INTRODUCTION

Paul Lucas, who visited Cappadocia in the early eighteenth century, claimed that the “strange carved spaces in the volcanic cones were the hermitages of Byzantine monks” (1) (2), which was echoed by the early European travelers and explorers that followed him, who also suggested that the harsh volcanic wilderness is likely to have attracted a large monastic community. Ever since, the region in central Anatolia, famous for its peculiar landscape and its carved structures, has retained the monastic identity with which it was initially stamped (Ousterhout, 1996a, 31) (3). Surprisingly, however, there is not a single document referring to Cappadocia in this sense, and it is unlikely that any will ever come to light (Rodley, 1985, 5, 237; Ousterhout, 2005a, 177) (4). As for physical evidence, unlike Western models, it is difficult to talk of a standard plan for a Byzantine monastery (Rodley, 1985, 240-4; Ousterhout, 1996a; 1997a) (5); and in the case of Cappadocia the idiosyncratic nature of the carved architecture makes it all the more difficult.

In general, for Byzantine monasteries, consistency in the appearance of some elements may still facilitate their identification as such. According to Svetlana Popović (1998, 281; 2007, 1391-2). For a general description of the Byzantine monastery, see Mango (1976, 198) and Johnson and Talbot (1991, 1391-2).

7. See Footnote 15 below.
was an important step towards bringing scholarly order to the different perspectives on the numerous rock-cut cavities in the region, as the title of the book indicates, the prevalent monastic identity was still preserved (8). Rodley’s differentiation - though without denying the existence of “some overlap” - was based on a simple rule: complexes with rock-cut table and benches can be defined as “refectory monasteries” (Figure 1, 2); while complexes with a more formal plan and “which are carefully carved to imitate built architecture” but without a rock-cut refectory could be referred to as “courtyard monasteries”, despite the fact that not all of them contain a courtyard (Figure 3) (Rodley, 1985, esp. 9, 11). The examples she provided of both categories included only those complexes with an attached church or with a church in the close vicinity, but omitted many others of similar organization but lacking a church. Towards the end of the twentieth century, scholars conducting architectural surveys in the region began to question the monastic identity of Rodley’s “courtyard type”, claiming that an attached church alone does not necessarily imply a monastic identity (Ousterhout, 1997a, 422; 2005b, 214) (9). Accordingly, the lack of a refectory was considered as the main argument for the rather secular character of the courtyard type (Ousterhout, 2010, 95) (10), and they were accordingly re-classified as “courtyard complexes” or “courtyard houses” rather than monasteries. Consequently, aristocratic families with military connections residing in this border land of Byzantium were suggested as being the initial inhabitants of these complexes (11). Rodley (1985, 223-4) asserts that both the refectory and courtyard types were probably occupied for a short period, mainly during the eleventh century; and likewise, scholars speaking for the secular use of courtyard complexes date them to the tenth and eleventh centuries (12).

It is interesting to note that despite the absolute absence of any kind of rock-cut furniture for dining (Kalas, 2000, 89), the majority of so-called courtyard complexes contained spacious kitchens, recognizable from their huge conical, pyramidal or domical “chimney-vault” (13) and the occasional presence of carved hearths and niches in the surrounding walls (Figure 5-7). What is more noteworthy is that very few refectory monasteries included spaces that may be identified as kitchens (Figure 8), yet their contemporaneity with the complexes is questionable (Rodley, 1985, 249; Kalas, 2000, 41; 2009d, 114-5) (14). Therefore, while supporting the argument related to the secular character of courtyard complexes, this paper sees the unusual separation of food preparation and communal dining as a challenging new perspective that necessitates a re-examination of the differentiation between Rodley’s refectory and courtyard types.

**TRAPEZA AND SO-CALLED RECEPTORY MONASTERIES**

Naming them “after their most conspicuous feature”, Rodley (1985, 9, 151) describes her “refectory type” as a loose grouping with no formal arrangement of elements, with complexes that fall into this group comprising only a refectory, a church and one or two roughly, undecorated carved rooms (Figure 1).

