### DETERMINATION OF PRESENTATION PRINCIPLES FOR MULTI-LAYERED HISTORICAL TOWNS BASED ON CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE CASE STUDY: TARSUS

### A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF NATURAL AND APPLIED SCIENCES OF MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

ΒY

PINAR AYKAÇ

### IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE IN RESTORATION

FEBRUARY 2008

### Approval of the thesis:

### DETERMINATION OF PRESENTATION PRINCIPLES FOR MULTI-LAYERED HISTORICAL TOWNS BASED ON CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE CASE STUDY: TARSUS

submitted by **PINAR AYKAÇ** in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of **Master of Science in Restoration, Middle East Technical University** by,

Prof. Dr. Canan Özgen			
Dean, Graduate School of Natural and App	plied Sci	ences	
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Güven Arif Sargın			
Head of Department, Architecture			
Assist. Prof. Dr. Güliz Bilgin Altınöz			
Supervisor, Architecture Dept., METU			
Examining Committee Members:			
Inst. Dr. Namık Erkal (ARCH, METU)			
Architecture Dept., METU			
Assist.Prof.Dr.Güliz Bilgin Altınöz			
Architecture Dept., METU			
Prof. Dr. Numan Tuna			
City and Regional Planning Dept., METU			
Inst. Dr. Nimet Özgönül			
Architecture Dept., METU			
Inst. Dr. Meltem Uçar			
Architecture Dept., MEU	Date:	08.02	2.2008
	Daile.	00.02	2000

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name: Pınar Aykaç

Signature:

### ABSTRACT

### DETERMINATION OF PRESENTATION PRINCIPLES FOR MULTI-LAYERED HISTORICAL TOWNS BASED ON CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE CASE STUDY: TARSUS

Aykaç, Pınar M.S. in Restoration, Department of Architecture Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. A. Güliz Bilgin Altınöz

February 2008, 247 pages

The main subject of the thesis is "multi-layered historical towns" which are formed as a result of collective creation process and continuous inhabitancy that new buildings, edifices and open areas superimpose in time forming a specific character which can be defined as multi-layeredness. Considering the specific character of multi-layered towns, the principles for the presentation of historical stratification is the foremost objective of the thesis.

The thesis focuses on 'presentation principles" based on cultural significance of multi-layered historical towns so as to conserve, sustain and present their specific character as an integral part of the conservation process.

Therefore, the aim of this thesis is to determine "presentation principles" for multilayered historical towns in order to reveal and conserve their historical stratification by assessing the historical continuities, interruptions and transformations based on the cultural significance of multi-layeredness.

Focusing on this aim, the thesis is structured in two parts as the identification of presentation principles for multi-layered historical towns, discussing the information groups effecting the determination of cultural significance followed by the implementation of these principles on a concrete example as the case study. Subsequently, a proposal for the presentation principles guiding the design stages

together with the identification of information groups for the determination of cultural significance is apprehended for the case study.

The case study selected in the thesis for the implementation of the proposed principles is Tarsus which is a multi-layered historical town in Turkey having presentation potential for historical stratification.

To conclude, depending on the cultural significance specific to multi-layered historical towns, presentation is a way for the understanding and dissemination of these significances. The presentation principles set in this thesis can be regarded as a part of the conservation planning that has to be integrated to the existing process and it is possible to state that these principles are essential for the conservation and sustainability of multi-layered character of historical towns.

Keywords: Presentation Principles, Multi-layered historical towns, Tarsus, Cultural Significance of Multi-Layeredness.

### ÇOK KATMANLI KENTLERİN SUNUM PRENSİPLERİNİN KÜLTÜREL ÖNEME BAĞLI OLARAK BELİRLENMESİ TARSUS ÖRNEĞİ

Aykaç, Pınar Yüksek Lisans, Restorasyon, Mimarlık Bölümü Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. A. Güliz Bilgin Altınöz

#### Şubat 2008, 247 sayfa

Tezin ana konusu, kentsel yayılım alanının farklı dönemlerde değişmemesi, farklı dönemlerden yapıların şu anki kentte üst üste gelmesi sonucunda ortaya çıkan çok katmanlı kentlerdir. Tarihi kentlerin çok katmanlılık karakterini göz önünde tutarak, tarihi katmanlaşmanın sunumu için prensip oluşturmak tezin başlıca hedeflerindendir.

Bu tez, koruma sürecinin bir parçası olarak, çok katmanlı kentlerin kendilerine özgü kültürel önemlerini korumak, sürdürmek ve sunmayı amaçlayan sunum prensiplerinin tespiti üzerine odaklanmaktadır.

Bu nedenle, tezin amacı, çok katmanlılığa bağlı kültürel önemi temel alarak, katmanların mevcut kentle olan ilişkilerinin kentteki süreklilik, kesinti ve dönüşüm alanlarının yeniden belirlenmesi, yorumlanması sonucunda, tarihi katmanlaşmanın açığa çıkartılması ve korunması için sunum prensipleri oluşturmaktır.

Bu amaçla, tez; sunum prensiplerinin belirlenmesi ve kültürel önemi belirleyen bilgi gruplarının tespiti ile bu prensiplerinin uygulandığı örnek çalışma olmak üzere iki bölümden oluşmaktadır. Bununla beraber, örnek çalışma alanı özelinde, tasarım sürecini yönlendiren sunum stratejileri öneri ile beraber örnek çalışma alanının kültürel öneminin belirlenmesi için bilgi grupları oluşturulmuştur. Sunum prensiplerinin uygulanması amacıyla, sunum potansiyeli olan Tarsus, bir çok katmanlı kent olarak seçilmiştir.

Sonuç olarak, çok katmanlı kentlerin kültürel önemine dayalı olarak, sunum bu önemin anlaşılması ve yayılması için bir yöntemdir. Tezde önerilen sunum prensipleri, kentlerin çok katmanlılık karakterinin korunması ve sürdürülmesi için önemlidir ve koruma sürecinin bir parçası olarak değerlendirilmelidirler.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Çok katmanlı kentler, Sunum, Kültürel önem, Tarsus

*To my parents* 21.01.2008

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Assist. Prof. Dr. Güliz Bilgin Altınöz for her endless support and guidance in any time and any circumstances during my thesis research. I also thank to the jury members, Prof. Dr. Numan Tuna, Inst. Dr. Nimet Özgönül, Inst. Dr. Namık Erkal and Inst Dr. Meltem Uçar for their constructive criticism and suggestions.

I also express my sincere thanks to Prof. Dr. Ayşıl Yavuz for pushing me forward during my thesis work and Prof. Dr. Cevat Erder for his understanding when I was not around.

I am indebted to Hikmet Öz for allowing me to use his archival material. I express my sincere thanks to Levent Zoroğlu, Saadet Sayın, Fevziye Kökdil and Nurgül Nernekli for all the bibliographical and visual material they provide for the thesis. I would also like to thank to Nadir Durgun, Abdülbari Yıldız and to the restorers of SAYKA for their support during the site survey.

I am grateful to Ayşem Kılınç for her editorial assistance and A. Öncü Güney who has always been with me.

Finally, my parents, Aylin and Vedat Aykaç deserve the greatest thanks for their infinite support, patience and generosity in every aspect.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xiii
LIST OF FIGURES	xiv
CHAPTER	

1.	INTRODUCTION	. 1
	1.1 DEFINITION OF THE PROBLEM	. 4
	1.2 AIM AND SCOPE	. 5
	1.3 METHODOLOGY	. 6
	1.4 STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS	11

2. PRESENTATION PRINCIPLES BASED ON CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE OF
MULTI-LAYERED HISTORICAL TOWNS13
2.1 THE BACKGROUND: CONTENT AND PROCESS OF THE STUDIES TO
UNDERSTAND AND ASSESS THE HISTORICAL STRATIFICATION IN MULTI-
LAYERED HISTORICAL TOWNS13
2.2 CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE OF MULTI-LAYERED HISTORICAL TOWNS.20
2.3 PRINCIPLES FOR THE PRESENTATION OF MULTI-LAYERED
HISTORICAL TOWNS
2.3.1 Presentation and Interpretation Issues in Conservation
2.3.2 Principles Concerning the Interventions Held in Multi-Layered Historical
Towns
2.3.3 Principles Concerning the Presentations Held in Multi-Layered Historical
Towns40
2.3.3.1 Principles for In-situ Presentations44
2.3.3.2 Principles for Itinerary Preparation45
2.3.3.3 Principles for Information Panels46
2.3.3.4 Principles for Ex-situ Presentations46

3. TARSUS: A MULTI-LAYERED HISTORICAL TOWN	49
3.1 BRIEF LOOK ON THE HISTORY OF TARSUS	50
3.2 ANALYSIS & EVALUATION OF HISTORICAL PERIODS OF TARSUS	55
3.2.1 Determination of Historical Periods Based on Diachronic Survey	55
3.2.1.1 Topography and Natural Aspects	59
3.2.1.2 Hellenistic Period	60
3.2.1.3 Roman Period	64
3.2.1.4 Medieval Period	71
3.2.1.5 Ottoman Period	76
3.2.1.6 Early Republican Period	82
3.2.1.7 Current Town	83
3.2.2 Determination of Different Quality Areas Based on Diachronic Survey	.86
3.2.2.1 Identity Areas	91
3.2.2.2 Identity Areas of Multi-Layeredness	94
3.2.2.3 Reserve Areas	97
3.2.2.4 Risk Areas	97
3.2.3 Determination of Levels of Historical Layers with Respect to the Leve	l of
the Current Town	97
3.3 CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT STUDIES IN TARSUS	100
3.4 EVALUATION OF CURRENT PRESENTATION STATUS OF HISTORICA	L
PERIODS IN TARSUS	128
3.4.1 In-situ Presentation Status of Historical Periods	128
3.4.2 Ex-situ Presentation	129
3.4.3 Presentation of Historical Stratifications in Touristic Tours	133
3.4.4. Presentation Potential of Historical Stratification in Tarsus	138
4. PROPOSAL FOR THE PRESENTATION OF MULTI-LAYEREDNESS BASED	
ON CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE IN TARSUS	144
4.1 PROPOSALS FOR EX-SITU PRESENTATION	144
4.2 PROPOSALS FOR IN-SITU PRESENTATION	145
4.2.1 Proposal for Itineraries	145
4.2.2 Proposal for Information Panels	159
4.2.3 Proposal for Principles Guiding Design Interventions	161
4.2.3.1 Determination of Project Areas	162

