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A Rural Settlement in the Rough Cilicia-Isauria Region: Karakabaklı

Ümit AYDINOĞLU – Ümit ÇAKMAK*

The ancient settlement of Karakabaklı is located inland from the sea, near the modern town of Siliște. It lies seven kilometers northwest of Susanoğlu and close to the ancient city of Corasium (Fig. 1). This area was known in ancient times as Olba Territorium, and originally belonged to a Hellenistic temple state, then passed to Isauria during the Diocletianus Period. With its particular characteristics, Karakabaklı of Rough Cilicia-Isauria shows many similarities to other rural settlements in the areas1.

Both historical and geographical features played a role in the emergence of these settlements. Additionally, the mild Mediterranean climate also played as a role in allowing the spread of agricultural activities in the area. Despite the rough, hilly areas in the region, the many collapsed karst areas likely contributed to the development of rural settlements, along with other geographical factors, such as valleys. Roads, which made transportation between inland areas and the sea easier, also contributed. It is known that villages, workshops, and farmsteads were established along these roads near ancient population centers. Obviously, historical process was also a major contributing factor in the development of these ancient communities.

Karakabaklı is remarkable for its location near Corasium, to which it is connected by an ancient road. The discovery of many rural settlements along this route is particularly important since it sheds light on contact between ancient cities and their khora. Although Karakabaklı was a rural settlement, it has well-preserved structures exhibiting features of urban architecture. As an example, archaeological surveys have revealed structures showing a farmstead with a courtyard and tower, along with agricultural production and storage buildings, cisterns, two monumental gates, two basilicas, houses, and tombs. Most of these constructions were added to the settlement in later periods, pointing to continuity of inhabitation in the area (Fig. 2). Surveys indicate the rural settlements expanded with time,
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1 The rural settlements in the area vary typologically. Among the various settlements are the simplex and or complex farmsteads, small and large villages. They are usually, larger villages constructed closer the cities, with workshops constructed either inside or outside the villages to process agricultural produce independently in order to process the products.
following a process in which settlements in different periods began around a farmstead, later developing into villages. It is possible to come across structures carrying traces of urban architecture (monumental gates, ancient roads, basilicas, etc.) especially after the 4th century AD. This would be in keeping with a general characteristic of the region’s settlement pattern.

In this study, data compiled as the settlement’s buildings were identified, would indicate Karakabaklı also followed this pattern of farmstead to village as a result of geographical and historical factors. Previous studies have attributed this settlement the Late Antiquity Period, and although most of the archeological evidence found here seems to belong within this time frame, there are remains pointing to earlier periods. These discoveries shed new light on the established historical age of the settlement, and suggests there is room for question. These later surveys indicate surface constructions were added at at later dates, thereby influencing the characteristics of settlement. Even so, some buildings have retained architectural styles showing the settlement was originally a farmstead. This seems to point to the fact that many farmsteads in the Roman period, were exposed to substantial change in later and different periods and became rural settlements. These changes could be best understood through (i) the analysis of the constructions added in later periods, (ii) identification for the reasons behind these additions, (iii) and the contribution of these additions to the architectural characteristics of the region. The monumental structures in Karakabaklı reveal traces of urban change stemming from the original rural settlement, providing different examples of rural settlement from Late Antiquity. These findings then, along with the existence of other similar structures in the area, make it possible to discuss the concept of rural settlements in this period.

One of the purposes of this study is to first collect data that concerns reasons urban architecture can be observed in the area. Revealing those environmental and historical factors contributing to the development of the settlement will also assist in reaching conclusions and making generalizations on similar settlements in the area, as well. Hence, this study also will evaluate the historical processes affecting settlements in the surrounding area. To gain a clearer picture concerning the area’s buildings in general, we will investigate the buildings of Karakabaklı, and compare findings to those of other buildings in the same area.

The Farmstead

The farmstead located to the northeast of the settlement includes a two-story house with a walled courtyard adjacent to it, and a pentagonal tower in the corner of the courtyard (Fig. 3). The rectangular farmhouse, facing agricultural lands to the south, covers an approximate area of 12.80x8.60 meters (Fig. 3a). Inconsistent masonry construction observed here indicates at least two different construction phases (Fig. 3b). There are also differences in the planning of the two floors. The ground floor contains large rooms with

---

high arched ceilings, likely used for storage (Fig. 3c), while the upper floor, as the windows and doors would indicate, was utilized as a living area. The consoles on the upper floor held a wooden structure belonging to a balcony. The arched console on the east side of the building supported ladders leading to this balcony, which surrounded the upper floor (Fig. 4a). The rectangular walled area between the farmhouse and the tower is was likely an open courtyard. The walls around the courtyard connect to the farmhouse (Fig. 4b). In the south corner of the courtyard is a pentagon tower (Fig. 4c), providing entrance to the courtyard (Fig. 4d). The masonry of the tower consists of cut stone, and contains many embrasures. There are remains inside both the courtyard and the tower belonging to the places added subsequently (Fig. 4b).

Buildings to the west, (buildings A, B and C), connected to the farmhouse. The plans of these buildings show that they were primarily for agricultural production and storage. The outer walls of these buildings have block masonry similar to those of the farmhouse, the tower, and the courtyard walls, showing all these buildings were built contemporaneously (Fig. 3d). The additions made later show these constructions were continuously used through many later periods. However, identification of later usages of buildings is not possible (except for structure A).