In general, after the church, the refectory was the second most important architectural element within a Byzantine monastery and its location within the complex was related directly to the location of the former (Popović, 1998, esp. 283, 302; 2007, esp. 48) (15). According to Popović (1998, 303), who emphasizes the commemorative meaning of the communal meal for the first Christians, the “two buildings provided a joint setting for an
integral monastic ritual that began in the church and ended in the koinobion trapeza” (16). Nevertheless, Popović (2007, 48) also writes that “[o]bviously, its [the refectory’s] function was dual, secular and religious”. Indeed, besides its religious purpose, the refectory was also a secular space where daily meals would be served, and therefore had to be reasonably linked with the kitchen (Popović, 2007, esp. 50, 60-1).

The common basilical, or single-aisled Byzantine refectory plan was a rectangular space that in some examples was divided into bays. Cruciform and T-shaped plans were seldom (Popović, 1998, 297) (17). As for the interior articulation, the apse was commonly used “[i]n the central regions of Asia Minor and in the Balkans, especially during the middle Byzantine period” (Popović, 1998, 297). The room was often occupied by permanent furniture such as masonry tables and a stone lectern for religious readings (Popović, 1998, 285; 2007, 48). Tables were organized in two ways: either as rows of semi-circular tables placed along the walls; or as a single long table in the center, sitting in line with the main axis (Kazhdan and Johnson, 1991, 2109; Popović, 1998, 299).

As Rodley (1985) asserts, there are several carved structures containing a special room with a long rock-cut table (trapeza) and benches that at first sight would appear to have been parts of Cappadocian monastic establishments (Figure 1, 2). She exemplifies eleven such cases, which have been found clustered in the Göreme Valley within the Open Air Museum, and another two examples, Yusuf Koç Kilisesi and Archangel Monastery; the former located near the village of Avcılar and the latter near the village of Cemil (Rodley, 1985, 151-83). Nevertheless, recent studies (Pierre Lucas, 2003; Ousterhout, 2010) show that refectories are considerably more in number than initially noted by Rodley (1985). Pierre Lucas (2003) mentions more than twenty-five refectories carved just outside the Göreme Open Air Museum. Unlike the groupings mentioned by Rodley, many of them are isolated without forming a complex and without any church or chapel in the vicinity (Ousterhout, 2010). There are yet other refectories which seem to have been part of an establishment, such as the refectory opposite the courtyard complex Kılıçlar near Göreme (18); the refectory by Geyikli Kilise

---

16. See also Kazhdan and Johnson (1991, 2109).
17. See also Kazhdan and Johnson (1991, 2109) and Footnote 41 below.
18. Rodley (1985, 118) mentions its façade in the appendix of her “courtyard monasteries” without recognizing that it contains a rock-cut refectory. Jerphanion (1925-42, I: 254) also mentions a refectory by the complex Kılıçlar, but the photograph (Jerphanion, 1925-42, pl. 25:3) of it that he published is not from the refectory opposite. I thank Robert Ousterhout for his remark on this.
Accordingly, the recorded courtyard Area 17 at Çanlı Kilise as the only monastic complexes such as Çanlı Kilise, Selime-Yaprakhisar and Açıksaray, despite the existence of open-air cemeteries, burials in church narthexes and naos, and separate funerary chapels, not a single refectory has been found (except for Area 17 in Çanlı Kilise); For burials at Çanlı Kilise see Ousterhout (2005a, 89-91, 165-6); at Selime-Yaprakhisar see Kalas (2009b); at Açıksaray see Oztürk (2010, 168-9).

For Byzantine and Roman tombs in and around Göreme see Thierry (1984, 1987); For burial practices in Cappadocia see Grishin (1989, esp. 46); Hill (1994, 138) and Teteriatnikov (1996, 165-182); Interestingly, in the vicinity of ensemble of courtyard complexes such as Çanlı Kilise, Selime-Yaprakhisar and Açıksaray, despite this brings immediately to mind Cappadocian square kitchens with high chimney-vaults rather than Cappadocian flat-ceilinged refectories. Similarly interesting, although the interior walls of related rooms suggest a small number of monks, perhaps fewer than ten in most cases; however, this contradicts the higher number of monks that may be deduced from the size of the refectory, in which thirty to forty people would be able to sit around the single long table that was usually carved on one side of the room (Rodley, 1985, 249) (24).