4.	.2.3.2 Cultural Significance of Historical Buildings in the Project Area	170
4.	.2.3.3 Evaluation of the New Buildings in the Project Area	181
4.	.2.3.4 Levels of Historical Periods in the Study Area	183
4.	.2.3.5 Principles for Intervention Designs for the Project Area	188
4.	.2.3.6 Proposal for Design Interventions in the Project Area	189
4.3 ASS	SESSMENT OF THE RESULTS OF THE CASE STUDY	197

5. CONCLUSION	201
REFERENCES	204
APPENDICES	

A. EXAMPLES RELATED TO THE EX-SITU PRESENTATION OF HISTORICA	۱L
STRATIFICATION	214
B. EXAMPLES RELATED TO THE IN-SITU PRESENTATION OF HISTORICA	L
STRATIFICATION	217
C. GLOSSARY	224
D. VALUE TYPES	226
E. 1937 DEVELOPMENT PLAN BY HERMANN JANSEN	227
F. OTTOMAN MAP SHOWING TARSUS AND ITS VICINITY	228
G. OTTOMAN MAP OF TARSUS (BEFORE 1919)	229
H. FRENCH MAP OF TARSUS (1919)	230
I. MAP OF TARSUS IN THE LATE 20TH CENTURY	231
J. THE CONSERVATION SITES OF TARSUS	232
K. MAP OF TARSUS COMMERCIAL CENTER	233
L. 1948 TARSUS MAP	234
M. INFORMATION GROUPS FOR THE DETERMINATION OF CULTURAL	
SIGNIFICANCE OF HISTORICAL EDIFICES	235
N. INFORMATION GROUPS FOR THE EVALUATION OF NEW BUILDINGS	242

# LIST OF TABLES

# TABLES

Table 1 Information used for the current state assessment	3
Table 2 Information used for the Determination of Cultural Significance	3
Table 3 Information groups used for the determination of presentation potential4	1
Table 4 The information groups for the determination of cultural significance of	
Historical Edifices (for all of the edifices in the project area See Appendix M)175	9
Table 5 The information groups for the evaluation of new buildings (for the all	
buildings, See Appendix N)182	2
Table 6 Value types defined by different scholars, charters and organization226	3
Table 7 Information Groups for the Determination of Cultural Significance of	
Historical Edifices	5
Table 8 Information Groups for the Determination of Cultural Significance of	
Historical Edifices	7
Table 9. Information Groups for the Determination of Cultural Significance of	
Historical Edifices	9
Table 10 Information Groups for the Evaluation of New Buildings242	2
Table 11 Information Groups for the Evaluation of New Buildings243	3
Table 12 Information Groups for the Evaluation of New Buildings	4
Table 13 Information Groups for the Evaluation of New Buildings	5
Table 14 Information Groups for the Evaluation of New Buildings247	7

# LIST OF FIGURES

# FIGURES

Figure 1 Satellite view of current Tarsus and its immediate vicinity (Google earth,
last accessed on 24.01.2007)49
Figure 2 Study Area within Tarsus (aerial photograph of Tarsus in 1992, obtained
from Harita Genel Komutanlığı58
Figure 3 Bed of Cydnus, boundaries of Rhegma and the shoreline in Antique period
(Ramsay 1890)59
Figure 4 Relation of Tarsus with Mediterranean in Antique period (reproduced from
Ramsay 1890)61
Figure 5 Topography and Natural Aspects of Tarsus62
Figure 6 Hellenistic Period in Tarsus)63
Figure 7 a) Main axes in Hellenistic period (author, October 2006) b)Hellenistic
Sewage System (Hikmet Öz archive)64
Figure 8 Roman period in Tarsus65
Figure 9 Roman period in Tarsus66
Figure 10 Location of the theatre on Gözlükule mound (Goldman 1935:528)69
Figure 11 a) General view of theater in the 20 <sup>th</sup> century
(http://ddc.aub.edu.lb/projects/jafet/blatchford/html/122.html, last accessed
17.01.2007) b) Donuktaş in 1970s (Hikmet Öz archive)69
Figure 12 a) The plan of the vaulted building in the garden of Barbaros Hayrettin
High School (Ministry of Culture, registration sheet) b) Vaulted building in the garden
of Barbaros Hayrettin High School (Hikmet Öz archive)70
Figure 13 Medieval Period in Tarsus72
Figure 14 a) Demirkapı in the 19 <sup>th</sup> century (Mutafian,1988) b) Tomb of Caliph
Memun, Prophet Şit and Lokman (author 07.2007)73
Figure 15 The older wall fragment on the lower part of Great Mosque (author
07.2007)
Figure 16 Connection of Cydnus with Mediterranean in the 16 <sup>th</sup> century.
(Piri Reis)76
Figure 17 Tarsus in Ottoman period78

Figure 18 a) Saray Hanı in 1960s (Hikmet Öz archive) b)Ottoman commercial center
in 1960s (Hikmet Öz archive)79
Figure 19 Ottoman residential buildings attached to Roman baths
(http://ddc.aub.edu.lb/projects/jafet/blatchford/html/126.html, last accessed on
12.01.2007)
Figure 20 Yılancık Turkish Cemetery in 1960s.(Hikmet Öz archive)81
Figure 21 Water sources in Tarsus and its vicinity (Ulutaş 2006)82
Figure 22 Tarsus in Republican Period
Figure 23 Current Tarsus, town center (aerial photograph of Tarsus in 1992,
obtained from TC Genelkurmay Başkanlığı Harita Genel Komutanlığı85
Figure 24 Historical periods of Tarsus
Figure 25 Edifices that have survived to the present
Figure 26 Different Quality Areas in Tarsus
Figure 27 Different Quality Areas in Tarsus90
Figure 28 Identity Areas of Historical Periods in Tarsus
Figure 29 Continuity Areas in Tarsus95
Figure 30 Conservation sites and registration status of historical edifices101
Figure 31 Conservation and Development Process in Tarsus102
Figure 32 Intervention before 1937 in Tarsus104
Figure 33 1937 Development Plan in Tarsus105
Figure 34 Interventions between 1937- 1958 in Tarsus108
Figure 35 1958 Development Plan109
Figure 36 Interventions between 1958- 1967 in Tarsus111
Figure 37 1967-1973 Revision plans)112
Figure 38 Interventions between 1974-1982 in Tarsus)114
Figure 39 1982 Development plan116
Figure 40 Interventions between 1982-1989 in Tarsus118
Figure 41 1989 Conservation Plan119
Figure 42 Interventions between 1989-1995 in Tarsus123
Figure 43 1995 Development Plan124
Figure 44 Interventions between 1995-2007 in Tarsus126
Figure 45 a) Church of St. Paul after restoration (author, July.2007) b) Information
panel of Great Mosque and landscaped for presentation (author, July.2007)129
Figure 46 Tarsus tourism guide book130

Figure 47 In-situ presentation status in Tarsus	1
Figure 48 Ex-situ presentation status in Tarsus132	2
Figure 49 International tours in Tarsus135	5
Figure 50 Religious Tours in Tarsus136	3
Figure 51 Tourist Information Center Tours in Tarsus	7
Figure 52 Accessibility of Historical Stratification in Tarsus	9
Figure 53 Integration of Historical Stratification in Tarsus14	1
Figure 54 Attraction of Historical Stratification in Tarsus143	3
Figure 55 Itinerary for the presentation of multi-layered character of Tarsus147	7
Figure 56 General view of the 3D Itinerary for the presentation of multi-layered	
character of Tarsus148	3
Figure 57 3D itinerary for the presentation of multi-layered character of Tarsus-	
View 1148	3
Figure 58 3D itinerary for the presentation of multi-layered character of Tarsus-	
View 2149	9
Figure 59 3D itinerary for the presentation of multi-layered character of Tarsus-	
View 3149	9
Figure 60 3D itinerary for the presentation of multi-layered character of Tarsus-	
View 4150	C
Figure 61 3D itinerary for the presentation of multi-layered character of Tarsus-	
View 5150	C
Figure 62 3D itinerary for the presentation of multi-layered character of Tarsus-	
View 615	1
Figure 63 Itinerary for the presentation of Hellenistic period of Tarsus152	2
Figure 64 Itinerary for the presentation of Roman period of Tarsus153	3
Figure 65 Itinerary for the presentation of Roman period of Tarsus154	4
Figure 66 Itinerary for the presentation of Medieval period of Tarsus156	3
Figure 67 Itinerary for the presentation of Ottoman period of Tarsus	7
Figure 68 Itinerary for the presentation of Early Republican period of Tarsus158	3
Figure 69 Proposal for town scale information panels160	C
Figure 70 Proposal for building scale information panels	1
Figure 71 Project areas fort he presentation of historical stratification in Tarsus 163	3
Figure 72 Main project area in Tarsus165	5
Figure 73 Identification of the Edifices in the Project area166	6

