The region was conquered by the Hittites in the fifteenth century BC and the Phrygians entered the area around 1200 BC, establishing a strong kingdom in the environs of Eskişehir. In the eighth century BC however, with pressures from the Lydians, and because of the steady loss of strength as a result of the the Assyrian invasions, the Phrygian kingdom was destroyed by the Cimmerians, remaining under Lydian rule until the Persian invasion in 546 BC. In the Hellenistic Era, Rome began to reign in Anatolia and Seyitgazi, named “Nacolea”, became an important guard post of Rome (Aşlıoğlu, Memlük, 2010). After 395 AD, many Byzantine cities were established in the region.

In the period of the Seljuks, Nacolea was conquered by the Danışments and the Seljuk tribes. Seyitgazi was annexed to Ottoman lands during the reign of Murat I. Seyitgazi participated in the War of Liberation with a special battalion; the troops were partially incapacitated in the Greek invasion and on 1922, with the coming of the Turkish armies, it became a part of the Turkish Republic (Altınsapan, 1999).

5. Plan typologies and general characteristics of the structures in the region

In this work, the term “megaron” has been used to signify structures with 2 long walls ending in antae at the front, a front porch which is entered axially on the short side, and a rectangular single main room. However, to be precise, these structures have also been described as megaroid buildings, megaroid-style buildings, megaroid-shaped buildings, megaron-like buildings and the like.

The region’s megaroid buildings have a main room and a front porch, comprised thus of two structural archetypes. They constitute a longitudinal mass. The buildings vary in size. The main rooms are almost square or in the form of a longitudinal rectangle and form the core of the building. They are used for sleeping, eating and for most domestic activities. The main room sizes vary. They are usually of the size 3x3 m. None of the examples exhibit a central hearth. The hearth would occupy the wall across from the door. There are niches in the walls of the main room. The buildings can be directly accessed from the main room. In none of the examples is the door of the main room on the central axis, but either to the right or the left.

The term “porch” is used to refer to the roofed area between the extensions of the long walls of the main room. The two long walls of the main room extended beyond the short front and constituted a porch at the front. The roof extended over the porch and provided additional working space. The porches are shallow in general. On the average, the depth of the porches is 1 m. In only a few examples, the porches are deep. The people of the region refer to the ground level porch as the “ev önü” (front of the house), and to the porch on top of the barns as the “hayat”. In no example are the porches paved with a special floor covering. None of the houses had a rear anta/rear porch.

While most structures are one-storied, some buildings rise above a barn. Examples rising above a barn are few in the area. Some of the single-storied structures are built on ground level while some have been built on a stone basement. In this case, the structure has a raised porch with stairs leading to a porch. The stairs can be at the center of the house or on one side of the porch. The stairways open to the porch. The people in the region call the houses on ground level as “Yer Ev” (Ground House).

The region has six types of megaroid structure. This typology was attained from a total of 33 buildings among the houses scanned for the research throughout the region (Figure 4, 5). Some of them are in ruins. Of those
surviving, some have either been abandoned or converted into storage space. Rebuilding has occurred in some houses. The full age range of the houses is not known exactly. However, the average age of all of the examples, according to the testimony of the villagers, is 120-140 years.

1. Type with 2 antae: This is the most widespread plan in the region (Figures 4, 5). This type consists of a main room and a porch at the front (Figures 6-8). The side walls of the main room extend to form a porch at the front. They are antae walls. The antae form a solid wall. A building is built on a stone basement. In this case, the structure has a raised porch with stairs leading to a porch (Figures 6: B, 8). In general, these types of structures are freestanding on a road.

2. Type in antis: This is the second widespread plan (Figures 4, 5). In this type, the structures are single-roomed with an open porch and one, two or
three wooden posts placed between antae (Figure 9). In this form, the structures appear to be monostyle in antis, distyle in antis and tristyle in antis (Figures. 9-13). The monostyle in antis is the simplest form. The porches are very shallow and there are...
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no rear antae. In only one example of these buildings, which are generally on ground level, is the structure accessed with stairs consisting of a few steps (Figure 9: C, 13). While the structures are generally freestanding on a road, one of the buildings is attached parallel to the courtyard wall (Figure 10).