Building A, with dimensions 22x13 meters, has a rectangular plan and is located to the left of the farmhouse\(^3\) (Fig. 5a). The structure has isodomic masonry with large rectangular block walls, flat on the outside, but rough on the inside (Fig. 5b). On the east side, there are four embrasures that are too small to be windows and were most probably used to let in light and air, suggesting this structure might have been used for agricultural and storage purposes. Based on the inside masonry usage, connections with outside walls, use of spolia, and differences in floor plans, it is clear that five other areas here show subsequent reconstruction, indicating this structure was initially used for agricultural purposes, then later remodeled as a residence. The addition of a courtyard and a peristyle at the front (Fig. 5c) would appear to confirm this assumption.

Building A has a rectangular courtyard, though architectural pieces such as column piers, architrave block, and unprocessed column capitals point to the the possibility of a courtyard with a peristyle (Fig. 5d-e). The other places all have small square plans, which include rectangular niches in the walls, as well as connecting doors that make possible passage from one to another. Inside the building, there are two cisterns, a hole carved into the bedrock forming a pythos, and a collection vat.

Another building (Building B) is located approximately 120 meters west of the farmhouse and was also likely used for agricultural purposes and was built with isodomic masonry consistent with other buildings in the area. Both the two main buildings here show a rectangular shape (Fig. 6a). The north wall has been protected up to 4 meters, while the other walls have been destroyed (Fig. 6b). Irregular masonry would imply that, although it was built together with the farmstead buildings and was originally used for agricultural purposes, it was later enlarged with several additions and possibly served different purposes. Building C uses isonomic masonry as well (Fig. 6c) and was also a work

---

\(^3\) In the previous studies, this building was evaluated on the basis of its design features/plan per se. It is defined as a peristyle Byzantine house by Tiryaki (1999, 47) and Eyice (1999, 214), as a house with a traditional peristyle courtyard inhabited until the Late Roman Period by Zeyrek (2005, 45), and as a peristyle house by Eichner (2004, 76-77). However, in these studies, only the final phase of residence has been considered.
and storage area. The south wall of the building on the northeast of the settlement has been destroyed almost completely (Fig. 6d), although it is possible to observe some additions in this building, as well. Unfortunately, it is not possible to identify the functions of the either building in later periods. All the buildings inside the settlement share many features in common regarding the construction techniques, suggesting they all would belong to the same construction period\textsuperscript{4}. These buildings appear to be sub-components of the same farmstead. Additional surveys conducted around the general area reveal many similar buildings using the same construction techniques. Regarding their architectural design, these buildings show variations ranging from simple structures to more complex ones. Some of the farmsteads, for instance, are large and contain more complex designs and have buildings that were used for both agricultural production as well as living areas, possibly inhabited by the land’s owner or supervisor. The farmstead in Karakabaklı displays the general characteristics of farmsteads in the area\textsuperscript{5}.

The tower in the Karakabaklı farmstead is a common feature of most farmsteads in the area, with its provision for an entrance to the courtyard. This kind of tower was commonly used for similar purposes among other farmsteads. The farmstead, as well as the tower, is surrounded by thick walls which possibly were used for defensive purposes.

As previously noted, farmsteads were formed by economic and geographical conditions surrounding them. Archeological evidence indicates this region underwent a rapidly expanding rural settlement and agricultural growth, extending through the second century and into the third century A.D.\textsuperscript{6}. The farmstead in Karakabaklı belonged to this same period and was subject to the same expansion.

Similar farmstead characteristics exist in different areas, each a result of similar needs and conditions; similar geographical conditions can be found in Lycia, Cilicia, and Isauria. Research shows farmsteads in Lycia, for example, are particularly dense on roads passing through settlements and in agriculturally rich lands found in valleys. These farmsteads resemble their contemporaries in Rough Cilicia and Isauria, with similar towers, courtyards, work buildings, presses, cisterns, tombs, and in their proximity to ancient roads. Surveys conducted around Beydağları are particularly striking in regard to the similarity of settlements, farmsteads, towers, and agricultural development\textsuperscript{7}. Many other farmsteads have been explored in the environs of Kyaneai, located in Middle Lycia, and in Trebenna, on the borders of Pamphylia, Pisidia and Lycia\textsuperscript{8}.

\textsuperscript{4} It is, however, apparent that the farmsteads were constantly in use along different periods as the additions made in later periods, in accordance with the needs, as houses, different types of tombs, production installations, basilicas, and cisterns also reveal. Some of these additions also lead a change in the function of the constructions. As it will also dwell on in the conclusion section, the settlement had been used as a farmstead initially but later turned out to have the characteristics of a village. The additions in the settlement belong to this later village period.

\textsuperscript{5} See Aydinoğlu (2010, 251-253) for the general characteristics of the farmsteads in the area and an extensive comparison.

\textsuperscript{6} It has been discovered that the production activities in the area intensified as of the end of the 2nd century and the beginning of the 3rd century. Although there must have existed some other rural settlements in the area, it is difficult to define the farmhouses in these periods due to the problems of dating and identification of the archeological remains here which results from the constant use of the settlements throughout different periods.


\textsuperscript{8} Kolb 1999, Kolb - Thomsen 2000, 219. See Doğan 2008, 2 vd.; Doğan 2004, 93 for similar constructions in Alanya (Coracesium) and the surrounding area.
Rural settlements discovered in Northern Syria are also similar to those in Rough Cilicia in terms of being shaped by their needs and living conditions. The settlements in rural areas of this region, known to have been developed starting with the first century A.D. and extending into the mid-eighth century A.D., have temple tombs, basilicas, and many work and storage buildings and its equipments. Additionally, in the fourth century, Northern Syria and Rough Cilicia both had adopted a new administrative system that included basilicas\(^9\). Many farmsteads of similar design have been discovered in Philistine, and were connected to one another by ancient roads, situated near urban settlements, and overlook valleys, etc \(^10\). In Philistine farmsteads, known to have been in use between the fourth and seventh A.D., there were farmhouses inhabited by landlords that overlooked the agricultural land of the farmstead. The Philistine farmsteads are also similar to those in Rough Cilicia-Isauria in that the former also had two-story farmhouses, with the ground floor serving as work and storage areas, while the upper floor was reserved as a living area. All seemed to possess enclosed courtyards with cisterns, and more work areas.