Figure 74 a)Old Mosque (author July, 2007) b) Eski Hamam (author July, 2007) .167
Figure 75 a) Arab tomb (author July, 2007) b) Building underneath Makam Mosque
(author July, 2007)167
Figure 76 a) Mustafa Ağa Mescidi (author July, 2007) b) Roman bridge (author July,
2007)
Figure 77 a) Ottoman residential building(author July, 2007) b) Roman Baths (author
July, 2007)
Figure 78 a) Kubatpaşa Medresesi (www.tarsus.bel.tr , last accessed on
21.12.2007) b) Makam Mosque (www.tarsus.bel.tr , last accessed on 21.12.2007)
Figure 79 a) Location of Yeloğlu Han (author July, 2007) b) Location of Saray Hanı
(author July, 2007)169
Figure 80 Project area with the information coming from diachronic survey172
Figure 81 Knowledge on existences of the edifices in the Project area173
Figure 82 State of survival of the edifices in the Project area174
Figure 83 Position and perception of the edifices in the study area175
Figure 84 Types of Interventions of the edifices in the Project area177
Figure 85 Functional and social aspects of the edifices in the study area178
Figure 86 Sections showing the vertical relations in the Project area (Drawings are
derived from measured drawings of Makam Mosque prepared by Nurgül Nernekli in
2007and Roman Baths by, SAYKA Ltd. Şti. in 2002.)185
Figure 87 Sections showing the vertical relations in the Project area (drawings are
derived from measured drawings of Roman Baths by SAYKA Ltd. Şti. in 2002.) .186
Figure 88 Sections showing the vertical relations in the Project area (Drawings are
derived from measured drawings of Makam Mosque by Nurgül Nernekli in 2007) 187
Figure 89 Principles guiding the design stage in the Project area191
Figure 90 Decisions on historical edifices192
Figure 91 Decisions on new buildings193
Figure 92 Proposal for the Roman level (- 5.50m), Medieval level (- 1.50m) and
Ottoman level (±0.00m) in the Project area194
Figure 93 Proposal for the Project area, View 1195
Figure 94 Proposal for the Project area, View 2195
Figure 95 Proposal for the Project area, View 3196

Figure 96 The graphical reconstruction of Tomb I and its immediate vicinity (Web
Site of Appia Antica Project, ( <u>http://www.appia.itabc.cnr.it/appia_3d.php</u> , accessed
on 21January 2008)214
Figure 97 The graphical reconstruction of Tomb I (Web Site of Appia Antica Project,
(http://www.appia.itabc.cnr.it/appia_3d.php, accessed on 21January 2008)215
Figure 98 The general view of Theatre C in Troy, Çanakkale, Turkey (Web Site of
Project Troia, (http://www.uni-tuebingen.de/troia/vr/vr0210_en.html, accessed on 01
January 2008)215
Figure 99 The graphical reconstruction of Theatre C of Troy IX (Web Site of Project
Troia, ( <u>http://www.uni-tuebingen.de/troia/vr/vr021001_en.html</u> , accessed on 01
January 2008)216
Figure 100 a) Itinerary for the presentation of Roman period in Zaragoza b) Itinerary
for the presentation of Moorish period in Zaragoza
(http://cmisapp.zaragoza.es/ciudad/turismo/es/enlace/paseos.htm.,
last accessed on December 17, 2007)217
Figure 101 a) Itinerary for the presentation of Renaissance period in Zaragoza b)
Itinerary for the presentation of Baroque period in Zaragoza
(http://cmisapp.zaragoza.es/ciudad/turismo/es/enlace/paseos.htm,
last accessed on December 17, 2007)217
Figure 102 Map showing the phases of Roman period in Nyon, Switzerland.
(http://keepps.tripod.com/Nyon/nyonpresent/presenthome.htm, last accessed
December 17: 2007)218
Figure 103 Information panels of Walking Tours of Nyon ( <u>http://keepps.tripod.com/</u>
Nyon /nyonpresent/5nicole/5nicole.htm, last accessed December 17: 2007)218
Figure 104 London Rose Theater (Website of APPEAR, <u>http://www.in-situ.be</u> , last
accessed on January 13, 2008)219
Figure 105 The Roman Theater of Zaragoza
(http://img68.imageshack.us/img68/2341 /teatredecaesaraugusta7zi.jpg, last
accessed on December 8, 2007)219
Figure 106 Urban archaeological site in Brussels
(Website of APPEAR http://www.in-situ.be, last accessed on January 13, 2008)220
Figure 107 The presentation of remains in Crypta Balbi
(http://appearfr.english-heritage.org.uk/print/?63, last accessed on 14 January 2007)

Figure 108 TimeScope utilized in the Ename Project for the presentation of ruins of
Abbey Church (http://www.ename974.org/Eng/pagina/archeo_concept.html, last
accessed: 22.01.2008)
Figure 109 Kedumim Square in Old Jaffa with Visitors Center underneath (Vedat
Aykaç February 2008)221
Figure 110 Visitors Center underneath Kedumim Square (Vedat Aykaç February
2008
Figure 111 a) Old Municipal Building of Jaffa before the bombardment b) Old
Municipal Building of Jaffa after the bombardment in 1948
(http://archnet.org/library/images/oneimage.jsp?location_id=8931ℑ_id=41438,
accessed on 22 January 2008)222
Figure 112 a) The demolished wall of Jaffa Old Municipal Building (Vedat Aykaç,
September 2005) b) The presentation of Jaffa Old Municipal Building foundations
(Vedat Aykaç, September 2005)
Figure 113 1937 Development plan by Hermann Jansen (Hikmet Öz archive)227
Figure 114 Ottoman map showing Tarsus and its vicinity (Hikmet Öz archive)228
Figure 115 Ottoman map of Tarsus (before 1919) (Hikmet Öz archive)229
Figure 116 French map of Tarsus (1919) (Hikmet Öz archive)230
Figure 117 Map of Tarsus in the late 20th Century (ROTHER L., 1971)231
Figure 118 The conservation sites of Tarsus (Ministry of Culture and Tourism
registration sheet)
Figure 119 Map of Tarsus Commercial Center (ROTHER L., 1971)233
Figure 120 1948 Tarsus Map (Gürani 1999)234

### **CHAPTER 1**

#### INTRODUCTION

Towns are naturally developed settlements of special nature having the vestiges and the relics of their material existence partially above the surface but in the majority of cases underground.

(Council of Europe 1991:1)

Historic towns are one of the most complex physical formations that lead to a number of discussions in the field of conservation. Due to their natural development process, former development and conservation plans, historic towns vary in both character and conservation problems. Focusing on this differentiation, UNESCO World Heritage Committee categorizes the historic towns where habitation continues as:

- towns from a specific period or culture and considerably unaffected by subsequent developments
- towns where historic parts take precedence over the contemporary environment
- towns embracing sectors, areas or isolated units, showing the former character of the town which has disappeared
- historic centers covering the same area as ancient towns and enclosed within the modern settlement.

(UNESCO 1992:7)

Corresponding to the second category; when the urban expansion area of different historical periods overlap throughout the history of a town, the buildings of the successive periods endure within the modern city constituting a significant character for these historic towns. Bruno Fortier, who is a French architectural historian, differentiates cities as creation and accumulation cities in his book "Love for the City" in 1995. According to Fortier, different from the creation cities which are the representatives of the theory and practice of modernism; accumulation cities are created through a continuous process of urban transformation revealing the physical evidences of past settlements which produces "a heterogeneous mixture" (Doevendans and Schram 2005:29).

This "heterogeneous mixture" formed by the uninterrupted occupancy results with several phases or units of transformation which can be defined as "historical periods" or "historical layers". These layers of historic evolution from the past to the present accumulate within the town's physical form and reveal the relations like continuities, interruptions and transformations between historic town and the new urban settlement.

As a result of collective creation process and continuous inhabitancy; new buildings, edifices and open areas superimpose in time forming a specific character which can be defined as multi-layeredness. Hence, multi-layered historical towns are the agglomeration of different layers and their relation with each other, forming a physical entity that contributes to the town's character and urban identity<sup>1</sup> (Altınöz 2003:1).

Apparently, the agglomeration of different historical layers was a continuous process throughout the history and will persist in the future as expected. However, rapid urban development becomes a threat with destructive interventions for both built-up and buried heritage among with the conservation planning process disregarding the collective creation process. Certainly, "the physical presence of the past is only one of the elements to be understood and used in the creation of the new, but it is ignored, misunderstood, or prevented at our peril." (Biddle 1980:9)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> "Multi-layered towns" is a term initiated by Güliz Bilgin Altınöz in her PhD thesis (Altınöz G., 2002) which is defined as towns which have been continuously inhabited since early ages onwards and where still inhabitation exists.

Subsequently, for the integration of the past into the conservation strategies, the evaluation of historical stratification becomes substantial for both the understanding and survival of historical towns. As it is stated in "Management Guideline for World Cultural Heritage Sites", historical stratigraphy which is the evidence brought by changes in use over time with the connections and continuity, constitutes the basis for establishing the criteria for conservation (Feilden and Jokiletho 1993 :77).