3. Type with a single anta: This is the third plan type in the region (Figures 4, 5). In this type, there is a single anta wall of the building. One of the antae forms the solid long side of the main room and one or more wooden post/columns are found at the other end (Figure 14). Generally this type appears as a single wooden post-column
on the other end of a solid long side wall which is one of the antae walls
(Figures 14: A-D, 15-18). Sometimes 2 or 4 wooden posts may be found in
front of the porch (Figures 14: E-F, 19-20). In applications with a single post/
column, sometimes a wooden door opened to the courtyard is built on
the post/column side of the porch (Figures 14: B-C, 16-17). Both freestanding
and attached structures parallel to the courtyard wall structures can be seen
at the location. In the structure on the location attached parallel to the court-
yard wall, the courtyard wall forms the single anta (Figure 18).

4. Prostyle type: This is the other type in the region (Figures 4, 5). Pro-
style is a term defining freestanding columns across the front of the build-
ing and refers to a building having posts only along the front side. This
type of building does not possess antae. The prostyle porch has been used
in the region in the distyle and tristyle prostyle (Figure 21). In the distyle pro-
style, a wooden post/column is found at each end of the porch in front of the
structure (Figures 21: A-B, 22-23). In the tristyle prostyle, the structure has
3 wooden posts/columns in front (Figures 21: C-D, 24-26). In general, the
prostyle type has been implemented in examples built on a high sub-base-
ment or barn and these structures are accessed by stairs. The structures are
freestanding on a road.

5. Closed porch type: This type of plan, which is only encountered in a
single example in the region, compris-
es a main room with a double entrance
and a closed porch/anteroom in front
(Figures 4, 27: A, 28). It is without rear
antae. The building is freestanding on
a road.

6. Type with a rear room: In this
plan, which is only uncovered in a sin-
gle example, the main room is subdi-
vided by a wall to create a back room
(Figure 4). A partition wall divides the
interior into two rooms. Thus, a small
rear room is formed in back of the main
room of the structure (Figures 27: B,
29), the long main room being flanked
by the smaller room at the back. There
is a deep porch with a single anta in
front of the structure. The building is
attached parallel to the courtyard wall.
While the courtyard wall forms the
single anta of the structure, in the oth-
er direction, 3 wooden posts stand in
front of the porch (Figure 29).

These megaroid-style buildings are
characterized in three locations; free-
standing on a road or on a courtyard,
adjacent or abutting another structure
and attached to parallel to the court-
yard wall.

In the first type of location, the
structures are freestanding and self-contained structures on a road or
on a courtyard. They are single unit
structures. Their porticos have been
built to face the south. Their orienta-
tion is looking out toward open spaces
and streets (Figures 8, 17, 23, 24, 26).

In the second type of location, the
structures are buildings where a few
families live together and which also

Figure 24. The megaroid building built in
type 4C.

Figure 25. Inside of the same house. The
hearth.

Figure 26. The megaroid building built in
type 4D.
have a barn, a hayloft and stand in a courtyard along with other houses. These buildings are either freestanding inside the courtyard, looking out toward the road, or they have been built attached to parallel to the courtyard wall. In this case, one wall of the house is also the wall of the courtyard (Figures 10, 18, 29). In other words, the courtyard wall forms one of the antae of the building.

In the third type of location, the structure is leaning on another structure at the back. The building usually leans on another structure (an annex), most likely a barn or hayloft. Only in very few examples, this annex is a house (Figure 17). The annex is not entered from the main building. It is separately roofed. There is only one example of an annex added to the long side of the building, but the construction of this indicates that the annex was built later (Figure 20).

The organization of the façades of the buildings is made up of a door and one adjacent window opening out into the main room. With this arrangement, the buildings have a two-element structure on their façades. Only in some examples were the windows on the façades closed off afterwards.

The side walls of the buildings too have windows but some structures remain windowless. The rear façades of the buildings however are without windows.

All of the megaroid structures in the region have a roof that is one of 3 types—flat roof, low-pitched roof or gabled—but all of the types are wooden. In all the types of roof, the roof extends over the porch. In the case of the flat roof, some of these are sometimes tiled with bricks but sometimes covered with earth. The low-pitched roof and the gabled roof however are tiled with brick. Because the rooms are small, no internal wooden posts or a central post carrying the roof in the main room have been encountered.