**Tombs**

Various types of tombs have been discovered in Karakabaklı, among which are three aedicula tombs with large ashlar and with either a chamosorium or a sarcophagus tombs inside. The first example of aedicula tombs is situated to the left of the farmhouse (Fig. 7a). Unfortunately, the barrel vault making up the outer layer has been destroyed (Fig. 7b). Another tomb of this type is placed to the left of the basilica (Fig. 7c) and is well-preserved. Inside this tomb, there is a broken sarcophagus with no relief or inscription (Fig. 7d). The last example shows walls demolished but a chamosorium intact, which has a cover and a cross relief inscribed on its side (Fig. 7e). The tombs are made up of local limestone, but none of them have inscriptions.

There are many examples of this type of tomb in this area. However, some of the architectural pieces, such as altars and columns used in decoration do not exist in Karakabaklı\(^11\). Research suggests these tombs began appearing in the region around the second century\(^12\) and continued to be in use for sometime afterwards\(^13\). Another sample of tombs discovered in this area must have been constructed in a different period as the cross relief outside the cover also suggest, this tomb is also different from the other samples in the area regarding its masonry. Examples of this type have been discovered in the

---


\(^10\) Hirschfeld, 1997, 50 vd.

\(^11\) See Sağut 2005, 105 for the following proposals: (i) these tombs were constructed in the farmsteads in the region, (ii) some of them had columns with Corinth or Doric capitals, and the capitals themselves had “T” shaped stone blocks so as to form the cross timber, (iii) there existed reliefs on the larger part of this cross timber.

\(^12\) Durukan 2005, 119. Similar tombs, though with different characteristics, could be observed in settlements such as Kümbe, Yukan Hüsseyinler, Cennet–Cehennem, Sakızlık Harman, Sancıören, Tülü, Demirciören in Olba Territiorium. Sağut 2005, 101-154. Besides, many similar samples have been discovered in the farmsteads, see Aydinoğlu 2010, 244-250.

\(^13\) The tomb situated next to the farmstead is considered to belong to the landlord, Eyice 1981, 207. However, there is no evidence to prove in which period the tomb was constructed. See Çevik et al., 2007, 87 Fig.1; for a good example of aedicula tomb that belonged to the landlord.
Demirciören, Karadeveli and Halilören khora of Corycus and in light of the cross reliefs on the sarcophagi or chamosoriums\textsuperscript{14}, they are thought to date to the Early Byzantine Period.

Many sarcophagi have been discovered in the area. They are made from local limestone (Fig. 8a), and some of the samples are particularly shaped on their pediments (Fig. 8b). These sarcophagi generally have only one side carved with patterns such as tabula ansata, altars, rosettes, bunches of grapes, crosses inside a medal, and fish; no inscriptions have been discovered as yet on the sarcophagi (Fig. 8c).

Chamosoriums generally have a triangle inner form and a pillow part a bit higher on the surface where the head of the deceased is placed. These chamosoriums are highly similar to other chamosoriums in that some of them have covers sitting on an equal level with the bedrock, while others have covers standing higher than the bedrock (Fig. 8d). The covers the chamosoriums possess have acrotetria on their corners, and the front parts are of triangle design, which is the standard chamosorium cover as encountered typically in Rough Cilicia and Isaura (Fig. 8e).

Similar ornamentation and design would indicate the sarcophagi discovered in the settlements are related to others in the same region. Sarcophagi production in the area started during the Roman Empire period and continued until after the Byzantine period\textsuperscript{15}. Sarcophagi with motifs like tabula ansata, rosettes, and bunches of grapes belong to the period of Empirical Rome (Fig. 8f). Dating chamosoriums is difficult due to their plain design. The production and use of limestone sarcophagi persisted through early Christianity. The fish and cross patterns discovered on sarcophagi in Karakabaklı would relate to the aforementioned period (Fig. 8g). The fish pattern is a common Christian design feature used from early periods and is sometimes encircled. It is suggested circled fish patterns on a sarcophagi cover would attribute it to the fourth century\textsuperscript{16}. While sarcophagi with cross patterns in a medal engraved on covers date back to the fourth-sixth centuries, the sarcophagi ornamented with a large cross would thoroughly place it within the sixth and seventh centuries\textsuperscript{17} (Fig. 8h). Thus, it would be appropriate to date the sarcophagi with cross reliefs on the trough back to the forth to the seventh centuries.

The Ancient Road and Monumental Gates

The settlement is located next to an ancient road whose stones are still visible today. The road probably constitutes one of the main routes leading inland away from the sea\textsuperscript{18}. The stone pavement is made of large rectangular limestone resembling roughly cut plates (Fig. 9a). Two monumental gates show the entrance to the settlement on the road. These

\textsuperscript{14} Durugönül \textit{et al.}, 2008, 121.

\textsuperscript{15} Regarding the dates the Roman Period sarcophagi in settlements such as Elaiussa Sebaste, Canyettis, and Corycus originate, Machatschek suggests the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century the earliest (Machatschek 1967, 43-48). Koch, on the other hand, suggests the end of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century and the beginning of the third 3\textsuperscript{rd} as the dates aforementioned sarcophagi originate, Koch 2001, 267.