Consequently, when dealing with the conservation of multi-layered towns, this historical stratigraphy should be concerned bearing in mind that every period is valuable contributing to the physical entity of these towns. Therefore, the successive historical periods, transformation processes, the integrity of each phase with its own components such as expansion areas, main axes, buildings, different functional areas etc. and the interactions with the components of other periods become essential for the conservation of this historical stratification and sustainability of multi-layered character of the historic towns.

In the words of La Regina and Querrien (cited in Marti 2004:3):

studying the traces of the past, establishing which can still 'live' and choosing, in an informed manner, the model for their survival: artificial, within a museum, or organic, within the modern urban fabric. Better still, the city of the present and of the future may be planned ... on the basis of the urban and social data of the past.

#### **1.1 DEFINITION OF THE PROBLEM**

"In the case of ancient towns, the obvious point of reference for an appropriate programme of urban research aimed at ascertaining changes in, or the survival of, monuments and functions in the various stages of development is such town's beginnings. These beginnings are apparent not only in architectural remains but also, and above all, in the original urban pattern and zoning. This method of investigation should be repeated for each phase of a town's development, and it is through an historical analysis of the formal and substantial aspects of specific periods that a complete picture is built up."

(Sommella 1984:27)

It is apparent that; research, analysis and presentation of the spatial development of historic buildings and sites constitute one of the basic components for the process of their conservation and rehabilitation (UNEP 1988:1).

However, most of the multi-layered historical towns come across with the problem of losing their multi-layered character due to the conservation strategies disregarding the entire historical development process of the town, design interventions eradicating the traces of this process which are today imperceptible or underground and improper presentations concentrating basically on the well known edifices or a specific historical period rather than the spatial development process of these towns.

In multi-layered historical towns, the relations of different periods among themselves and with the current town are revealed by the physical evidences of continuity, discontinuity and transformations. These physical evidences are susceptible to inappropriate design interventions or presentations which can actually take part in the perception and conservation of the multi-layered character of historical towns. One of the major problems of the inappropriate design interventions and presentations are the lack of principles guiding the design stages based on the cultural significance of multi-layeredness. Hence, in order to conserve and sustain the multi-layered historical towns, the physical evidences from successive periods of the town's history forming the historical stratification should be considered as the basis in determining principles and be an integral part of the presentations and design interventions.

This will provide a basis for the conservation of multi-layered character of historical towns, resulting with proper presentations, interventions and apprehending the cultural significance of multi-layeredness.

### **1.2 AIM AND SCOPE**

Towns, being only settlements of a particular kind, are not essential to human life; they represent a preference which has come and gone and reappeared again in different guises...

(Carver 1987:72)

Considering the collective creation process, the aim of this thesis is to determine 'presentation principles' for multi-layered historical towns in order to reveal and conserve their historical stratification by assessing the historical continuities, interruptions and transformations based on the cultural significance of multilayeredness. Focusing on this aim, the thesis is structured as the identification of presentation principles for multi-layered historical towns, discussing the information groups effecting the determination of cultural significance followed by the implementation of these principles on a concrete example as the case study.

Undoubtedly, presentation includes different ways of appraisal of cultural heritage. However, the advantages or disadvantages of these different methods of their effectiveness are not discussed in the scope of this thesis. Moreover, cultural significance which means "aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations" (ICOMOS 1988:3) is considered as the cultural significance of multi-layeredness that can be defined as the cultural significance specific to these towns. As to the case study, the main focus of the thesis is not to evaluate the urban and conservation history or defining a methodology for the assessment of historical stratification and presentation status. However, the information coming from historical and archaeological research, conservation history and presentation status are utilized both for setting and evaluating the presentation principles.

When the current status of the town is evaluated, the main criteria is the conservation and presentation principles together with the cultural significance of multi-layeredness. Therefore,

Conservation of cultural heritage is fundamentally a cultural problem; there is a need to establish a basis for balanced judgements where cultural, economic and financial values are taken into account in the context of the decision-making process concerning the planning and management of the built environment.

(Zanchetti and Jokiletho 1997:38)

Although conservation and management process covers various prospects, due to the aim of the study, this thesis focuses on physical and historical aspects of the conservation process adopted for multi-layered historical towns omitting the economic, managerial and social ones. In addition, the objectives of the thesis is not to re-define the conservation planning process of multi-layered historical towns.

In the view of the aim of this thesis, historical stratification, presentation principles, design interventions and cultural significance of multi-layeredness are the main concerns of this thesis.

#### **1.3 METHODOLOGY**

To begin with, the thesis is two-fold according to the purpose of the study. Firstly, the conceptual part; which includes a background information on the methodology

for the analysis and assessment of historical stratification among with the presentation and interpretation issues in conservation. Subsequently, a proposal for the presentation principles guiding the design stages together with the identification of information groups for the determination of cultural significance of multi-layeredness.

Secondly, the analysis and assessment of historical stratification in Tarsus which is a multi-layered historical town in Turkey as the case study, actuate its current presentation status, the conservation history specifically focusing on the presentation decisions and finally proposing principles for the presentation of the physical evidences of successive historical periods.

In order to achieve an effective conservation for a multi-layered historical town, it is necessary to comprehend the historic evolution and transformation process and trying to define the integrity of every historical period with their components and the interactions of these periods with each other.

For the analysis and assessment of historical stratification, the combination of historical and archaeological research together with archaeological and site surveys are utilized which is an existing methodology in the field of urban archaeology.

One of the first applications of this methodology is explained in the book "Future of London's Past" and the purpose of the methodology is defined as follows:

to assess the current state of archaeological knowledge about the City of London in relation to the destruction of the evidence by redevelopment and to suggest a solution whereby a great deal more could be investigated and recorded than is at present possible.

(Biddle et al 1973 :1)

The process and content for assessing historical stratification in multi-layered towns is discussed and experimented by A. Güliz Bilgin Altınöz in her Masters and PhD theses (Bilgin A.G. 1996; Altınöz G.B. 2002) and by Burak Belge in his masters thesis (Belge 2005). For the analysis and assessment of historical stratification, this existing methodology is utilized in this thesis which will provide a basis for the assessment of cultural significance of multi-layeredness and the proposal of presentation principles.

Due to the special character of multi-layered towns, the cultural significance specific to historical stratigraphy has to be identified after the assessment of historical stratification. Therefore, the information categories for the determination of cultural significance is re-structured and re-defined where necessary. For this purpose, as a background information, the existing value groups are evaluated exploiting "Conclusions and Recommendations of workshop on the Evaluation of Historic Buildings and Sites" (UNEP 1989), research reports on heritage values of Getty Conservation Institute (Mason and Avrami 2000), Burra Charter (Icomos 1988) and Management Guide prepared by Organization of World Heritage Cities and Management Guidelines for World Cultural Heritage Sites (Feilden and Jokiletho 1993).

Following the cultural significance assessment of multi-layered historical towns and their components; the interpretation and presentation issues in conservation are discussed briefly with respect to Ename Charter (Icomos 2005), Freeman Tilden's interpretive principles (Tilden 1957), David Uzzell's interpretation guidance (Uzzell 1990) and Management Guidelines for World Cultural Heritage Sites (Feilden and Jokiletho 1993).

Consequently, presentation principles for the conservation of multi-layered character of historical towns are proposed varying from town to building scale including both ex-situ and in-situ presentations guiding the design stages. While setting the principles for presentation, the character and successive historical periods of multilayered historical towns are taken into consideration as it is also stated in The Icomos Charter for the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites known as Ename Charter as follows: The contributions of all periods to the significance of a site should be respected. Although particular eras and themes may be highlighted, all periods of the site's history as well as its contemporary context and significance should be considered in the interpretation process.

(Icomos 2005:36)

Tarsus, which is a multi-layered historical town in Turkey, inhabited from Neolithic era onwards and embracing various edifices from different periods, is chosen as the case study of this thesis. The existing methodology is utilized in the analysis and assessment of the historical stratification in Tarsus so as to obtain a thorough understanding of the multi-layered character and the reflections of the historical stratification in the current town. The existing methodology exploits archaeological and historical data obtained from different disciplines. However, for the compilation of archaeological data is not systematic or continuous especially in local levels (Tuna 1999:220). Therefore, the information utilized for the analysis and assessment process is not well-balanced for each period and should be improved and revised by further archaeological investigations.

While analyzing the urban history, the social life and structure in the historical periods are not apprehended unless there exists physical reflections of the former social life within the current town. When analyzing the historical edifices contributing to the town's character, mainly their existence and nonexistence are taken into consideration rather than their physical condition, material or construction techniques since it necessitates a profound study for their conservation decisions.

The existing methodology for the assessment of historical stratigraphy also covers the identification of different quality areas reflecting the interaction between the historical periods and with the current town. These different quality areas are evaluated for the determination of "cultural significance based on multi-layeredness".

After the determination of "cultural significance based on multi-layeredness", in order to make a comparison between the presentation principles assessed for multilayered historical towns and the recent presentation status in Tarsus, current presentation status of historical stratification in Tarsus is also evaluated. Firstly, former conservation and development practices together with the conservation and development plans are analyzed and evaluated specifically focusing on valorization, de-valorization and presentation approaches to historical stratification. Secondly, for the assessment of in-situ presentation status, information panels, landscaping, urban design and restoration works for presentation purposes are surveyed and evaluated. Afterwards, the touristic routes for different tourist profiles are analyzed by the information coming from Ministry of Culture and Tourism, Tarsus Tourist Information Center and Turkish Tour Guides Association (TUREB). Moreover, Açalya Alpan's masters thesis (Alpan 2005) is utilized as well for the understandings of the current integration status of historical stratification, internet sites of Tarsus Municipality<sup>2</sup> and Ministry of Culture<sup>3</sup>, touristic booklets of Tourism Information Center and Tarsus Municipality are utilized together with the academic sources.