The unusually high number of isolated refectories carved side-by-side around Göreme has led scholars to reconsider their function. As already pointed by Rodley (1985, 250), Pierre Lucas (2003, 41) too talks about refectories in the context of venerated pilgrimage sites. Robert Ousterhout (2010, 97), on the other hand, pointing to the emphasis on burials in the vicinity of refectories, questions their monastic identity, and asks: “[m]ight the scattered trapezai be understood as a late, distant relative of the Early Christian triclia, used for the refrigera meals at the Roman catacomb?” (22) Indeed, in more general terms, Popović (1998, 300-1), recalling the location of early refectories next to the burial caves in the Christian East; and the from the middle- and late-Byzantine period, in which the refectories generally open towards the church narthex with a funerary function, also proposes that “one must look to another ritual performed in the early days of Christianity, the funeral banquet, as a source of the form of the refectory and its ritual” (23).

As for Cappadocian refectories belonging to a grouping, the number and size of related rooms suggest a small number of monks, perhaps fewer than ten in most cases; however, this contradicts the higher number of monks that may be deduced from the size of the refectory, in which thirty to forty people would be able to sit around the single long table that was usually carved on one side of the room (Rodley, 1985, 249) (24).

The presence of an apsidal niche, which in all probability would have been the area reserved for the abbot at the head of the table, implies a strict hierarchy in the seating arrangements (Kostof, 1972, 51; Rodley, 1985, 247; Popović, 1998, 302; Kalas, 2000, 40; 2009a, 157). In Çarlı Kilise (unit 1) in Göreme the niche at the head of the table is decorated with a representation of the last supper, which makes its monastic identity almost certain (Figure 2) (Ousterhout, 2010, 97) (25). Nevertheless, although the interior walls of refectory buildings elsewhere were usually decorated with “symbolic images” (26) the example in Çarlı Kilise is rather an exception within Cappadocian refectories. Similarly interesting, although built refectories found elsewhere in Byzantine monasteries usually have high ceilings that are either vaulted or domed (27), Cappadocian refectories have low and flat ceilings, and are rather crudely carved (28). This is remarkable, since Cappadocian carvers tended to imitate built forms, as can be seen in the hundreds of rock-cut churches and courtyard complexes in the region. Even the elaborately carved refectory in the Geyikli Kilise, which is decorated with carved niches, featured only a simple flat ceiling.

COURTYARD COMPLEXES

As for courtyard complexes, over forty examples have been discovered within the areas occupied by the modern cities of Aksaray, Nevşehir, Kayseri and Niğde. A concentration of such complexes can be observed at strategic points close to fortresses or military roads at three sites: Çanlı Kilise, Selime-Yaprakhisar and Açıksaray (29); while others are spread...
across the volcanic valleys. Accordingly, courtyard complexes can be divided into two sub-categories: ensemble of courtyard complexes, covering these three sites of concentration; and isolated courtyard complexes, covering ten other isolated examples – Direkli Kilise, Karanlık Kale, Eski Gümüş, Soğanlı Han, Erdemli, Şahinefendi, Aynalı Kilise, Hallaç, Kılıçlar and Bezir Hane (30).

Courtyard complexes were often organized around a three-sided courtyard, as in the case of the Hallaç complex near Ortahisar, which is often used to exemplify this type of complex (Figure 3) (Mathews and
Daskalakis-Mathews, 1997, 299; Kalas, 2009b, 81) (31). Accordingly, the so-called “inverted T-plan”, consisting of a vestibule lying parallel to the cliff and a perpendicular longitudinal hall, has attracted the most attention from scholars citing the secular / domestic function of courtyard complexes (32). More interestingly, these apparent reception spaces, which give no indication of having a religious use, were usually carved behind high and elaborately decorated façades that could have been seen from great distances (Figure 4). This clear intention to express status is in direct contradiction to the monastic ideal of a modest life (Ousterhout, 2005b, 215; Kalas, 2009a, 165). Moreover, results of a recent comparative study by the author (Öztürk, 2010) have supported existing evidence that not all of the complexes of the courtyard type contain a church, and none of them has a rock-cut refectory. Instead, they occasionally include a spacious kitchen and a large stable, as well as rooms that were apparently multifunctional.

a. Triclinium

Of the 31 courtyard complexes in the sample (33), 25 had at least one longitudinal hall (34), which was generally located along the central axis of the courtyard and usually constituted the main hall of the complex (Figure 3). More than two-thirds of these halls were entered through a horizontal vestibule that lies perpendicular to the hall, forming an inverted T-plan. More interestingly, half of the examples of longitudinal halls had either a niche or a room carved into the farthestend most face facing the central entrance. This indication of a hierarchy among the people occupying the same room led some scholars to identify these halls as refectories, while leading other scholars to suggest a secular receptional use. In this respect, Rodley (1985, 247), insisting on her monastic identification of courtyard complexes, suggests that these spacious halls probably constituted refectories that may once have been furnished with wooden rather than rock-cut furniture (35).