\textsuperscript{16} Stauch 1972, 1.

\textsuperscript{17} The examples with cross relief and inscriptions in Corycus belong to the last quarter of the 4\textsuperscript{th} century. See Aydın 2008, 269-281, Keil ve Wilhelm 1931, 152, No: 350 for the Christian sarcophagi in the region and their dating.

\textsuperscript{18} We could assume that the ancient road, which could be followed as long as approximately 15 kilometers, passes through the ancient settlements such as Karakabaklı-Işikkale-Aşağıdünya-Sinekkale-Akhayat and connects this region to Central Anatolia, Sayar 2007, 202.
gates should be considered as tetrapylons since they contain arches built on four piers (Fig. 9). The gate to the north has a dimension of 8.20x7.47 meters and resembles a square (Fig. 9b). The well-preserved arch of the gate and its masonry is built with large square stones. On the gate piers are shaped column capitals (Figs. 9c-d), with apses added in later periods between the east and the west piers of the gate (Fig. 9e). The apses were built with small limestone blocks resting against the piers of the gate. Possibly the apse between the opposite piers was built to enhance the esthetic visual quality of the structure because the ancient road was still in use. There is one more monumental gate standing in an east-west direction to the south of the ancient road (Fig. 10a). The arches belonging to this gate have been destroyed, but the bases the arches previously rested on remain in-situ (Fig. 10b). It appears this gate went through some changes afterwards but continued to be utilized as the main entrance to the basilica close by (Figs. 10c-d). Finally, it would appear that an apse was added later to the west of the gate.

There are many other monumental gates in other settlements other than Karakabaklı in the region. Perhaps a similar tetrapylon in Corycus was built for religious and monumental purposes at the entrance of the area where all the basilicas are located. Also, the suggested date as to the origin of the tetrapylon is the end of either the fifth or sixth centuries. Similarly, there is another demolished tetrapylon on the ancient road at the entrance of Işikkale, another ancient settlement, located nearly one kilometer away from Karakabaklı. The gates in Karakabaklı are strikingly similar to ones in other settlements of the region in that they are all located on roads. The gates in the settlement had four passages and were placed both at the beginning and at the end of the ancient thoroughfare. Considering their position, it might be inferred that the monumental gates in Cilicia were used in various ways, perhaps at the entrances to the cities, or the start of main streets, or at the cross points cardo and decumanus meet, or on the boundaries of the community. The Corycus and Işikkale tetrapylons are, as an instance, located at the beginning of a road. The monumental gates in Karakabaklı, with its “L” shaped arch piers and square design, are similar to those in Corycus, Gabu Iunes in Libya, and El Lejjun in Jordan in that they all have the same plans. Besides, the plain design observed with tetrapylons in Corycus, Işikkale, and Gabu Iunes can also be seen on decorations used in Karakabaklı. The capital decorations of the tetrapylons in Karakabaklı and Corycus are similar to each other when considering their kyma recta, kyma reversa and molding. Regarding the gates’

19 Some other monumental gate examples are placed in ancient settlements like Antiocheia ad Cragum, Syedra, Diocaisareia, and Seleucia ad Calyceum, Corycus, Hierapolis-Castabala, Anazarbos, Mopsuestia, and Tarsus-Sağlık, Aşkın 2006, 94.

20 The building, situated on the ancient road, next to the basilica, and at the eastern entrance of the area where the basilicas are located in the settlement, has an “L” shaped arch pier but only one corner still standing today. In the middle of the capital decoration of the gate, there appears a circled cross with posts of equal length. The architectural remains on the ground and on the upper corner of the gate indicate that there used to be a dome on the tetrapylon. According to Herzfeld and Guyer, the building originates in the 6th century, Guyer - Herzfeld 1920, 126. On the other hand, Hill suggests the building must have appeared in the late 5th century the latest, Hill 1996, 124, 131.

21 Variniöloğlu 2007, 298. See also Mühlbrock 2003, 256; Lauffray 1988, 35; Sarre - Herzfeld 1920, 370 for the tetrapylon at the crossing point of the two main streets in the Zenobia in Syria.

22 See Stucchi 1975, 447-448; Mühlbrock 2003, 205 for the Gabu Iunes tetrapylon to be found in the southeast part of the Kyrene.

constructions materials, the tetraptylon in Karakabaklı are similar to ones in Cilicia and Isauria since they are all limestone.

The upper backbone of the tetraptylon in the Roman Empire Period usually had cross vaults relating to the architectural design on the surface of the gate. This would indicate the gate has a cross vault. The surface of the south tetraptylon corresponds to this architectural rule of the time. Since the settlement was established in the khora of Corasion (367-375 A.D.), the tetraptylon might have been built sometime after this date, i.e. towards the end of the fourth century or at the beginning of the fifth century.

Basilicas

There are two basilicas (Fig. 11a) constructed next to the ancient road in Karakabaklı (Fig. 11b). The well-preserved Basilica #1 was constructed next to the tetraptylon to the south. The basilica was constructed with local limestone, and shows southern and northern side-chambers with twin windows at the apse. In the naos of the basilica, there are many columns and some of which belong to three different types of column capitals (Figs. 12 a-b-c). These capitals have much in common regarding their decoration. They show leaves emerging from a branch then separating into three directions which appear to lean outward. No masonry or mosaic decoration has been discovered in the basilica, although, a circled cross shows above the main door with floral ornaments decorating the lintel. Additionally on the floor, there are roof-tiles that have fallen from the roof. Basilica #1 was built after the ancient road, with the southern tetraptylon being used as an entrance (Fig. 10c), which, in turn, caused the main gate to be situated in a more southern direction. This might appear as the reason for an axial slip in the plan of the basilica.

