

MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF ARCHITECTURE

CONS 604 GRADUATE SEMINARS

2021-2022 FALL SEMESTER

Feb.09, 2022 | 09.00-10.20 | @zoom

meeting link:

<https://zoom.us/j/93271141237?pwd=MjQ5T1pDdnJmdUcyaS9aNm5LNnYxQT09>

meeting ID: 932 7114 1237

password: 570828

09.00 - 09:30

Selin Sur — A Reappraisal of the Walls of Galata in İstanbul in Terms Of Medieval (Byzantine East, Latin West) Building Techniques and Masonry Traditions

Supervisor: Ufuk Serin

Jury: Pınar Aykaç, Kutgün Eyüpgiller

When the Genoese colony in Constantinople was granted the right to settle in Galata (or Pera) in 1267 and received a concession area in 1303 by an agreement with the Byzantine Empire, they began to fortify their settlement, despite strict prohibitions. As the Genoese lands expanded in the following years, the fortifications were gradually built and took their final shape in 1452. The walls were largely demolished following the decision of the Sixth Chamber of Municipality (*Altıncı Daire-i Belediye*) in 1864. There are many fortifications in Anatolia attributed to the Genoese. Moreover, the Galata Tower and eight fortresses in Anatolia are in the Tentative List of UNESCO World Heritage Sites, under the title 'Trading Posts and Fortifications on Genoese Trade Routes from the Mediterranean to the Black Sea'. However, the Galata Walls are the only fortifications entirely built by the Genoese. Although the 'Genoese castle' is a term which is used for many fortresses with or without necessarily a Genoese history, the 'Genoese' architectural character has not been fully identified yet. This research aims to investigate the Medieval building techniques and masonry traditions that the Genoese appear to have followed through an analysis of building techniques. Within this scope, the inventory of the surviving parts of the walls is updated, the building techniques of each remaining section are examined in detail, and the data from the field study on brick measurements are given. Following this analysis, the other 'Genoese' fortresses in Anatolia are studied; divergences and convergences between them and the Galata Walls are identified. Finally, the building techniques and

materials of the walls are evaluated in terms of Medieval building techniques and masonry traditions. According to this research, the Genoese largely reused available building materials. They adopted the building techniques and masonry traditions of the Late Byzantine period and possibly practiced the pointed arches of Medieval Latin architecture for the first time in and around Constantinople.

09.50 - 10:20

Özgür Ürey — a Typological Analysis of Traditional Residential Buildings in Beypazarı: A Comparison with Ottoman House Culture

Supervisor: Neriman Şahin Güçhan

Jury: Sibel Yıldırım Esen, Pınar Aykaç

This study aims to analyze traditional residential buildings in Beypazarı, in order to assess their position within and relationship with Ottoman house culture. The previous literature on traditional Beypazarı houses mostly focus on architectural features, spatial and formal characteristics, and structural and material qualities. In addition to the features listed above, this study also aims to examine Beypazarı houses both in terms of their relationship with the urban context and also their relationship with the important fires that have shaped the urban fabric since 1869. In addition to this, it is seen that the previous literature on Beypazarı houses does not always explicitly document the studied cases by means of actual locational information and architectural drawings. This study on the other hand, displays and documents the studied cases by means of actual locational information, architectural drawings and photographs.

On this basis, this study includes both a theoretical survey and a field study that examines a sample of traditional Beypazarı houses. The theoretical study includes a brief history of Beypazarı, an examination of Ottoman house culture, and an inquiry on traditional Beypazarı houses. The field study examines a total of 25 houses, 23 of which are town houses and 2 of which are vineyard houses. Beypazarı houses can be analyzed under two different groups, which are town houses and the vineyard houses in Inozu valley. In this study, since the sample case of vineyard houses is very limited and typologically atypical, the analysis was based only on the 23 town houses. The cases have been selected among the houses that have preserved their original features with limited or no interventions. 14 of the studied houses were documented personally by the author by drawing and photographing on site during the field work. The survey projects of the remaining 11 houses were obtained from the Ministry of Culture and from various academic studies, but these were also compared at the site, and photographed and documented.