Offering a contrasting view, Ousterhout (2005a, 147) supports the secular identity of the courtyard complexes, ascribing “central importance” to the longitudinal halls in daily activities; and suggesting that their function may have been as a reception area in which “the head of the household” rather than the abbot would have been seated at the emphasized end (36).

Ousterhout (2005a, 150) claims that there is insufficient evidence to support the existence of “formal dining in the Middle Byzantine period”, and likens (2005a, 147) the Cappadocian longitudinal halls to the halls that started to appear in late antiquity houses, when public architecture had declined and public affairs began to be conducted within the house. Also speaking in support of the idea of domestic use, Thomas Mathews and Annie-Christine Daskalakis-Mathews (1997, 300) claim that even though the Byzantines may have referred to the main hall in a courtyard complex as a triclinium, or dining room, it may well have had a similar function to that of the Islamic qa‘a, that is, serving multiple purposes, such as for dining, leisure and business.

More interestingly, besides longitudinal halls, one-third of the 31 courtyard complexes contain an additional centrally planned hall (Figure 3) (37), cross-in-square or cruciform in plan and with a dome, with entry being through the vestibule in half of the cases. The similarity in their form, size and location at the core of the complex is striking. The cruciform halls in Selime Kalesi and Karanlık Kale were directly connected to the main longitudinal hall and communicated only through them (38). Veronica Kalas (2000, 148) identifies the former as the probable triclinium (39); while Ousterhout (2005a, 151) could not assign a specific function to the centrally planned...
halls, choosing to describe them as “secondary formal spaces” (40). In the peristyle houses of late antiquity, Simon Ellis (2004, 39) claims that the hall "with three or more apses, lying immediately to the right of the triclinium", would have been a grand dining hall for the hosting of formal banquets by the local aristocracy. In this respect, the centrally planned hall found in the courtyard complexes would likely be used as a more formal dining room; but unlike examples from late antiquity, they were not usually isolated, but were rather at the core of the complexes.

As exemplified above, regardless of the proposed identity of the courtyard complexes, scholars generally agree that the spacious halls served for the taking of meals, although those speaking for a secular identity believe that this was not their only function. This is not surprising, since scholars such as Nicolas Oikonomidès (1990, 212) suggest there were probably similarities between the rules for imperial banquets, banquets of high society and the rules of monastic refectories; while, Popović (1998, 298) asserts that “[c]ontemporary palace architecture no doubt had an impact on refectory architecture” (41).

b. Kitchens

At this point, Rodley’s suggested caution at the very outset in her definition of so-called “courtyard monasteries” deserves particular attention:

“The terms ‘vestibule’ and ‘hall’ are used here for convenience and do not carry precise implications of function. It is not usually possible to know exactly what functions were served by the individual elements of a complex, except in the obvious cases of churches and kitchens.” (Rodley, 1985, 11)

Indeed, especially remarkable in courtyard complexes is the high frequency of a square room with a huge chimney-vault, either conical, pyramidal or domical, implying a kitchen (Figure 5-7). Rodley (1985, 19), while recording the complex in Hallaç, identified specifically room 6, which contained “a fairly steep dome rising above a deep overhang”, as the kitchen (Figure 3) (42). Pointing to the smoke hole as clear evidence, she mentions that “rooms of this type” had also been discovered in other complexes (43).

The Cappadocian kitchens under consideration are rather extraordinary, since cooking and household production, for instance, in the Middle Byzantine houses in Greece would normally be done in the courtyard, as was the case in ancient times (44). While the majority of these houses did not feature hearths to indicate clearly the location of kitchens, a brazier set in the courtyard might have served for cooking (45). In contrast, Clive Foss (1976, 70) reports that the Middle Byzantine houses in Sardis consisting of one or more rooms usually included a semi-circular brick hearth; and likewise, one room in the larger houses in Byzantine Pergamon often featured a hearth built into one of its walls. Other than the presence of a hearth, these rooms bear no architectural differences to the rest of the house, and in smaller houses the same room was used for living, cooking and storage (Rheidt, 1990, 199). In Alanya too, archaeological evidence has been insufficient in allowing a differentiation of specific functions related to specific spaces within the Byzantine house, and as such no room could be identified with certainty as a kitchen by the survey team (46). On the other hand, Semavi Eyice (1996, 209) mentions that “a small room with a rectangular opening in the middle of its vault” found in a Byzantine brick house in Side was in all likelihood the kitchen.