Basilica #2 is smaller than Basilica #1 and is interestingly located next to the first basilica (Fig. 11a). The column capitals here have simpler floral ornaments. The masonry consists of small local limestone, and the gate at the entrance has figures such as six peacocks, placed anti-thetically; several animal reliefs with floral ornaments placed among them (Fig. 12d). Where the structure meets the apse of Basilica #1 would indicate a dome above (Fig. 12e). The area between Basilica #1 and Basilica #2 is interesting as it was a crossing point between the two basilicas. In addition to these two basilicas, there is another building with a basilical plan which stands next to Basilica #2. This building is of smaller dimension and contains two side-chambers. It was probably used as a chapel (Fig. 12f).

Both basilicas in the settlement carry features shared by basilicas in Cilicia and Isauria. Just as basilicas in the area, these basilicas have three naves. Like the basilicas in northern Syria, the basilicas in Karakabaklı possess side-chambers with an apse leading eastward and an area for a bema with an outside wall. Like other basilicas in the area, the

24 It would not be appropriate to refer to the side-chambers of the basilicas in the region as pastophoron since they served for martyrion or baptism purposes also, see Aydin 2002, 109.
25 Regarding the main door of the basilica, its wall height on the right wing is of 8.65 meters, whilst the wall height of the south wing is of 5.65 meters. Neither the south-north apse nor the east-west apse of Basilica 1 forms a 90-degree angle. A similar application could also be observed with temenos wall of Zeus Olbios Temple in Diocesarea in the Roman Empire Period, Wannagat 2005, 135-136.
26 See Aydin 2007, 27 ff. for such applications in basilicas in the region.
Karabaklî basilicas show walls consisting of two-rows of small, smooth stones. Basilica #1 seems to have thicker northern walls, as compared to its other walls. Basilica #1 also has another second floor. One of the most important factors in dating the remains in the settlement is the basilica capitals. The capitals in Basilica #1 were produced during the fifth century, or the beginning of the sixth century and, since many similar buildings are in the area, it is possible to allow a probable dating for these basilicas to the fifth century. The capitals of basilica #2 are simpler, when compared to Basilica #1 and exhibit features of sixth century architecture. Other examples of floral and animal reliefs on main door lintels also date to the sixth century. Ergo, both basilicas, in compliance with the religious and economic developments of the time, must have been constructed between the fifth or sixth centuries.

Houses

There are buildings inside the settlement, added in later periods and utilized as houses. These buildings were all built using ashlar constructions but with no apparent plan or order (Fig. 13a). These are plain buildings, simply planned consistent with the rural area. They had two floors, arched entrances, small rooms, and supports for the upper floor (Fig. 13b). The two-storied buildings had twin windows, and rooms on the ground floor that was used for barn or storage. The upper floors, on the other hand, were planned as living areas. There are remarkable similarities between the architectural features of the houses in this settlement and houses in northern Syria. Syrian houses, which belong to the fourth to the seventh centuries, have simple plans and smaller rooms inside. Also, the rooms on the ground floor similarly serve as barn or storage. Due to the similarity in geographical conditions, both the buildings in these two regions were of ashlar construction. One difference between the houses in Syria and Karabaklî is that arches were employed in the Syrian houses, instead of the early Byzantine columns at the entrance of buildings in Karabaklî.

---

27 Such capitals are used commonly in Asia Minor and Northern Syria as well. These are of octagonal shape and the upper corners have bud reliefs and Ion volutes extending towards left from the right side. Above the Ion volutes are the reliefs of acanthus leaves apparent in two sections, Asgari 1995, 263 ff.; see Strube 2000, 71, 83; Strube 1993, 163, 192 for similar examples in Northern Syria; see Wulff, 1909, n.159 for the similar column capital claimed to have originated in Cairo in the 5th century.

28 Basilica 3, located in Kanyellis in the area is quite similar to Basilica 1 in Karabaklî regarding the floral decorations and the craftsmanship of the column capitals. G. Mietke dates Basilica 3 back to the year 500, Mietke - Westphalen 1999, 517 ff. Additionally, there are some other ancient settlements like Çatören and Kabaçam, and similar basilica column capitals in Corycus dated back to the years 525-575 by G. Mietke, Mietke 2006, 371-389. However, these dates put forward regarding the abovementioned basilicas are too late and need to be reconsidered.

29 Personal communication with G. Mietke on the dating of capitals in Basilica 2.


31 Apart from the buildings that constitute the farmstead, no other archaeological evidence regarding the Roman Period residences has been discovered.

32 Eichner 2004, 76; Eichner 2005, 201 ff. Besides, these buildings, to be evaluated as examples of the Early Byzantine Period domestic architecture, have been scrutinized in earlier studies such as Eyice 1981, 204 ff; Eyice 1988, 15 ff; Eyice 1999, 206 ff; Tiryaki 1999; Varinlioğlu 2007, 299.

