

Prof. D. Pietro Maria Militello

Review of

Ceyda Oztosun's ph.D. Thesis

Public Awareness on Coastal and Underwater Archaeological Heritage Protection in Turkey

The title of the Thesis focuses on two important issues of archaeological Cultural Heritage (henceforth: CH) today. The first issue concerns awareness on the side of the wider public about the social and economic value of CH. This aspect is considered one by the European institutions as one of the main goals for a sustainable development, as demonstrated by the presence of this topic in Horizon 2020 and Horizon 2030 calls. The second issue concerns the role of Underwater CH within the broader framework of CH. Modern technologies allowed in the last decades a booming of research on underwater remains, and underwater archaeology has been labelled by Cypriot Broodbank as one of the 4 new trends in Mediterranean archaeology. On the other hand, attitudes towards CH, and underwater CH, is still different in Mediterranean Countries, notwithstanding the effort by EU and national institutions to reach a shared protocol. Turkey, the region under examination, has a special position in this picture, due to its rich underwater patrimony.

The chosen argument by the candidate, therefore, is promising and innovative and sets along the line of a very update interest.

The structure of the thesis

The structure of the thesis is well built, even if with a quantitative predominance of the presentation of archaeological data on the social analysis of public awareness. After Methodology (15 pp. 5% of the total) It starts with a survey of archaeological evidence from coastal and underwater contexts in Turkey (Chapter 2: roughly 170 pp., 57% of the total); than analyses risk factors (chapter 3: roughly 30 pages, 10% of the total) and institutional attempts to protect CH at an international level, in Turkey and in Poland (Chapter 4: roughly 20 pages, 7% of the total). Chapter 5 and Conclusions tackle the main topic of the title: public awareness and its importance for the preservation of underwater CH (roughly 50 pages, 17% of the total). The reaming part concern introduction.

The content of the thesis

After prefaces, introductions and acknowledgments the **first chapter** concerns methodology. The chapter focuses indeed on the definition of Cultural Heritage and on the need to raise public awareness through “diffusion theory” (a definition is missing but “diffusion theory” is explained in the last chapter). In defining the meaning of *Culture* the author refers to Atatürk, Malinowski and Weber; in defining the meaning of *Heritage* the definition to the *Turkish Language Institution Dictionary*. Other sources could be quoted, from Lubbock to Leory Gourhan or Geertz for culture, to contemporary literature for Heritage (e.g. Rizzo-Throsby 2006), but a systematic analysis was probably beyond the scope of the thesis.

The **second chapter** forms the archaeological core of the work, presenting underwater archaeological evidence including a list of harbours, submerged architectures and shipwrecks, and a discussion of anchors and amphoras. Some 44 harbours sites are discussed, and 7 sunken sites, bringing together ancient sources, modern literature and, when present, archaeological evidence. The analysis is well made, sources correctly quoted, and a series of photographs demonstrate how (unfortunately) many of the sites are today under the new cities. The paragraph on shipwrecks includes 42 cases from southern Turkey. Some of them are recent findings, and are discussed in length (as the Kumluca or the Kalkan shipwrecks), with a really interesting documentation including also a few orthophotogrammetries. The last two paragraphs move from the list to the general classifications. Anchors and (commercial) amphoras are described according to their typology, and, in case of amphoras, of their place of manufacture. Both paragraph, especially that devoted to anchors, are interesting, but the reader wonder why other kinds of evidence (as copper ingots, plates etc.) are not discussed. At least a mention of these items and an explanation why they are not included could be made.

Chapter 2 does not aim at giving a complete list of all the existing underwater archaeological evidence, but, as the same candidate affirms in the case of harbours (p. 17), the result of a survey made by the Turkish Mediterranean Coastline and Underwater Archaeology (TMCUA) Research Project, of which the candidate is an active member.

Chapter 3 analysis risk factors treating underwater CH. risk factors are not only due to natural erosion of water and climate change but also to also a more aggressive attitude by the “people” (amateurs, tourists, local communities). Modern tools and devices that make underwater CH more accessible to scientists and knowledge (from remote sensing to SCUBA diving technologies) are also responsible, at the same time, for allowing people to come near and plunder them (see p. 201), increasing the risk of destruction. This context requires an appropriate response. The very good knowledge and theoretical approach to both risk factors and history of CH protection is summarized

in the schemes, especially 2 and 3 devoted to risk factors (pp. 204-205) and International regulation (p. 231). They provide a very useful and well thought representation of the situation.

In **chapter 4**, a clear and well presented picture is given of the evolution in the protection of CH and underwater CH. The most interesting part is surely the chapter about the protection of CH “in Türkiye” (why not “in Turkey”?), a surely not well known topic, which would suit better to the recent development of studies on protection of Cultural Heritage in European countries, as part of a wider movement towards the acknowledgment of the social role of antiquities. What interestingly emerges is that the Ottoman empire was in the end not so late in comparison with many European countries where protection acts started only in the XIX century. The different perspective in the interpretation of “western” archaeological research in Anatolia is surely interesting and convincent, even if the idea of a “west” as a unity is perhaps misleading: there is a difference between countries as Italy or Greece which were, at the same time, a subject of plundering and other, more aggressive countries as France or United Kingdom. At the same time, the problem of belonging of CH in those countries under Ottoman rule is not addressed.