Greek monasteries, it would seem, not only had spaces reserved for dining in the form of refectories, but also spaces set aside for cooking.
Accordingly, Rodley claims that the kitchens of Cappadocian courtyard complexes “are of a type traditional in the Greek monasteries and probably generally” (47). Kalas, on the other hand, points out that although also square in form, the built kitchens of the late- and post-Byzantine monasteries of Greece have domical vault roofs rather than conical or pyramidal ceilings, as seen in Cappadocia (48).

Kalas (2009d, 109-10), indicating the difficulties involved in the study of medieval archaeology, highlights the importance of the kitchens of Cappadocia, which have been preserved not only in plan, but also in elevation (49). Indeed, in contrast to the scarcity of surviving built kitchens, almost two-thirds of the Cappadocian courtyard complexes had spaces especially designed for cooking for large numbers of people (50). Accordingly, 18 kitchens found in 31 recorded complexes have “standard”

48. Kalas (2009d, 115), also referring to Orlandos (1927, 37-45), emphasizes this as a “more logical design solution in a masonry-built structure”.
49. Yet, Kalas (2009d, 110-1) also voices the difficulty of stratigraphic investigation in Cappadocia where the architecture is still standing, but where small finds to confirm the function are usually absent; For difficulties related to the archaeology of Byzantine housing, see Rheidt (1990; 1996), Eyice (1996), Tanyeli (1996), Kalas (2007b).
50. See Footnote 72 below.

Figure 5. Selime Kalesi, kitchen (photograph by author).

Figure 6. Açıksaray, Area 5 (No. 1 by Rodley, 1985), kitchen (photographs by author).
features, and their identification is without doubt. These are: three kitchens (in Areas 1, 6, 13) at Çanlı Kilise; four kitchens (in Areas 2, 5, 7, 8) at Selime-Yapıkarhisar; five kitchens (in Areas 3.1, 4, 5, 7, 8 (Nos. 2a, 2, 1, 6, 3 by Rodley, 1985)) at Açıksaray; and six kitchens in Hallaç, Şahinefendi, Karanlık Kale, Eski Gümüş, Soğanlı Han, Kılıçlar from the category of isolated courtyard complexes (51).

Kalas (2009d, 113), who wrote a recent article on Cappadocian kitchens, asserts that “[t]he kitchens in Areas 6, 13, 23, and the East Settlement [at Çanlı Kilise] are considered to present the typical arrangement, whereas remaining examples vary in form”. She suggests that “typically arranged kitchens tend to belong to the more ‘well organized’ units” (52). Nevertheless, such simplifications, which are based on a limited number of examples, can be confusing (53).

Kalas (2009d; 2000, 88) further discusses the kitchen in relation to the church of the complex, comparing both components in regard to their plan, dimension and location. Accordingly, Kalas claimed that in general the kitchen and the church were often of similar dimension in the courtyard complexes, going even further to suggest:

“Because both the Middle Byzantine cross-in-square church and the kitchen are essentially square in plan, perhaps the carver set out to establish a square room of a certain dimension and repeated it once for the church and once for the kitchen, though the two rooms would be finished in a very different fashion in elevation.” (Kalas, 2009d, 115) (54)

At this point it should be recalled that carving differs from conventional building processes, in that it allows more individuality. Unlike conventional materials, such as reinforced concrete or brick, the material of carving requires no form, nor does it depend on a standardized module. In contrast, the dimension of the carved spaces strongly depends on the characteristic and limitations of the particular rock layers encountered while carving (55). It is also worth noting that the church and kitchen were not unique in terms of size, as several other spaces also shared similar dimensions.