33 See Eichner 2004, 77; Eichner 2005, 204 for a detailed comparison.
Workshops and Production Installations

The multitude of agricultural and work buildings uncovered in the area point to the existence of olive oil and wine production. This is in keeping with rural characteristics of the area. Among these installations used for olive oil and wine production, lever and screw presses with perforated press piers at fulcrum have been found, along with round-shaped crushing stones, and collection tanks. Two workshops utilizing this type of equipment were discovered in the settlement. Both the workshops used stones big enough to contain the press force applied by the lever and screw press. Workshop #1 measures nearly 7x11 meters and two lever and screw presses with perforated press piers at fulcrum, along with a mortar-shaped crushing basin, and a round-shaped crushing stone were found (Figs. 13 c-d). Likewise, Workshop 2 has a lever and screw press with perforated press pier at fulcrum and a mortar-shaped crushing basin as well. (Fig. 13e). The discovery of rock cut lever and weight presses along with press weight stones, apparently used together in an open area, is quite striking (Figs. 13f-g). An abundance of archeological findings, similar to those found in other areas around the Mediterranean region, has been discovered in surveys conducted in Karakabaklı. Additionally, threshing floors, common in rural areas in the region, also exist in Karakabaklı.

Conclusion

Urban Architecture Features in a Rural Settlement: The Alteration in Settlement Character

Considering the economic and geographical conditions, Karakabaklı was a rural community situated in the vicinity of Corasium. After the city was reconstructed in the fourth century, it was rebuilt with a surrounding fortification wall with monumental gates and towers. The city also functioned as a port, which allowed production and exportation of goods from the vicinity of Corasium. Karakabaklı would have participated in the aforementioned process, as well as many other rural settlements discovered on this route.

Archeological evidence discovered in the area would indicate again that Karakabaklı originated as a settlement and evolved into a village afterwards. Obviously, this required a process with some preceding stages. Observing the evolving characteristics of Karakabaklı is essential to understanding the developmental process of any typical rural settlement in this region. It is clear that buildings were added to the settlement in two distinct and subsequent phases, and somehow they conformed and contributed to the general characteristics of the settlement. As mentioned previously, there is significant evidence discovered here to show the buildings, constructed in the first phase, belonged to a farmstead of the Roman Period. This farmstead included a two-floor farmhouse, a courtyard entered through a tower next to the farmhouse, and buildings used for storage and production.

---

34 See Aydinoğlu 2009, 70 ff. for the comparison of production installations found in Karakabaklı with the other samples both in this region and in some other regions, for the typology and dating criteria.

35 The resettlement of the ancient city Corasium is a result of both a deliberate increase in the number of states and a boost in the authority, particularly as of Diocletianus period. The city serves as the port of the region. The settlement, known to have been reconstructed between the dates 367-375 by governor Flavius Uranios, increased its olive oil and wine production especially in the 4th and the 6th centuries, as the tomb inscriptions in the area also reveal, Hild - Hellenkemper 1990, 37, 311.
All these structures were found to have been built with similar construction techniques. It could be inferred then, that in the second phase, the settlement, developed around the farmstead, began to resemble more like a village. During this period, (i.e. as of the fourth century,) the ancient road, monumental gates, houses, and new tombs were added. This latter phase continued into the fifth and sixth centuries, with other additions, like basilicas and houses. Also, the buildings constructed during the first phase were re-utilized during this period. Evidence found clearly indicates the rural settlements continued to be in use until the early middle Byzantine period.

As also mentioned previously, most the characteristics revealed by the farmstead in the first phase reflect the general characteristics of the farmsteads in the region. Many farmsteads discovered in the region were generally situated near an ancient road and have certain features in common, i.e. the farmhouses, production and storage buildings, and tombs. Some of the farmsteads were surrounded by walls, enabling the building’s fortification. The farmstead in Karakabaklı would also be an example of this. Such fortified farmsteads, as well as the towers located inside these farmsteads, existed in the area from the Hellenistic Period through the Byzantine Period. Scholars, studying ancient agriculture, confirm farms of the period would have needed structures like storage buildings, barns, olive and wine presses, shelters for shepherds and housekeepers and their presence would greatly characteristic. Archeological evidence would seem to support the presence of these farmstead characteristics especially in the late second century and early third century A.D. In reviewing the fact that the farmstead in Karakabaklı held certain properties in common with the other farmsteads in the area and also taking evidence discovered in the settlement into consideration, we can conclude the farmstead in Karakabaklı would be part of the aforementioned period.

36 Among the similarities are the location of the farmstead by an ancient road, the opening of the farmhouse into a southern courtyard, its two-floor structure, the use of the basement for agricultural purposes and the use of the upper floor for residential purposes. Besides, the two olive oil workshops with production installations and the presence of threshing floors indicate the active production process in the area. Regarding the different types of tombs here, they not only symbolize the continuation of the settlement in different periods, but also reflect the prominent features of the farmsteads in the area.

37 Aydinoğlu 2010, 251.

38 It would be appropriate to assume that this type of fortified farmsteads did not serve for military purposes; rather, they were utilized by landlords themselves. This conclusion we have reached regarding Cilicia and Isauria regions is also referred to in Notitia Dignitatum, where it is suggested that the farmsteads with towers as they were constructed on the outskirts of mountains were surrounded by defense walls, Hellenkemper 1986, 628, fig. 6a-6b.

39 One of the oldest agricultural constructions in the area is Cilicia Towers, known to have been constructed in the period starting with Hellenistic Period and extending to the beginning of the Roman Period. It is suggested that these towers served for the security of agricultural production as well as for the observation purposes, Durğunül 1998, 113. With the addition of production installations, some of these towers were exploited as olive oil workshops in Roman and the Early Byzantine Periods, see Aydinoğlu 2009, 49-50. The small farmsteads with production installations and tombs explored in the recent surveys near Corycus make up the earliest archeological evidence of the presence of agricultural production and organization in the Hellenistic Period, Arıkçı 2010, 36-40.