As to the proposals for the presentation of historical stratification, different quality areas, which can be defined as the areas presenting different relations of historical layers among themselves and with the current town as mentioned before, constitutes the basis for the determination of itinerary routes and project areas.

After the identification of project areas, the cultural significances of buildings and open areas in the boundaries of the project areas are assessed for putting forward the presentation principles guiding the design stage. In this thesis, proposals are accomplished for in-situ presentation in the light of principles for itineraries, information panels and design interventions whereas for ex-situ presentations, only principles are set since the scope of ex-situ presentations ranges from virtual reconstructions to interactive web sites.

Finally, the current presentation status, conservation and development studies are compared with the newly introduced presentation principles followed by the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> www.tarsus.bel.tr

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> www.kultur.gov.tr

evaluation of these principles on the conservation and sustainability of multi-layered character of historical towns as an outcome of this thesis.

### **1.4 STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS**

In the introduction part, after a brief definition of "multi-layered historical towns", the main objectives, definition of the problem, aim and scope of the thesis along with the methodology are defined.

In the second chapter, as a background information, the methodology of the studies held in multi-layered historical towns are mentioned resulting with the process structured for the analysis and assessment of historical stratification. Furthermore, the information and value groups effecting the cultural significance of multilayeredness are put forward for the determination of cultural significance specific to multi-layered historical towns. Consequently, after an overview of interpretation and presentation issues and principles in conservation are discussed; the presentation and intervention principles specific to the character of multi-layered historical towns are put forward. The presentation principles cover in-situ presentations such as itinerary preparation, information panels and design interventions together with exsitu presentations in general.

In the third chapter, Tarsus which is a multi-layered historical town in the southeastern part of Turkey in Mediterranean region is conferred as the case study. Firstly, the historical stratification of Tarsus is analyzed by the existing methodology intended for multi-layered historical towns. Secondly the "cultural significance of multi-layeredness" is defined based on the different quality areas assessed as a result of the analysis phase. Consequently, the conservation and development history of the town is evaluated based on presentation decisions and approaches to the historical stratification. Accordingly, the current presentation status and presentation potential of the historical stratification in Tarsus is assessed. Based on the analysis, assessment and evaluations on the historical stratification of the town, a presentation proposal is put forward in order to reveal the multi-layered character of Tarsus in different scales and different mediums such as itineraries, information panels and design interventions. Finally, the results of the case study are discussed

by comparing the current presentation status and the proposed principles for presentation.

In the conclusion chapter, the approaches to the problem and evaluation of the case study are covered together with the discussion of the proposed presentation principles. As a final point, suggestions are made for further studies on the multilayered historical towns and their presentation issues.

### **CHAPTER 2**

# PRESENTATION PRINCIPLES BASED ON CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE OF MULTI-LAYERED HISTORICAL TOWNS

# 2.1 THE BACKGROUND: CONTENT AND PROCESS OF THE STUDIES TO UNDERSTAND AND ASSESS THE HISTORICAL STRATIFICATION IN MULTI-LAYERED HISTORICAL TOWNS

Studies, research and presentation of the spatial development of historic buildings and sites constitute one of the basic components the process of their conservation and rehabilitation. This should be based on a detailed study of the actual state (including the architectural survey), on information which can be deduced from the studied building or site, as well as on other textual or graphical sources.

(UNEP 1988:342)

To begin with, for the identification of successive historical periods, a comprehensive archaeological and historical research should be exploited. This research utilizes different kind of visual and written documents among with the data obtained from archaeological excavations and surveys. While dealing with these documents, it is essential to keep in mind that the "information sources"<sup>4</sup> can vary both in quality and reliability. The primary written and visual sources provides exact information whereas secondary sources are generally subjective and give indirect

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Information sources are defined as all material, written, oral and figurative sources which make it possible to know the nature, specifications, meaning and history of the cultural heritage. (Nara Document on Authenticity, 1994 App.2)

information. Therefore, in the research process, the reliability of knowledge should be clearly identified for the identification of historical periods.

In the workshop on the Methodology of Studying and Presenting the Spatial Development of Historic Buildings and Towns in Genoa, the necessities of the researches held in multi-layered towns are discussed as follows:

- to acquire a complete knowledge of our heritage and understand the factors which influenced its creation
- to identify the principles behind the development of a historic tissue or a building, and
- to find out the past uses, the organization of functions and design principles of urban and architectural heritage in order to facilitate the definition of the appropriate policy of intervention.

(UNEP 1988:342)

In order to acquire a complete knowledge and the factors which influenced the creation of multi-layered historical towns, the continuous creation process effecting the multi-layered character should primarily be taken into consideration. The uninterrupted occupancy in these towns, results with several phases or units of urban history that can be defined as "historical periods". These periods of historic evolution from the past to the present, accumulate within the town's physical form and reveal the relations such as continuities and interruptions between historic town and the new urban settlement. Therefore, for the assessment of multi-layeredness, after a detailed historical and archaeological research, it is essential to figure out the phases of transformation process, which are the successive historical periods.

It has to be kept mind that each successive period is contributing to the character of multi-layered historical towns and "the research should respect all layers equally regardless of the time when they came into existence, and irrespective of the researchers' or any other group interest " (UNEP 1988:343). Therefore, the research and analysis of the spatial development should cover all the historical periods first

separately and then as a whole. This research should specify every period not regarding one important than the other.

While analyzing these successive historical periods, each historical period, if legible, have to be studied with its own components for the understanding of their integrity. The components of urban form are the urban expansion areas, main axes, main buildings and edifices, urban structure, natural features and different function areas. After the analysis of every period separately; the superimposition of each layer with the former one and the interaction of successive layers among themselves and with the current town should be defined. As a result of the analysis of these interactions, "different quality areas" are identified. These areas are significant since they are the representatives of the specific character of multi-layered towns and constitutes the basis for the further decisions on conservation.

In "Planning and Management of Historic Cities -a Czech Approach and Example of a World Heritage City of TELČ", Miloš Drdácký suggests dividing the areas as: area which determines the character of a historical town; area which accompanies the character of a historical town and other area (Drdácký 2004 :8). In the case of multilayered historical towns, the areas determining the character of the town comprise maximum superimposition of successive historical periods which are defined as "continuity areas". Furthermore, the areas accompanying the character of the town will be, "identity areas" which represent the character specific for each historical period. Since these areas are either determining or accompanying the character of multi-layered historical towns; after their survey, the interpretation and presentation principles have to be identified based on the designated qualities of each area to enhance their stratigraphic character.

In "Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas" which is also known as Washington Charter, it is stated that, knowledge of the history of a historic town or urban area should be expanded through archaeological investigation and appropriate preservation of archaeological findings (Icomos 1987:2). The importance of research by using the historic and archaeological sources is also highlighted in "Burra Charter" and according to the Charter; work held on a place

should be preceded by studies to understand the place which should include analysis of physical, documentary, oral and other evidence, drawing on appropriate knowledge, skills and disciplines (Icomos 1988:11).

Therefore, as mentioned before, for the analysis of multi-layered historical towns, information sources and data on the urban history and material evidences play an important role. These information sources can be divided into two as primary sources and secondary sources according to the accuracy of knowledge they involve. The primary sources are inscription panels, foundation charters and some of the archive documents such as construction records whereas secondary sources are travelers books, miniatures and engravings (Bakırer 1982: 22-24).

For the studies held in multi-layered towns, the primary sources can be increased as the data obtained from archaeological excavations and surveys together with the inscription panels for dating the buildings, historical maps whereas secondary sources can be data obtained from travelers books, engravings etc (Bilgin,1996:33-34). The information obtained from the sources has to be supported with site surveys in order to assess the current state of the historical stratification. The methodology for the analysis of multi-layered historical towns is derived from the existing methodology of urban archaeological studies dealing with archaeology in urban areas.

According to P. Sommella (1984:5),

A correct methodology for urban archaeology should comply with the obligatory, successive stages. Cartographic surveys, direct analysis of the technical stages and planimetric integration of remains according to typological standards thus make it possible to establish the importance of the buildings on, and hence the socio-economic significance of, each plot studied and to follow through the successive transformations and new uses made up of such plots up to the present day. It is thus possible to combine the identification of appropriate solutions for future development and the pursuit of specific surveys involving stratigraphic excavation.

This proper methodology is defined as the "diachronic documentation"<sup>5</sup> which is defined as the analysis of each historical period separately for an integral understanding of horizontal relations of the edifices in each period. After the analysis of each historical period separately, for the understanding of vertical relations between the historical layers, diachronic plans are superimposed which results with "the comprehensive understanding of an urban environment by means of horizontal and vertical cross-sectional analyses and thematic studies presenting the full history of the cities" Paolo Sommella (1984:2).

As an outcome of this diachronic approach, "a synchronic whole is approached in which the contribution of each of the different stages is equal and in which none of the phases are underestimated or neglected" (Bilgin 1996:35). Following the diachronic plans and their superimposition, by the relation of historical periods with each other as well as the current town results with the identification of "different quality areas".

In urban archaeological studies, the different quality areas are defined as "urban archaeology character zones" and identified according to the conserved and destroyed archaeological potential such as categories like "conservation areas" (restricted development), "research areas and controlled development areas", "limited development areas" and "development areas" (Belge 2005:10). When the urban archaeology character zones are evaluated, the classification is based on archaeological deposits their conservation status and potential. However, in the case of multi-layered historical towns the character zones are classified according to the successive historical periods, their relation among each other and with the current town.