Two types of wall technique have been used on the walls of the structures—stone wall construction and timber-reinforced stone construction. In the timber-frame supported stone wall, walls were supported by a wooden framework of horizontal, transverse and vertical timbers. While rubble stone was generally used as material for the walls, it can also be seen that both rubble stone and finely cut stones were used together. In some buildings, mud-brick was used along with the stone. In addition to this mixed material, mixed wall construction can also be observed. In very few examples, timber-frame stone and mud-brick construction can be seen together in a mixed wall construction system. In one example, bağdadi (lath and plaster) was used on one anta wall of the structure (Figure 7). Sometimes the walls were covered with clay and straw plaster.

None of the houses have toilets. All of the toilets are outside. In one corner of the main room stands a wooden platform that serves as a bath.
6. Comparison of the historical megarara

When the megaroid buildings in the region are compared with historical megarons of ancient Anatolia and Near East, it can be noticed that the plan types, construction systems, building materials and roofing systems display some common elements.

The first plan type in the region is the "type with 2 antae". This type consists of an almost square or longitudinally rectangular main room and a porch at the front (Figure 6). There are no rear antae. Similar types of this plan can be seen in ancient Anatolia in Troia I (House 102), Troia II, Karataş-Se- mayük, Bademağaç, Büyükkale, Beycesultan X-IX, Keçiaçayırı, Gözlükule Tarsus and Kerkenes. All have megaroid structures that are single-roomed, with an open porch and without rear antae. The side walls of the main room extend to form a porch at the front and they constitute the antae walls. So, the antae walls of the buildings are the solid side walls of the main room. In general, these types of buildings are freestanding. Some of the buildings are attached to each other because of the "Anatolian settlement siedlungschema" (Blegen, 1937; Neve, 1996; Summers et al., 2004; Efe et al, 2011; Lloyd, Mellaart, 1962; Warner, 1979; Naumann, 1998; Duru, 2003).

Another plan in the region is the "type in antis". In this type, one, two or three wooden posts are placed between antae (Figure 9). The porch is very shallow and there are no rear antae. These structures display a porch arrangement of monostyle, distyle and tristyle in antis type. This type porch arrangement resembles the façades of Phrygian rock-cut shrines and Phrygian, Lycian, Hellenistic and Roman periods rock-cut tombs (Kortanoğlu, 2011). It was Ch. Fellows and later Benndorf and Niemann who asserted that these tombs might have been influenced by wooden houses in ancient Lycia (İşık, Yılmaz, 1996). The façades of the tombs resembled house façades because the tombs were considered the residences of the dead (Ambrossini, 2011). Thus houses began to be seen as the precursors of the Lycian rock tombs and Phrygian rock-cut shrines and tombs (Kjelden, Zahle, 1975). In the book he wrote in 1853, "Ein Ausflug nach Kleinasiien und Entdeckungen in Lycien", Ch. Fellows drew pictures of the Turkish houses and storehouses he saw in the Xanthos plains and he called attention to the resemblance between these houses and the wooden house architecture of ancient Lycia and the Lycian rock tombs (Figure 30) (İşık, Yılmaz, 1996). These house tombs imitated the appearance of wooden Lycian houses, with their stone reproductions of wooden architectural features (Metzger, Coupel, 1963). These tombs have the same shape, all small temples with pediments supported by columns. Their façades have a pediment and columns between the projecting side walls (antae). They generally have façades with an arrangement of 1, 2, 3 or 4 columns between antae (in antis). Besides having gabled roofs, there are also examples of flat roofs.

The Phrygian rock-cut façades provide a clue about the megaron façade arrangements at Gordion. Some of them consist of a façade, varying in size, generally depicting the front of a house. The most prominent feature of the Phrygian rock-cut façades is a focal niche with a surrounding façade decorated with geometrical motifs. They are thought to have imitated the front of a building of public importance. The appearance of Phrygian houses may be gauged from the carved rocks representing the façades of buildings, probably temples, illustrated in stone in Arslankaya, Bahşayiş, Demirkale or Midas City (Barnett, 1967). Berndt-Ersöz assert that the rock-cut façades are not true copies of Phrygian houses, but may be imitations (Berndt-Ersöz, 1998; 2006).