38 Cato De Re Rustica, I,3; Columella De Re Rustica, I,4,10.

40 Production activities in the area intensified at the end of the 2nd and at the beginning of the 3rd centuries. A.D. However, there must have existed rural settlements in the area around the 1st-2nd centuries A.D. The archeological evidence is not clear enough so as to prove the presence of farmsteads in the area during these periods since the farmsteads were constantly in use throughout various periods, which gives rise to problems related to the identification and dating of the archeological remains encountered.
It is also apparent the settlement was constantly in use through different subsequent periods as indicated by monumental gates, basilicas and houses which were constantly added to the settlement. This evolving process is a general characteristic of settlement patterns in the area and is also highlighted by many other similarities in the same region. It is also during the early stages of this process that the settlement began its transformation into a village.

The reasons for such growth in a rural settlement could be revealed through an analysis of historical factors. The history of the region provides data explaining the rise in the number of rural settlements especially towards the end of the second and at the beginning of the third centuries. The effects of the Roman Empire on the economic and social structure of settlements in Cilicia and Isauria are particularly visible in this period; evidence of such Roman Empirical effect on the region’s cities are shown in aqueducts, temples, monumental gates, tombs, and columned streets\textsuperscript{42}. This same effect is quite evident in rural settlements, as well. Rural settlements must be included in this same growth process, as the number of farmsteads and their buildings increases during this period. Together with the extension of urban life, farmsteads became an indispensable part of economic life. The economic crisis that prevailed throughout the empire in the third century also affected the rural settlements in Cilicia and Isauria, as suggested by new settlement patterns observed in the area after the third century\textsuperscript{43}. With the construction of new buildings, traces of urban architecture (i.e. mosaic decoration, peristyle courtyards, monumental gates, and tombs) became more common, as in the case of the settlements in Cilicia and Isauria\textsuperscript{44}. The number of rural settlements increases remarkably between the fourth and seventh centuries.

The construction of monumental gates in Karakabaklı would indicate evidence of the aforementioned historical process. Illegal excavations in front of the northern gate show these constructions were built in the same period as the ancient road. The roads here consistently display features of urban architecture in a rural settlement\textsuperscript{45}. The gates possibly were built to imitate of the gates of Corasium, which were reconstructed during the reign of Governor Flavius Uranios. Additionally, their appearance in Karakabaklı would comply

\textsuperscript{42} Waelkens 1987, 94 vd; Dodge 1987, 106 vd.

\textsuperscript{43} Mitchell 1996, 193 vd.

\textsuperscript{44} Cilicia was affected by the Roman Empire in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century B.C and thereafter. In this period, the structures displaying urban architecture features such as aqueducts, temples, monumental gates, tombs, and columned streets were built. Besides, coins were produced, and the Roman construction techniques were employed in civil and religious buildings as a result of which vaults and arches became more common. See Durukan 2009; Erten 2009; Kaplan 2009; Kaya 2009; Özbay 2007 for the architectural traits of the period in the region.

\textsuperscript{45} There are \textit{tetrastyloons} at the crossroads as well as in front of the prominent structures, which function as an entrance/exit of the settlement. \textit{Tetrastyloons} are a main part of urban architecture and also become a part of big construction complexes such as forums. \textit{Tetrastyloons} are known to have been utilized for social and political purposes. \textit{Tetrastyloons} were constructed in the east of Roman Empire from the second half of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century. The Empire use \textit{tetrastyloons} particularly to control the regions under the control of the empire in order to change the architectural characteristics of the settlement and to spread political and social propaganda. Some stylistics changes could also be observed in the eastern part of the empire. The \textit{tetrastyloons} constructed at the crossroads initially began to appear at the junction of two streets. An increase in the height/length of arches and columns used as a base could be observed. Starting with Hadrianus Period, \textit{tetrastyloons} emerge in the military areas and reach a climax ideologically and architecturally in Severus Period. \textit{Tetrastyloons} with no apparent proper form or significance are also visible starting in the 5\textsuperscript{th} century and extending until Justinian’s Period. Aside from these functions, \textit{tetrastyloons} could also act as an architectural form of Christianity in a necropolis, Mühlenbrock 2003, 122-123; Frothingham 1915, 155.
with the economic and architectural properties of the time\textsuperscript{46}. It is acknowledged that buildings, such as monumental gates, roads, bridges and border towers were reconstructed during the time of Diocletianus, especially around the more important cities in the region\textsuperscript{47}. These construction activities continued during the reign of Valentinus, Valens, Gratianus, Arcadius, and Honorius\textsuperscript{48}. The \textit{tetrapyrons} in Karakabaklı had their surface cross vaulted, which was a common architectural, political and economic process for the time\textsuperscript{49}. Most of the \textit{tetrapyrons} dating back to the fourth century are known to have been related to the \textit{principalis}. Such a claim for Karakabaklı, however, has not been found as yet, and cannot be archeologically substantiated.

The monumental gates added later to the settlement are representatives of the urban characteristics the settlement had gained; these gates also symbolically provided an entrance to the settlement. However, the gates in Karakabaklı served not only for an entrance but also were used for religious purposes. The Southern \textit{tetrapylon} is combined with Basilica \#1, while the basilica's front entrance gains a monumental identity\textsuperscript{50}. It is notable that the entrance to the area where the churches are located in Corycus is similarly decorated with a \textit{tetrapylon}, and the entrance to the Alahan monastery is through a similar gate.

The two basilicas added in later periods appear in the settlement during the fourth and seventh centuries, as suggested by archeological evidence in the area. In line with the political, religious, and economic developments during the fourth and the seventh centuries in the eastern territories of the empire, many basilicas were constructed\textsuperscript{51}. The presence of these two basilicas in Karakabaklı also supports this claim, and it is possible to observe similar examples across the region\textsuperscript{52}. During late antiquity, it became common to add basilicas, irrespective of the size of the community and this seems to have become a rural settlement pattern in the region. This difference could be observed in the size and the number of basilicas in the settlements.