Concerning the location of the kitchen, Kalas (2000, 87; 2009d, 111) claims that when possible it was located on the opposite side of the courtyard to the church; yet a recent comparative study of courtyard complexes conducted by the author showed that one-third of complexes with kitchens (6 of 18) had no attached churches at all. Of the 12 complexes that included both a church and a kitchen, 10 indeed had a cross-in-square church; but of these 10 complexes, only in four was the kitchen obviously located across from the church (56). On the other hand, 13 of 18 kitchens opened directly onto a courtyard or a front door space. While only one of them had an additional entrance from the vestibule, two of them had an indirect additional entrance from the vestibule via another in-between room. Only in one case was the kitchen located upstairs; and the rest (4 of 18 kitchens) were entered from the vestibule. Additionally, one had a second entrance from the hall, which constitutes the only exception in our corpus for a direct connection between the kitchen and the hall (57). To conclude, although the kitchen was not far from the core of the complex, it had a rather “secondary position” (Ousterhout, 2005a, 152) (58).

Kitchens are generally the most heavily eroded spaces within a complex due to their location facing directly onto the courtyard, and owing to their spacious ceiling and open smoke hole. Nevertheless, their square plan and
A form is still readable, and accordingly, Kalas (2009d, 112) has been able to differentiate between larger kitchens with pyramidal ceilings (Figure 5, 7) and smaller kitchens with conical ones (Figure 6). The larger kitchens measure about 7–8m x 7–8m, as in Areas 2 (Selime Kalesi) and 11 at Selime-Yaprakhisar; while the smaller kitchens measure 4–5m x 4–5m, and as emphasized by Kalas, are more common (Kalas, 2009d, 112-4) (59).

Despite suffering severe damage, it can be still observed that several kitchens had at least one elongated and a few smaller niches which acted as shelves; and a semi-circular niche that would have served as a hearth, all of which were carved into the surrounding walls (60); while some also contained a so-called tandır, a circular hearth dug into the ground for heating and cooking (61). Another typical feature of these kitchens is a number of adjacent smaller rooms that may have provided extra space for storage and food preparation (62). Interestingly, pit-loom s have been found.

![Figure 7. Açksaray, Area 3.1 (No. 2a by Rodley, 1985), kitchen (photograph by author).](image1)

![Figure 8. The crude kitchen at Archangel Monastery, Cemil (photograph by Tolga B. Uyar).](image2)

59. See also Figure 3, 4 for Selime Kalesi and fig. 10 for Yaprakhisar 11 in Kalas (2009d).


61. See Kalas (2000, 139; 2007a, 287-8; 2007b, 407, 2009d, 112, 116-7) and Öztürk (2010, 230); Kalas (2009d, 117) suggests that a portable brazier might have been used as a supplementary cooking device in courtyard complexes, although none has been found. The tandır probably was not used in the Byzantine period and is rather a later development. I thank Robert Ousterhout for his remarks on this.

In fact, two different forms of tandır are still in use in the modern-day villages of Cappadocia, where cooking takes place in the courtyard or in the roofed recess, the
CAPPADOCIAN REFFECTORIES AND KITCHENS

Most interestingly, none of the examples belonging to the courtyard type that included large kitchens contained built-in furniture for dining; just as hardly any of the refectory type that did contain rock-cut furniture featured any kind of kitchen, which were frequently found in the courtyard type.

Oikonomides (1990, 213) interprets the presence of built-in furniture as a sign of a lower status in the Middle Ages. As Rodley (1985, 247) has already proposed, though having monastic use in mind, a wooden table and benches might have indeed been used in the courtyard complexes.
of a large rock-cut trapeza and benches, as “courtyard monastery” rather than refectory monastery. This is confusing, since it features no characteristics of the courtyard type, aside from an elaborate painting program in its church. Moreover, it is located in the Göreme Valley in the vicinity of other refectory monasteries. Yet, Rodley (1985, 250) suggests a “dual role” for it.

In Karanlık Kilise (Rodley 1985, 48-56, fig. 9) there is a highly eroded small-sized room with rather an irregular vault and a chimney, which might be a kitchen. I thank Robert Ousterhout for bringing this to my attention. In the Yusuf Koç Kilisesi, which is one of the refectory monasteries of Rodley (1985, 151-7, fig. 28) there is a similar small space with a chimney. Unlike the one in Karanlık Kilise this one has also a hearth carved into the wall below the chimney that is still used by locals. There is a large kitchen with an irregular plan but containing a chimney and a hearth in the Archangel Monastery near Cemil (figure 8) (Rodley 1985, 157-60). I thank Tolga Uyar for bringing this to my attention. Interestingly, none of these probable kitchens were mentioned by Rodley (1985).