These different quality areas are firstly the "character zones" for each period that the character of a historical period is revealed and perceived in reference to the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> The term "diachronic documentation" is used by Güliz Bilgin Altınöz in her masters thesis to define the documentation each period separately for the understanding of the integrity of each period in itself. (Bilgin, A. G., 1996)
survived edifices. Whereas, the character zones for multi-layered historical towns are the areas where edifices from different periods are superimposed on top of each other that can be distinguished as physical continuity areas. These physical continuity areas are defined as "identity areas" <sup>6</sup> in urban archaeological studies. (Bilgin 1996:49)

When it comes to the relation of the historical stratification with the current town, the developments effect the different quality areas representing the multi-layered character of historical towns. One of these areas can be defined as "risk areas"<sup>7</sup> where superimposed layers are susceptible to urban development and this development will cause deterioration and loss of physical evidences of past settlements. Therefore, the risk areas can be defined as the areas where historical periods overlap with the new development areas of the historic town and cause destruction of the historical stratification.

The other areas in relation with the current town are "reserve areas" that are also mentioned in urban archaeological studies as archaeological reserves.<sup>8</sup> In the case of multi-layered towns these zones are the areas where there is an archaeological potential and urban development is not a threat for historical stratification and can be preserved for further archaeological surveys and excavations in future. Therefore, the reserve areas can be defined as areas that the archaeological and cultural deposits exist without any destruction underneath the current town unintentionally, having archaeological potential.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> These character zones are defined as identity areas by Güliz Bilgin Altınöz in her masters thesis (Bilgin, A. G., 1996)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Risk areas are mentioned by Güliz Bilgin Altınöz in her masters thesis (Bilgin, A. G., 1996. Urban Archaeology As the Basis for the Studies on the Future of the Town; Case Study: Bergama)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage in 1992, introduces the concept of reserve areas as: the creation of archaeological reserves even where there are no visible remains on the ground or under water, for the preservation of material evidence to be studied for later generations. (Madran, Özgönül:414)

As a result of the considerations above, it can be stated that, determination of the different quality areas plays an important role for the sustainability of multi-layered character and determination of conservation strategies for the future developments. Based on the existing methodology on the assessment of historical stratification, for a comprehensive analysis and evaluation, the process of research in multi-layered historical towns should be determined as a prerequisite for the accuracy of presentation.

To begin with, **historical topography and natural aspects** of the town have to be analyzed since they are the fundamental elements of the historical town during their formation process and can be accepted as the first historical layer.<sup>9</sup> While analyzing the natural aspects, the environmental factors should also be taken into consideration in regional scale.

Following the historical topography and natural aspects, the **historical periods** which constitute the town's character have to be identified considering the availability of information and their physical reflections in the current town. Each period should be analyzed with its **components** such as urban expansion areas, main axes, major buildings and edifices, open areas etc. Based on the reliability of information derived from the historical sources, **the existing and probable elements** of each historical period have to be identified and differentiated.

After the detection of each historical period, the interaction among different historical periods with each other and with the current town have to be identified since they are the indicators of continuity, interruption and transformations in urban form. As a result of the analysis of the interactions, different quality areas of multi-layered historical towns have to be identified since these areas are the representatives of historical stratigraphy and have to be utilized in conservation decisions. These different quality areas are:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> The importance of historical topography is also mentioned in European code of goof practice: "Archaeology and the Urban Project" as an important part of the character of the town and has to be conserved. (Council of Europe, 2000:3)

- Reserve Areas<sup>10</sup> that can be defined as areas that are not susceptible to urban development or the areas where the continuous superimposition is interrupted at a certain period. Therefore, these areas should firstly be designated and conserved today and then reserved for further investigations in the future.
- Identity Areas of Each Historical Period are the areas representing the characteristic of a specific historical period and include survived edifices from that period which are conserved until present.
- Identity Areas of Multi-layeredness of the historical town are the areas where different historical periods superimpose and physical evidences from different periods still exist, which can also be defined as continuity areas with maximum stratification.
- Risk Areas are the areas that are susceptible to urban development and having more possibility to lose their stratigraphic character.

The understanding and assessment process of historical stratigraphy is fundamental for the identification of cultural significance of multi-layeredness. Therefore these principles derived from the existing assessment methodology constitutes the basis for the conservation of multi-layered historical towns.

## 2.2 CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE OF MULTI-LAYERED HISTORICAL TOWNS

Conservation decisions whether they are concerned with giving a building "heritage" status, deciding which building to invest in, planning for the future of a historic site, or applying a treatment to a monumentuse an articulation of heritage values (often called "cultural significance") as a reference point. Assessment of the values

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> In the creation of reserve areas are encouraged since the usage of the archaeological site for either enhancement of research is said to be progressively destroying them. (APPEAR, 2005:37)

attributed to heritage is a very important activity in any conservation effort, since values strongly shape the decisions that are made.

(Mason 2002:5)

Therefore in order to put forward any principle or strategy related to cultural heritage, the primary step should be the determination of "cultural significance". The term is generated by Burra Charter in 1988 meaning aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations which is embodied in the place itself (ICOMOS 1988:5).

In the case of multi-layered historical towns, formed as a result of successive creation process, these towns constitute a different character defined as historical stratification. Therefore, it is important to assess the cultural significance specific for multi-layered character of these towns which is the basis of their conservation. According to Feilden and Jokiletho (1993 : 77),

The value of an historic town is embodied in the material testimony of its stones and its structures, and often lies beneath their visible surface. This historical stratigraphy -the evidence and marks brought by changes in use over time, as well as the connections and continuity that make an individual building part of the urban context- constitutes the basis for establishing the criteria for its conservation.

Therefore, the assessment of cultural significance based on historical stratification is important for both understanding the specific character of multi-layered historic towns and valorization of the cultural significance. Furthermore, the cultural significance of multi-layeredness provides the basis for any type of intervention, presentation and conservation activities.

In "Policy Statement on Restoration, Reconstruction and Speculative Recreation of Archaeological Sites Including Ruins" prepared by English Heritage, (English Heritage 2001:6) the importance of this continuous creation process and its effect on cultural significance is promoted as follows: Significance involves a detailed understanding of the historic fabric of the site and how it has changed through time, and then an assessment of the values - both historic and contemporary - ascribed to that fabric. Significance may lie both in the earliest phase of the site, and in any changes to it.

Accordingly, the physical evidences of the continuous creation process are important factors effecting the historical stratification. Hence, the assessment of 'cultural significance of multi-layeredness' and the identification of information groups in the assessment process are essential for the sustainability of the character of these historical towns. In this thesis, "cultural significance of multilayeredness" refers the physical values specific to the historical stratification apart from the social, economic or other aspects of cultural significance.

To begin with, as the first step of cultural significance assessment, the current state of historical stratification should be determined since current state effects the interpretation, conservation and presentation principles. Consequently, information groups which will be collected and utilized in the assessment process should be identified. Some of these information groups are valid for all types of studies in historic towns whereas most of them are specific to multi-layered ones.

The current state assessment includes; identification of cultural heritage including basic information like the name, address and the category of the edifice or area. Since the historic town that is dealt with has multi-layered character, the edifices should be classified according to the historical periods. For the determination of the period of the edifices, together with the bibliographical sources, inscription panels with construction dates are also utilized.

For future decisions on presentation or any kind of intervention; ownership status whether the buildings and areas are in private ownership or public such as municipality, foundation or treasury should be identified. Also the registration status of the edifices or open areas should be identified since it shows that registered edifices or open areas are legally conserved and the recognized as cultural heritage. Another aspect is the accuracy of knowledge of the information utilized in the determination of cultural significance. The accuracy of knowledge depends on the type of the sources such as the primary or secondary sources and their reliability. It is known that when an information is obtained from secondary sources, the subjectivity of the information has to be considered. Also, the level of investigation of the edifices or open areas can give sufficient information on the period and building category. Besides, the degree of knowledge on the existence of the edifices or open areas is an important criteria for current state assessment.

 Table 1 Information used for the current state assessment

CURRENT STATE ASSESSMENT
dentification: Name, Address, Building Category, Number of Storey
Classification according to Historical Periods: Period, Construction Date, Inscription Panel
Current Status: Ownership, Registration Status
Accuracy of Knowledge: Types of Sources and their Reliability, Degree of Knowledge on Existence, Level of Investigation

For the determination of accuracy of knowledge, the types of sources have to be categorized as follows:

- Primary Sources
  - o Visual
    - Photographs
    - Maps
  - o Written
    - Foundation Charters
    - Excavation Reports
    - Inscription Panels

- Secondary Sources
  - o Written
    - Travelers Books
    - Oral
    - Academic Sources
- Data coming from the physical evidences

In this case, primary sources and the data coming from the physical evidences can be accepted as more accurate sources than the secondary sources. After the determination of the types of sources, the information coming from the sources should also be categorized for the understanding of edifices. The degree of knowledge on existences<sup>11</sup> differentiate according to knowledge groups as follows:

- Location
- Period
- Building type
- Building contour
- Building height
- Building function

When it comes to the cultural significance of multi-layeredness, the information categories which are essential for the assessment should be analyzed. These categories are authenticity (state of preservation), information obtained for the determination of historical periods, information utilized for the determination of different quality areas, integration together with rarity, representativeness and sustainability.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Degree of knowledge on existence is a term offered by Güliz Bilgin Altınöz by the information groups as existence, location, dimension& form. (Bilgin Altınöz, A. G., 2002: 124)

The state of preservation which can be obtained by types and levels of intervention and change status is important for the identification of authenticity. Also, determination of different historical layers is very important since these layers constitute the multi-layered character of historic towns. These historical periods are identified considering the period of edifices, state of survivals, knowledge on existences, level of investigation, sources along with their reliability, depth and density of cultural and archeological deposits.