\textsuperscript{46} The archeological and military policy of the empire must have become active as a result of the promotion of Corasium as the port of the capital Seleucia ad Calycednum. The state was actively involved in the management of the region: (i) the participation of the city, with both religious and military support of the empire, in many religious negotiations of the 4th century, (ii) the transfer of many legions to put down the riots started by the Isaurans, (iii) and the protection of Corasium as a port.


\textsuperscript{47} Wassink 1991, 488.

\textsuperscript{48} An example for this situation is the repair of the monumental gate in Diocaesarea damaged by the earthquake by Arcadius and Honorius, the empires at the time, Keil - Wilhelm 1931, 44.

\textsuperscript{49} It is possible to observe cross vaults on the upper surface of \textit{tetrapyrons}; this, in a way, is a state architecture policy in Tetrarchi and Constantinus periods, Mühlenbrock 2003, 124.

\textsuperscript{50} Some changes in the plans occurred because the Southern Tetrakylos was considered as the main door during the construction of Basilica \#1. More specifically, the planning of the central entrance as a \textit{tetrapylon} and the obligation that there exist an 180-degree axis adjustment between the main entrance and the apse caused a change in the plan of the naos and the apse. It is possible to observe some additions on the plan in order to use nave in the naos proportionally. Some of the additions are the termination of some part of the northern nave with a wall and the construction of a different hall to the north inside the basilica. Besides, it could be inferred from the tilted plan of the apse axis that Basilica 1 was altered so as to face the holy land a bit more. This alteration is apparent because the right axe in north-south direction does not meet the west-east wall which lies horizontally at a right angle.

\textsuperscript{51} Haldon 2007, 77.

\textsuperscript{52} Ceylan 2009, 51.
Regarding the settlement's houses from late antiquity, they were built in a narrow area between the farmhouse and the northern _tetrapylon_, which contains not only the farmhouse but also other contemporary buildings (Buildings A, B, and C) that were likely used for storage and production. Their construction techniques are strikingly different than the previously built ones in that the former are constructed with small stones with no definite order inside the settlement.

The archeological evidence discovered additionally provides information about the distribution of the settlement\(^5\). The buildings in the community cover an area of approximately three hectares. The construction of the buildings being in short distances from one another in a restricted area gave way to a village settlement which developed inwards. The settlement is situated on a stony ground, though they are all constructed on bedrock, perhaps to conserve fertile land for agriculture. In these settlements, there are houses built with a courtyard in which is a cistern with a lever and weight presses carved into the bedrock. There is not any proper street apart from the ancient road lying beside the settlement. This shows the settlement did not develop around a specific plan. In contrast to the fortified farmhouse, the houses built in the second phase of the settlement are not surrounded by walls. Nevertheless, closely constructed buildings make it possible for the outer buildings to protect the inner buildings. There appears to be is no shared pattern between private and public buildings since there was no urban planning in the settlement, which might also be the reason the basilicas were built beside the residential area.

---

\(^5\) The settlement is defined as _bourgade_ by Dagron and Callot due to its both urban and rural properties. On an inscription explored on the ancient road passing by the settlement, the settlement is referred to _komopolis_, which further verifies the characteristic features the settlement owns. Dagron - Callot 1998, 61; Varinlioğlu 2007, 298. However, the location of this inscription is not assured today.
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Fig. 1  Distribution map of survey area

Fig. 2  Aerial photograph of Karakabaklı
Fig. 3  The farmhouse
a. The plan, b. East side, c. Aerial photograph of the farmhouse,
d. Aerial photograph of the farmhouse and Building A
Fig. 4  The farmhouse
a. North side, b. The fortified courtyard, c-d. The tower
Fig. 5  Building A
a. The plan, b. East side, c. The rooms inside, d-e. Peristyle courtyard
Fig. 6
a. The plan, Building B, b. North side, Building B,
c. The plan, Building C, d. West side, Building C
Fig. 7
a. Section drawing, aedicula tomb by the farmhouse, b. aedicula tomb by the farmhouse
c. aedicula tomb to the north of the Basilica, d. aedicula tomb to the north of the Basilica (The backside), e. aedicula tomb with a cross relief on the cover
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a. The sarcophagus, b. The section drawing, the sarcophagus, c. The sarcophagus
d-e. Chamasoriums, f-g-h The samples of sarcophagus and covers with *tabula ansata* and cross reliefs
Fig. 9
a. The ancient road and northern tetrapylon
b. The plan, northern tetrapylon
c. The only arch standing by the northern tetrapylon
d. Drawing, northern tetrapylon
e. The apse added later on to the west of the gate.
Fig. 10
a. Southern *Tetrapylon* and the apse added later on to the west of the gate
b. The base the arches of the Southern *tetrapylon* rests on
c-d. The use of southern *tetrapylon* as the main door of the Basilica
Fig. 11
a. The plan, Basilicas in Karakabaklı
b. Aerial view of Basilicas and southern tetrarchy in Karakabaklı
Fig. 12
a-b-c. Different types of column capitals in Basilica 1, d. Peacock, animal, and floral decoration on the door of Basilica 2, e. The place pointing to a dome at the point Basilica 1 and Basilica 2 meet
f. The chapel next to Basilica 2
Fig. 13
a-b. The houses of the Early Byzantine Period in Karakabakh, c. The plan, Workshop 1
d. Aerial view, Workshop 1, e. Workshop 2
f-g. Lever and weights Presses carved into the bedrock