The porch in antis is also reminisc-
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Greek temples generally made use of the "distyle in antis" plan. The houses in the region with the in antis plan also resembled the columned prostas house of the classical Greek period. Here, in front of the oikos was a columned porch (prostas) which opened out onto the courtyard. House plans with prostas were derived from megaron. Other similar examples of porch in antis can be seen in Ain Dara and Tell Tayinat Building II. These temples are buildings where the lateral walls of the main hall of worship are continued on the façade with a vestibule/porch on either side. Both have two columns between antae.

Another plan encountered in the region is the "prostyle type". This type does not possess antae. There is a wooden columned porch in front of the main room. This type has been used in the region in distyle and tristyle prostyle (Figure 21). In distyle prostyle porch, a wooden post/column is found at each end of the porch in front of the building. The distyle prostyle is reminiscent of the rock-cut tombs façade of the Hellenistic and Roman in Highlands of Phrygia (Kortanoğlu, 2011). The façade of Ayazini and Yapıldak, there is a distyle prostyle porch arrangement (Figure 31). Here, a column is placed in each end of the porch.

The prostyle porch is also reminiscent of prostyle Greek temples. A Greek prostyle temple has a colonnaded porch in front of the cella. There are however generally 4 columned porches in front of the cella. Besides in the Greek temples, the prostyle porch is encountered in the Neolithic wooden houses of the Cucuteni-Tripolye-Ariuşd cultural groups. In the houses of these cultures, a porch made up of wooden posts stands in front of the main room (Figure 32: A) (Laszlo, 2000). A shrine in Jericho, dated to the PPNP, is the other resemble of this type. Here on level XI, in front of a building that Garstang believes to be a shrine is a veranda-like vestibule supported by six wooden pillars (Figure 32: B). Garstang describes it as a prostyle porch (Garstang, Garstang, 1940; Banning, Byrd, 1988). However, both Cucuteni-Tripolye-Ariuşd and the shrine in Jericho have semi-antae, a feature that is different from the prostyle types in our field of study.

The other plan in the region is the closed porch type. This plan is only encountered in a single example. The building is without rear antae. It consists of a main room with a double entrance and a closed porch/anteroom in front (Figure 27: A). The closed porch is very widely used in the megaron style of buildings in Anatolia. Examples of a single-entrance main room and a closed porch/anteroom can be seen in Gordion, Küllioba, Demircihöyük, Mersin, Hacilar IIA and Büyükkale. The main room with a double entrance is seen in Anatolia at Karataş-Semayük V-VI and in Bademağacı. At Bademağacı, in the EBII settlement, there are megaron-style buildings with a main room having double entrances with open porches (Figure 32: C, D). There is also a building with a double entrance and a closed porch/anteroom in front (Figure 32: E). At Semayük Karataş V-VI, although the main room in the megaron structures have a double entrance, these have open porches (Figure 32: F) (Warner, 1979). These buildings have no rear antae, but a rear room.

Another type of megaroid structure in the region is the plan type that has a rear room. In this plan, the main room is subdivided by a wall to create a back room. Thus, a small rear room is formed in back of the main room (Figure 27: B). In front of the main room is an open porch. At Bademağacı, House 30 is a building with a rear room (Figure 32: G). At Karataş-Semayük V-VI, rear rooms are found in several houses. There are megaroid structures at Küllioba with a closed porch and rear

Figure 31. Afyon Ayazini (http://www.webrehberi.net/yerel/afyonkarahisar/#!prettyPhoto[gallery2]/1/).
room. These rear/back rooms are used as storage facilities.

The other type of plan in the region was the "type with a single anta". In this type, one of the antae forms the solid long side of the main room and one or more wooden posts/columns are found at the other end (Figure 14). This type with a single anta wall is not encountered in the historical megaron and appears to be a local characteristic completely unique to the region.