Chapter 5 presents, finally, the results of activities carried out to improve public awareness in Turkey. These include both initiatives promoted by Turkish authorities, as in the case of the books and meetings for diving instructors, to initiatives for school children and tourist during Antalya Bilimfest. To all of them the candidate was active member and in some cases promoter. The initiatives for children and tourists, on the other hand, were built according to a methodology explained in pp. 255 (diffusion theory). Also in this case, other methodologies could be used or discussed, but, notwithstanding it, the importance of the chapter is the presentation of an effective communication activity and, above all, the presentation of a follow up based on survey among people to attended the events.

A rich bibliography of more than 700 titles is added at the end of the book.

To sum up, the unifying idea of the thesis is therefore that the rich patrimony in underwater archaeology present (in this case) in Turkey, described in capters 3) can only be made safe is public is aware (chapter 4). Some observations follows concerning both positive and negative aspects of the work, in some case related.

- 1) From a general point of view, the thesis deserves a positive judgments due to a comprehensive approach to underwater CH protection and the presentation of a lot of unpublished and fresh material, coming from the investigations made by the Turkish Mediterranean Coastline and Underwater Archaeology (TMCUA) Research Project.

- 2) As already stated in our introduction, the main argument of concern of the thesis is deeply important: public awareness is fundamental insofar in comparison with few specialist underwater archaeologists, members of the communities working in the sea are more probable to encounter underwater CH (p. 14). The issues dealt with in the research of Ceyda Oztosun provide fundamental material for further development of protection activities.
- 3) The thesis shows a thoroughly knowledge of underwater archaeological evidence in Turkey, going beyond the published material, and based upon a direct experience as a member of the TMCUA project (especially chapter 2 and 5) are based on the personal experience of the candidate. The experience of the TMCUA research project can be seen also in the theoretical chapter on environmental and human risks, also in this case provided often with first hand examples.
- 4) The candidate introduces us in Underwater CH research history from a different perspective, non EU centered. The history of archaeological research has a long bibliography, but almost all written from the point of view of European (or USA) researchers. The candidate reminds us how important the contribution of Ottoman scholars was, also through their links with Germany, but also how archaeology was also a struggle against the background of XIX century nationalism and colonialism. Hints at Osman Hamdi Bey as the first underwater archaeology legislator and researcher is interesting. Perhaps a thought could be made on why underwater research started in Turkey and not in Great Britain, France, Germany Italy or Greece which were at the forefront of archaeological research in the Mediterranean in the XIX century. Is there any connection between the early research by Hamdi Bey and the fact that modern underwater archaeology starts just in Turkey?
- 5) Finally, one important contribution of the thesis is the use of archaeological literature in language others than English (Turkish and Polish in first instance). If this aspect can be disturbing for some readers, used today to a monolingual bibliography, is instead, on my point of view, a great advantage, insofar it brings to our knowledge a whole archaeological literature otherwise known only to a restricted group.

Negative aspects

1) A negative counterpart of the use of data coming from TMCUA research project can be to give a biased idea of the whole of underwater CH of Turkey. The paragraph on harbours describes the evidence from all around the coast of Turkey, in the case of shipwrecks, on the contrary, only south-eastern and southern Turkey is involved, and the important evidence from other areas is missing. See., e.g. y the Istanbul area, also quoted by the candidate but in

a different chapters. (see p. 55 Theodosius Harbour). In the same way, this approach can determine an unbalanced description between very important, but old, findings and new discoveries (compare, e.g., the few lines devoted to the Cape Gelidonya and Ulu Burun excavations) and the new ones.

A possible solution could be to quote, at least, how many harbours or shipwrecks are currently known in order to understand how representative the chosen case studies are.

2) The visual organisation of the list of harbours and shipwrecks is not well satisfying. The list is not conceived as a catalogue, but just as a description. It would be useful, however, to clearly distinguish (as different elements?) what we know from historical (ancient and modern) and from archaeological evidence. In many cases, the long discussion on history of the site, sources, toponymes does not make clear what is preserved today.

3) At the same time a difference in extension can be seen between the description of findings based on published literature and that of findings made by the team of the candidate. Perhaps this distinction should be highlighted since the beginnings, introducing a special section or simply stating at the beginning of the paragraph “investigated by the Turkish...”. A suggestion is to set the bibliography on the shipwreck at the beginnings or at the end of the paragraph.

4) The weight of public awareness studies in the thesis looks underestimated in comparison with archaeological presentation of the data. In the Summary (p. 4) the author stresses the importance of “collaboration between archaeology and communication sciences”. As a consequence, the reader waits for a chapter devoted to a definition and presentation of these “communication sciences” and how do they apply to the raising of public awareness. In the chapters, instead, one single theory is quoted, the diffusion theory. Also in this case, the solution could be to substitute the expression “communication sciences” and “communication studies” with “communication experts/activity?”. 5) Finally, the reader would expect a larger number of plans and drawings of archaeological evidence (from harbours to amphoras) at the end of the book, beyond photographs showing the present state of conservation.

Final judgment

Due to the chosen important and innovative topics, the great expertise of the candidate in the field of underwater CH, the importance of the presented material, the reviewer fully judges the present thesis POSITIVE and worth admitting for the final discussion (final defence of the

doctorate). Some (apparent) inconsistencies, could be overcome explaining in the preface the choices made by the writer.

Pietro Maria Militello

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'P. Militello', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Prof. D. Pietro Maria Militello
Full professor of Archaeology
Dipartimento di Scienze Umanistiche
Università degli Studi di Catania
Piazza Dante, 32, 95124 Catania
Tel. *39 0952508201; mob. *39 3473735308 Email: milipi@unict.it