The analysis was made on the basis of certain parameters as specified in a table and in a matrix. The table analyzed the 23 houses under two main sections, which are big houses (that are bigger than 320 m²) and small houses (that are smaller than 275 m²). The big houses are categorized first according to their stories, which are four storied with mezzanine, three storied with mezzanine, three storied without mezzanine, and two storied without mezzanine. Second, they are analyzed according to the shape of their plans, as rectangular or square planned. Third, they are analyzed according to their sofa types, which are central and inner sofas, and also according to their sofa characteristics, which are open or not open to street. The small houses are not categorized according to their stories since they are mostly two storied. They are categorized first according to the shape of their plans, as rectangular or square planned; second, they are analyzed according to their

sofa types, which are inner and outer sofas, and third, according to their sofa characteristics, which are open or not open to street. The houses are analyzed by means of their location in Beypazarı city plan, site plans, floor plans, and elevation of the main façade including the sofa. The plans are highlighted as to differentiate the sofa, the rooms, *taşlık*, wet spaces (kitchen, WC, bathroom), and service spaces (*messan*, stable, and storage spaces).

The houses are also analyzed by means of a matrix, which is categorized under lot organization (which shows the relationship of the house with the street by means of the presence of courtyard, courtyard elements, and entrances), planimetric features and architectural spaces (which shows the presence and number of sofa, room, *taşlık*, stables, storage, pantry, *messan*, *gusgana*, and *ekmek evi*), constructional techniques and structural qualities, mass and façade features, and some specific architectural elements. The matrix also includes the fire date, lot area (m²), building base area (m²), total floor area (m²), the ratio of lot area to base area, and the ratio of lot area to total floor area. The matrix analyzed the houses according to these parameters, and it used the same classification in the tables for listing down the houses. The results of the analyses show that the organization of building lots, planimetric features and architectural spaces, mass and façade characteristics, and the constructional techniques and structural qualities of the traditional residential buildings in Beypazarı are in general coherence with Ottoman house typology. We find similar planimetric relationships in terms of the position of the sofa, the rooms, *taşlık*, wet spaces and service spaces with traditional Ottoman house typology. We see that in the big houses (bigger than 320 m²), while there are 5 houses with inner sofas and 4 houses with central sofas, there are no houses with outer sofas. In small houses (smaller than 275 m²), while there are 7 houses with inner sofas and 5 houses with outer sofas, there are no houses with central sofas. Presence of outer sofas in small houses can be attributed to the lot shape and it can be said that the elongated rectangular plan necessitated the use of an outer sofa in order to orient the sofa to the street. Concordantly, no outer sofa was found among the square plans in small houses. In the organization

of the building lot, we see similar organizational principles with that of the Ottoman house culture, which is based on the protection of privacy.

On the other hand, in terms of architectural spaces, mass formation, façade features and construction techniques, we still come across unique features that differentiate traditional residential buildings in Beypazarı within Ottoman house culture. In terms of planimetric organization and architectural spaces, we come across a third floor, called as *gusgana*, which is found only in some of the houses in Beypazarı but still unique to the area. In addition to this, we observe a unique type of cellar called *messan*, which is used for storing food as well as the valuable items of the household against fire. In façade organization, we see the usage of arched windows in the stone walls of the ground floor, as a unique feature seen in some of the houses. In terms of construction techniques, we see two features unique to the area, which are the use of *tatlı siva*, a plaster unique to the region in terms of its composition and application; and the use of two timber posts under the projection at the main façade, which are adjacent to the wall of the ground floor.

In terms of the relationship of studied houses with the urban context, we see that big houses are located mostly around the town center, along the major axis of Aladdin street. Small houses with gardens on the other hand, are generally located at the periphery. In terms of the relationship of houses with the fires, we see that there are no significant typological differences, since Karcıkaya region, which had not been affected from any fire, and the town center, which has seen many fires since 1869, are populated with houses that are typologically similar.

Consequently, according to the analyzed cases, this study demonstrates that the traditional residential buildings of Beypazarı are in general coherence with the 19th century Ottoman house typology. Overall, it can be said that Beypazarı houses can be positioned within the Ottoman house culture at the beginning of the 19th century, in terms of the abundance of houses with inner sofas both in the big and small houses.