The porches in the megaroid structures in the region are shallow in general. This type porch resembles the Anatolian megarons of Küllüoba, Semayûk-Kara Taş, and Bademağaci. These structures all have porches in front that are not very deep. However, there is some example of a considerably deep porch in the region; this example brings to mind a pronaos (Figure 14: D-E; 27: B). Megarons with deep porches in Anatolia are seen at Troia I (House 102), Troia II, Bademağaci, and Küllüoba.

None of the megaroid structures in the region have rear antae. They have front antae only. Examples of megarons without rear antae are found in Anatolia at Karataş-Semayûk, Bademağaci, Gordon, Küllüoba, Troia I (House 102) and the Troia II, VI.

Three types of roof have been used in the region—a wooden flat roof, a low pitched roof and a gabled roof. In all of the roof types, the roof extended over the porch. Of the historical megarons, Gordon exhibits the use of 3 distinct groups of roof systems—the gabled roof, the pitched roof and the flat roof (Berndt-Ersöz, 2006). The megaron at Gordon probably had gabled roofs, as indicated by a completely preserved poros akroterion whose lower parts follow the outline of a pitched roof, and three double-pitched poros blocks found at Gordon. Gabled buildings are also seen in the drawings incised on the exterior walls of Megaron 2, inscribed on potsherds from Midas City, and represented by three building models (Roller, 2009). In Troia, the roofs are flat. At Küllüoba too, because of the "Anatolian settlement siedlungschema" and since the houses are laid out in a row, it is hard to use a gabled roof. For this reason, the megarons in the settlement are covered with flat roofs. The long houses built as independent structures, however, may have used the gabled roof form (Fidan, 2012). In Bademağaci for the same reason, the megaroid buildings are flat roof-covered. In freestanding buildings at Karataş Semayûk too there is evidence that the gabled roof was used (Warner, 1994). In all of these historical examples, the roof extended over the porch.

In the structures of the region, two types of wall technique are observed—stone wall construction and timber-reinforced stone construction. The wall materials were generally rubble stone but there are also examples of rubble stone and finely cut stone used together. In some buildings, a smooth mud-brick was used together with the stone. Besides these mixed materials, some examples also display a mixed wall construction. There are very few examples of timber-frame stone and mud-brick construction mixed together in a wall construction system. At Troia, the superstructure of the walls is mudbrick and supported by a wooden framework. At Bademağaci, the buildings are built on a stone foundation and mudbrick superstructures. Houses at Gordon are built of stone or crude brick, using a half-timber structure (Barnett, 1967). At Gordon, the walls are put together with a wooden framework and filled in-between with masonry screens, forming a skeleton for the construction (Young, 1962). Timber-reinforced mud walling construction can also be seen at Karataş Semayûk (Warner, 1994). At Küllüoba, the remnants of wooden planks have been found between the stone foundations and the mudbrick wall above.

The megaroid buildings in the region are generally one-storied. Some
are on ground level but some rise above a sub-basement. A few have megaroid structures rising above a barn. The structures built on top of sub-basements are accessed with a few steps of stairs. At Tell Tayinat Building II and XVI, although the structures are on ground level, entrance was gained by means of a stepped porch, flanked by two columns in antis (Harrison, 2012).

The annexes used as barns or haylofts in the megaroid buildings in the region are generally attached to the short side of the structure in the back but in only one example, an annex has been added to the long side of the building (Figure 20). In the historical megaras, House 66 is the only example in Karataş-Semayük of an annex added to the long side of the building (Warner, 1979). The annex was probably built later both in Karataş and in the region. The annex was not entered from the main building and is separately roofed (Warner, 1979).

The megaroid buildings in the region are located in three locations; freestanding, adjacent or abutting another structure and attached parallel to the courtyard wall. But, the historical megaras (except the Anatolian settlement siedlungschema) were freestanding structures.

7. Conclusion

As can be seen, the megaroid structures in the Phrygian highlands share with the historical megaras, the similarities in their plan types, construction systems and materials, point to the existence of this type in the regional memory of rural architecture and to an architectural continuity in the region.