By evaluating the interaction of the historical periods among each other and with the current town, different quality areas are identified. These areas are continuity areas that can be divided into physical, functional and social continuity areas. For the determination of continuity areas, the expansion areas of each period, the buildings survived from each period, their function and state of survival should be analyzed. In addition to the continuity areas; risk, identity and reserve areas are also identified as a result of the interaction of different periods with the current town. As to the values specific to multi-layeredness, sustainability, continuity, rarity and representativeness of historical stratification are important for putting forward the presentation principles.

Consequently; for the conservation, interpretation and presentation of multi-layered historical towns; it is important to collect necessary information for evaluating this historical stratigraphy. This information can be visualized in the cultural significance chart together with the cultural significance categories.

Table 2 Information used for the Determination of Cultural Significance

#### DETERMINATION OF CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE

State of Preservation: Types and level of Intervention, Types and level of Changes

**Determination of Different Historical Periods:** Period, Types of Sources and Reliability, Degree of Knowledge on Existence, Level of Investigation, Depth and Density of Archaeological and Cultural Deposits, State of Survival

**Identification of Different Quality Areas:** Urban Expansion Areas of Each Historical Period, Continuity Areas, Risk Areas, Identity Areas, Reserve Areas

**Sustainability:** State of Survival, Condition, Used/ Abandoned, Relation of Archaeological and Cultural Deposits with the Current Layer

Continuity: Building Category, Current Use, Physical Continuity, Functional Continuity

Integration: Physical Integration, Functional Integration, Visual Integration

Rarity/ Representativeness: Rare for its period, Representative of its period

The cultural significance of the edifices and areas in multi-layered historical towns, authenticity or the state of preservation of the edifices is an important value. For the identification of authenticity, types and level of interventions whether excavation or restoration works took place and the types of changes that the edifices have faced to are important criteria.

Availability of information and existing physical evidences are the important factors for the classification of historical periods. First of all, the periods of the physical traces have to be identified. Secondly, for the evaluation of available information, types of sources and their reliability, level of investigations, degree of knowledge on existences, depth and density of archaeological and cultural deposits are the information groups to be utilized for the determination of different historical periods. Finally, state of survivals of the edifices have to be classified for the evaluation of existing physical traces. There are seven different cases for the identification of state of survivals as follows:<sup>12</sup>

- whole and intact remains
- intense remains forming more than one part of a whole
- intense remains forming a part of a whole
- scattered remains not giving information about the whole
- gaps which the non existence of the edifices are the traces for their existence
- destroyed and not survived edifices
- edifices whose state of survivals are unknown

(Altınöz 2002:124)

Sustainability is another criteria effecting the cultural significance of edifices. Sustainability can be determined by analyzing the current physical conditions and state of survivals of the edifices. Besides, relation of archaeological and cultural deposits with the current layer whether new buildings with basements are constructed on top or public open areas on top etc. In some of the cases, archaeological destruction can not be identified. Also if the buildings are not used, it also effects the sustainability of the physical traces.

Another aspect of the cultural significance of multi-layeredness is the identification of different quality areas. For different quality areas, urban expansion areas of each historical periods have to be superimposed together with the current town. Also the survived physical evidences from different historical periods are analyzed for identifying these areas. As a result of this superimposition, due to the interaction between the periods, these quality areas are assessed as follows:

- "Physical Continuity Areas" where physical traces from different historical periods overlap vertically or horizontally and represent the multi-layered character of the town.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> Guliz Bilgin Altınöz classifies the state of survival of the sites and edifices as five groups (Altınöz 2002:124)

- "Functional Continuity Areas" where buildings from different periods with the same function overlap vertically or horizontally.
- "Risk Areas" where cultural and archaeological deposits are threatened by urban developments.
- "Identity Areas" where survived edifices from each historical period represents the character of the periods.
- "Reserve Areas" where cultural and archaeological deposits are conserved unintentionally and have potential for further investigations.

Along with the continuity areas in town scale, the continuity in building scale should also be determined. The physical continuity (whether the building from a period is used, integrated or transformed in latter periods with physical reflections or functional continuity) the current and original uses of the buildings should be recorded. Moreover, rarity and representative of a specific period or historical stratification are other contributions to cultural significance of multi-layeredness.

When the cultural significance of multi-layered historical towns are evaluated, some of the value groups which are already defined in conservation are adapted for multilayered historical towns such as:

- Rarity
  - o Rare physical evidences<sup>13</sup> that survived from their period
  - Edifices, physical evidences which are the only indicators of a historical period
- Representativeness
  - o Physical evidences that are the representatives of a historical period
  - Physical evidences that are representatives of relations of different historical periods
- Documentary

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> The physical evidences can be edifices, open areas, remains or other components of urban form.

- Physical evidences which are the indicators of town's historical stratification
- Social
  - Physical evidences that have potential for the creation of public awareness of historical stratification
- Scientific
  - Physical evidences that have potential for dissemination of information on historical stratification
  - Physical traces that have investigation potential for revealing new information on historical stratigraphy.
- Authenticity
  - o Physical evidences that still preserve their multi-layered character

Besides the adaptation or re-definition of existing values, new values which are specific for multi-layered historical towns are also identified such as:

- Continuity
  - Physical continuity, physical traces that reflect the superimposition of different periods
  - Functional continuity, physical traces which preserve their original functions or areas where buildings with similar functions superimpose vertically or horizontally
- Integrity
  - o Physical evidences constructed together
  - Physical evidences from the same period
- Sustainability
  - o Physical evidences that are whole and intact
  - o Physical evidences that are not susceptible to urban development
- Integration

- Physical integration which is defined as physical evidences that are existing together, combined or utilized in latter periods or current town
- Functional integration whether the physical evidences are used by inhabitants or tourists
- Visual integration whether physical evidences are perceivable within the current town.

# 2.3 PRINCIPLES FOR THE PRESENTATION OF MULTI-LAYERED HISTORICAL TOWNS

## 2.3.1 Presentation and Interpretation Issues in Conservation

Interpretation is the explicit form of understanding; and both interpretation and understanding only occur in application, in our design proposals in restoring monuments, providing for visitors facilities, landscaping cultural sites and integrating archaeological and architectural heritage to the urban environment in the cities.

(Ganiatsas 1996 :19)

The increase in appreciation and awareness of cultural heritage is an important way for its survival and conservation. This appreciation can be achieved by the interpretation and presentation of cultural heritage to public. Although interpretation may refer to popular and touristic approaches to cultural heritage in general, it has to be considered not only a tool for achieving public awareness but also a way of conservation if it is utilized appropriately.

Furthermore, interpretation does not only help a better understanding of cultural heritage but also embodies the strategies for intervention. According to Vassilis Ganiatsas, who is a researcher and a member of Icomos Greece, both interpretation and understanding only occur in application, in design proposals, visitors facilities, landscaping and integrating archaeological and architectural heritage to the urban environment in the cities (Ganiatsas 1994:19).

The scope of interpretation has been discussed starting from the introduction of the term by Freeman Tilden with his book "Interpreting Our Heritage" in 1957. Tilden defines interpretation as an "educational activity which aims to reveal meaning and relationships through the use of original objects, by first-hand experience, and by illustrative media, rather than simply to communicate factual information." (Tilden 1957:8)

Since the term interpretation constantly evolves, the definition changes throughout the time considering different approaches to the cultural heritage. "Icomos Charter for the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites" which is generally known as Ename Charter, the definition is as follows:

"Interpretation refers to the full range of potential activities intended to heighten public awareness and enhance understanding of cultural heritage site. These can include print and electronic publications, public lectures, on-site and directly related off-site installations, educational programmes, community activities, and ongoing research, training, and evaluation of the interpretation process itself."

(Icomos 2007:3)

Although there are a lot of definitions for the term interpretation, the definition of Burra Charter is a simple but wide definition embracing all different approaches to the term as "interpretation means all the ways of presenting the cultural significance of a place." (Icomos 1988 :8) Although cultural significance is the leading criteria for interpretation and presentation and specific to a building or a historic town, there are some commonly accepted principles for effective interpretation of cultural significance.

In "Interpreting Our Heritage" Freeman Tilden (Tilden1957) points out six guiding principles for interpretation which are regarded as the basic principles of interpretation that can be summarized as:

- Any interpretation that does not somehow relate what is being displayed or described to something within the personality of experience of the visitor will be sterile.
- Information, as such as, is not interpretation. Interpretation is revelation based upon information but they are entirely different things. However, all interpretation includes information.
- Interpretation is an art, which combines many arts, whether the materials presented are scientific, historical or architectural. Any art is in some degree teachable.
- The chief aim of interpretation is not instruction, but provocation.
- Interpretation should aim to present a whole rather than a part, and must address itself to the whole man rather than any phase.
- Interpretation addressed to children, should not be a dilution of the presentation to adults, but should follow a fundamentally different approach.

(Tilden 1957:9)

By the initiation of Freeman Tilden, these principles are discussed and improved in the following years and starting from 2002 by the initiation of Icomos, in five years time, a charter is prepared for the determination of interpretation and presentation principles and objectives. In this Icomos Charter for the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites, seven objectives are mentioned for effective interpretation as; access and understanding, information sources, attention to setting and context, preservation of authenticity, planning for sustainability, concern for inclusiveness and importance of research, training and evaluation (Icomos 2007:4).