Ousterhout (2005a, 110) mentions a probable kitchen belonging to the only refectory monastery (Area 17) at Canlı Kilise, however the author could not identify this room during her visit. According to Ousterhout, this almost completely buried room has a flat-ceiling and a chimney carved near a corner. Ousterhout (2005a, 121) mentions a probable kitchen with a conical chimney found in the East Settlement at Canlı Kilise, which he suggests may be a monastery; nevertheless, he is uncertain of the function of this heavily damaged room, and so speculates whether this L-shaped room was both a kitchen and storage room, or even a refectory whose rock-cut table might have been buried. See also Ousterhout (1997, 306).

Jolivet-Lévy and Desmesnil (2009, esp. 86, 94-5) have reported recently a kitchen with a conical chimney belonging to an establishment that she identified as monastic in the village of Bahçeli. Interestingly, this establishment has neither a rock-cut refectory nor a hall.

Indeed, secular patrons of courtyard complexes would have had more freedom in this respect than the members of a monastic community, where communal meals were strictly regularized (79).

As for the so-called refectory monasteries, all of which feature rock-cut table and benches, at first sight they are indeed more likely to have been monastic establishments. Rodley asserts that refectory monasteries, especially those concentrated in the Göreme Valley, were probably related with sites of religious importance, and suggests that visiting pilgrims may have been accommodated in local camps. Accordingly, while “small permanent communities” might explain “[t]he absence of rooms clearly identifiable as kitchens”, long rock-cut table and benches might indicate “extra sitting space” for such visitors (Rodley, 1985, 249-50) (80). Furthermore, the scarcity of kitchens might be explained either in terms of the simple diet of the monks, which did not require any specific installation; or with a food supply from outside (Kalas, 2000, 89) (81).

On the other hand, Ousterhout (2010) emphasizes the “commemoration of the dead” as a probable raison d’être of numerous refectories in Cappadocia. Indeed, the use of isolated refectories as refrigera, as he proposed, would also explain the lack of kitchens, since in this case food and beverages would be brought by people gathering to commemorate the dead on occasion in the respective refectories. The simple interior articulations of these flat-ceilinged refectories might also support their only occasional use for the conducting of private meetings.

In this respect, Ousterhout (2010, 94) warns that “[m]onasticism in Cappadocia requires a much more nuanced approach than has been applied heretofore” (82). Likewise, its understanding also requires a look at the larger picture to include also the possible relations between both types cited by Rodley: the courtyard type and the refectory type. The proximity and visual connections between the courtyard complex Soğanlı Han and the refectory complex Geyikli Kilise, as well as between the courtyard complex Kılıçlar and the opposite refectory complex is remarkable, and may point to the nature of patronage in the region (83). In some cases, both

(76), which are more commonly identified as elite houses (77), however one must be still careful in transporting this symbolic meaning to the Cappadocian examples where the entire complex is carved from rock. Furthermore, masonry tables and benches as permanent built-in structures can be found even in built refectories (78). On the other hand, even if main halls of courtyard complexes had indeed once been refectories furnished with wooden tables and benches, their large size and prominent positions compared with the secondary position of the small churches would be still unusual, to say nothing of the complexes that featured large halls but no church at all.

On the other hand, as already indicated by Mathews and Daskalakis-Mathews, another possible explanation for the lack of permanent furniture may be that the inhabitants of courtyard complexes in this border region had borrowed the habit of sitting on the floor from their Muslim neighbors. They suggest that:

“There is some evidence that Byzantines not bound to a monastic regimen dined in the much more relaxed, Islamic ‘picnic’ style, seated cross-legged on the floor or on cushions. Tables were dispensed with; food was passed about on platters or in large bowls.” (Mathews and Daskalakis Mathews, 1997, 300-1)
types can be interpreted as physically and conceptually complementary to each other, while in other cases the one might be raison d'être of the other.

To conclude, all of these assumptions, while based on different evidence, should be accepted only with due consideration, since while the volcanic landscape of Cappadocia has preserved numerous architectural forms, supporting documentation is almost entirely absent (84). The intention of this paper has been to demonstrate the key role that the concepts of food preparation and communal dining and their architectural reflections can play in revealing answers to the many questions relating to the monastic and secular settlements in the region. This has certainly the potential to open a new perspective on the subject, given that the typological investigations that to date have focused only on the so-called inverted T-plan would appear to have reached their limits (85).
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