How do we explain these similarities exhibited by the historical megaras and those existing in the houses used today by Turkmen groups in the area after all this time has passed? The nomadic Turkmen tribes entered Anatolia in the 11th century. They transitioned into their settled lifestyle only at the end of the 19th century after a long period of living as nomads (Ögel, 1991; Kavas, 2012). With the start of their settled inhabitation, the Turkmen tribes who had made use of yörüük tents during their nomadic and semi-nomadic periods were inevitably influenced by indigenous Anatolian cultures (Tanyeli, 1996; Köse 2005). They chose the existing house plans of the indigenous people in the region when the time came for them to meet their need for permanent housing. This choice, which is the result of cultural adaptation, creates natural architectural continuity.

A look into the plan types, materials and constructions systems Turkish populations preferred in their transition to a settled lifestyle reveal a close similarity with the traditional housing patterns of the regions that they settled in (Tanyeli, 1996; Köse, 2005). The Anatolian culture is not homogeneous. Each subregion contained various cultural traditions. It was because of this that displayed different regional plan types. At the same time, new environmental conditions such as climate, geography and topography, as well as cultural interaction were also influential in this choice. They were however adapted to particular needs. We found the megaroid buildings in the region reflecting the regional taste in that the local house plans in the region appear both socially and functionally suitable for the newly migrating nomadic Turks.

Many historical house types are still being used in the rural architecture of Anatolia and the Near East can be seen in other plan types as well. Researchers Klinhott, Ragette, Yagi, Cerasi, Kobychev and Robakidze have reported that rural houses constructed in the style of historical plan types such as megaron, bit-hilani, tarma house, riwaq house, iwan house, houses with inner courtyards and houses with a front sofa, are still used in Syria, Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan, Daghestan and the Caucasian region, among other areas (Klinhott, 1978; Ragetta, 1974; Yagi, 1983; Cerasi, 2014; Kobychev, Robakidze, 1969). This is because traditional rural architecture is less prone to the impact of rapid cultural change and has evolved as a result of cultural continuity.

Anatolian traditional rural architecture also has a very rich cultural heritage related to the past. With this as its starting point, research conducted about Anatolia rural architecture constitutes an important resource that will shed light on studies into comparative
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evaluations of the housing architecture to be found in the layers of history hidden in any particular region. The concept of the Anatolian Turkish house has been in interaction for centuries with the Anatolian cultures that have been a part of this region, and has accordingly matured and reached a synthesis.
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Kırsal Anadolu’nun megarorid yapılarındaki mimari gelenegi sürekliliği: Dağlık Frigya örneği

Megalor planı, ortasında ocağı bulunan uzun dikdörtgen şeklindeki bir ana oda ile bu odanın yan duvarlarının (ante duvarlar) uzatılmasıyla yapının önünde olusturulan üzerinde örtülü bir portikodan/ante odasından (sundurma) oluşan yapıdır. Planın erken evrelerinde megaron, portikosuz/ante odası tek bir oda iken ilerleyen evrelerde plana bazen ana odanın yan duvarlarının arkaya doğru uzatılmasıyla oluşan bir arka portikoko/arka ante (sundurma) eklenir. Meganon planlı yapılarla örtü genelde beşik çatı iken düz çatı da kullanılmıştır.


Bu alan arastırması, Frigya vadinin Dağlık Frigya olarak bilinen bölümünün günümüzde kapladığı alan olan Eskişehir Seyitgazi and Ayon İlaniye ilçelerinin köylerini kapsayan alanda gerçekleştirilmiştir. 2014 yılı Ağustos ayında gerçekleştirilnen bu çalışmanın amacı, Frigya vadinin bu bölgelerindeki köylerinde “megaron türü” yapısı gelenEGINin izlerini arayarak, bölgede kırsal mimaride var olduğu taraflıması ileri sürülen “yapsal süreklilik” işareti etmektedir.

Bölgede bu amaçla gerçekleştirilnen ara oluştuında megaron özelliği gösteren, bir ana oda ve önunde portikodan (sundurma) oluşan, düz ve beşik çatılı yapılarla rastlanmış ve temkinli olmak amacıyla bu yapılar “megaronumsu”, “megaron benzeri” ve “megaron benzeri” yapılar olarak tanımlanmıştır. Bölgenin mimari kim-