Following these general objectives pointed out by Icomos Charter, accepted for comprehensive interpretation, the thesis focuses basically on presentation principles and strategies, which is an important way of interpretation. As said by Israel Antiquities Authority, "in order for the public to gain an understanding of and appreciation for the cultural significance of sites, they must be presented to the public, and suitable services and information pertaining to the site's messages and values must be provided." (Israel Antiquities Authority 2003:12)

While determining the cultural significance of a building or a historical site, it has to be taken into consideration that the values constituting this significance is various. Therefore, the character of the building, site or town, which is subjected to presentation that constitutes the cultural significance, is the basic criteria for the identification of detailed presentation principles. In the case of multi-layered historical towns, the cultural significance has to be considered in order to reveal the historical development of the town by revealing their stratigraphy.

The enhancement of cultural significance of multi-layered historical towns has to be achieved by interventions considering the historical stratification. The interventions can be defined as "the manner of appreciating archaeological and architectural heritage, the way we intervene to his heritage by imposing a certain meaning or certain contemporary additions or uses to it, and finally the way we integrate heritage to contemporary life." (Ganiatsas 1996:14)

Vassilis Ganiatsas classifies the interventions according to their kind and degree as:

- "The way in which an archaeological site, a monument, a historical site, is documented, illustrated and presented to the public.
- The way we valorize monuments for educational, scientific or cultural tourism reasons.
- The way in which we integrate archaeological sites, monuments and traditional and historic architecture to the urban and socio-cultural reality of our times."

(Ganiatsas 1996:14)

The interventions classified by Vassilis Ganiatsas is regarded and defined as "presentation" in this thesis and the principles and objectives are discussed based on this framework. The identification of principles and design proposals for presentation of historical stratification are two-folded. First of all, the presentation of a site should aim to bring history to life by use of the remaining archaeological evidence (Torre 1993:51); therefore the assessment of current condition is the primary step.

The current condition affecting presentation principles are first the quality of the material remains since they are the subject of the presentation. This includes the state of survival, material condition and level of intervention of the buildings or sites. These categories help to establish the authenticity of the remains and their integrity. The available information on the cultural heritage is the other aspect affecting the assessment of current condition. The level of investigation, the knowledge on existence and types and reliability of sources are the attributes serving as background for presentation principles. Besides the assessment of current condition presentation potentials is another aspect for defining presentation principles.

Enhancing The Values Of Urban Archaeological Sites Practical Guide, which is prepared by APPEAR,<sup>14</sup> points out some questions that helps to determine the presentation potentials of the edifices and sites as follows:

- "the location of the remains: are they close to the historic centre of the town? What use and functions do the adjacent areas serve? What activities are undertaken in the area? Are these compatible with the integration of a heritage site?
- How accessible is the site and the area surrounding it? What are the access routes? What are the circuits used by the people passing through the area? Are these likely to encourage visitors?
- The visibility of the remains: are they of significance to the area? Do they represent a reference point and an attraction?
- Their impact on the surrounding area; do the remains affect the urban unity and cohesion? If so, in what way? Is the surrounding are able to integrate the remains?"

(Appear 2005:23)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> Accessibility Projects. Sustainable Preservation and Enhancement of Urban Subsoil Archaeological Remains

As it can be understood from Appear Guide, the basic concepts for identifying the presentation potentials are; accessibility both in the town scale and building scale, position and physical perception of the remains, their integration and attraction.

It has to be kept in mind that every site is unique both in its present and past realities; appropriate interpretation depends on the physical evidence that has survived (Torre 1995:52). Therefore presentation should consider every site with its own context and entirety together with the physical condition and presentation potentials.

According to Feilden and Jokiletho (1993:100),

"All World Heritage sites have more than one important story to tell about their history; the way they were constructed or destroyed, the people who lived there, the various activities and the happenings, the previous uses of the sites and perhaps tales of the notable treasures. In presenting and interpreting the historical story of the heritage site, it is necessary to be selective and to decide which elements will be, of most interest to the kind of people that the site will attract; human interest stories are often the most popular."

Since multi-layered historical towns are the subject of this thesis, the main concern of the presentations have to be the historical stratification of the town excluding the social, economical and other aspects.

The term presentation covers a wide range of techniques both in-situ and ex-situ varying from town scale to building scale. In "Icomos Charter for the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites", presentation embraces a variety of technical means such as information panels, museum-type displays, walking tours, lectures, multimedia applications and websites. (Icomos 2007:3)

Although there are various ways of presenting cultural significance; the thesis covers on-site presentations including information panels, walking tours and design

intervention aiming the enhancement of cultural significance among with the principles for ex-situ presentations.

The in-situ presentations have different aims and different methods which can be categorized as:

- Archaeological Presentation; which can be understood as preserved excavations with the visual information, drawings, explanations etc.
- Didactic Presentation; reconstruction of an archaeological site or object in one to one scale.
- Architectural Presentation; where archaeological information and their interpretations are a basis for a project superstructure or serve as a motive for a new architecture.

(Momirski 1994 : 43)

The thesis covers archaeological and architectural presentation categories including open air presentation, undercover presentation, touristic routes, information panels of different quality areas or edifices. The principles of these presentation types are determined according to the "cultural significance of multi-layeredness" for enhancement and conservation of historical stratification.

Thomas Mann remarked that "to inherit one must also understand; inheritance is after all culture" and the presentation of a site can be considered to contribute to this "understanding" by transmitting the agreed values of the site. At one level this will be achieved by providing information, interpretation signs and guides. At the same time, presentation is also "*mise en valeur*"<sup>15</sup>. (Pound 2002:3)

In other words, the prior objective of the studies and information on the town's history provided by urban archaeology activities must be, helping the inhabitants knowing the vicissitudes through which the town has passed over the years, thus satisfying an implicit social need, namely "knowledge of the past" as a basis on which a social body may assert its own identity (Council of Europe 1991:5).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> "*mise en valeur*" is a French term for defining enhancement

This "knowledge on the past" can be achieved by the presentation of the town's history and historical stratification. Focusing on this aim, the principles for the presentations and interventions concerning the character of multi-layered historical towns should be identified.

# 2.3.2 Principles Concerning the Interventions Held in Multi-Layered Historical Towns

Based on the issues discussed on the presentation matters in conservation and the cultural significance of multi-layeredness, principles are put forward for the interventions held in multi-layered historical towns. The objectives of these principles are basically to conserve and sustain the historical stratification.

<u>First of all, the physical evidences that contribute the multi-layered character of historical towns have documentary value which are irreplaceable.</u><sup>16</sup> Therefore, the conservation of these evidences is an asset which should be considered in any kind of intervention.

Since the data from different periods can change according to new investigations, **minimum intervention** is a necessity for the conservation of the data to be observed in future with different perspectives, new methodologies and new evaluations in the light of new investigations. Following the same intention, the interventions have to be **reversible** and **renewable** allowing new modifications due to the new discoveries revealing new information on the physical evidences leading to a change in the evaluation of these evidences. Besides, by reversibility the damage on the original data will be minimum enabling new interventions.

Furthermore, the context is an important aspect for all types of cultural heritage. In the case of multi-layered historical towns, physical evidences are more to stand out with their context since the context indicates the interaction among historical periods. Therefore the interventions should consider the **context** of the physical

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> The irreplaceability of archaeological remains are also mentioned in "Archaeology and the Urban Project" (Council of Europe, 2000:3)

evidences. Accordingly, the interventions have to allow **in-situ** conservation as much as possible since the edifices have their essence specific to their context.<sup>17</sup>

Since the physical evidences are the traces of multi-layeredness, any intervention should concern the **sustainability**<sup>18</sup> of the physical data. The sustainability can be defined as "the capacity for the cultural and natural heritage to adapt itself to the current needs and requests through the adaptation of structures and functions" (Council of Europe 2002:90)

The towns are created as a result of continuous habitation. In this creation process, since all historical periods are contributing the historical continuity of the town, **respecting all the historical periods equally**, is important for the conservation of the town's character .Therefore for the identification of a former period, a latter period can not be destroyed or removed and also a certain period can not be highlighted regarding the rest as insignificant.

Another aspect concerning the historical stratification is <u>the physical edifices</u> <u>constituting the multi-layered character the town can be re-evaluated by further</u> <u>studies and investigations.<sup>19</sup></u>

In the view of the re-evaluations, the interventions have to be **adaptable** allowing modifications according to new information conducted from new investigations. But since each physical evidence has its own entity and specific conservation problems, these adaptability should not be understood as adaptability for different cases of historical stratification.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> The importance of in-situ preservation is mentioned in different international documents such as, the International Charter for Archaeological Heritage Management in 1990 by Icomos ; Burra Charter in 1988 by Icomos and the European Code of Practice: Archaeology and the Urban Project in 2000.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> Sustainability is also indicated in the interpretation plan for a cultural heritage site as a central goal in The Icomos Charter for the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites Proposed Final Draft, 2007

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> The ongoing process of research in urban archaeology as the development of methods of excavation or analysis or acquisition of new knowledge and the probability of reassessment is also mentioned in 'Enhancing The Values Of Urban Archaeological Sites Practical Guide' (APPEAR 2005 :37)

Another issue for the interventions is the efficiency of knowledge. If there are not enough information guiding interventions, the physical traces shouldn't be intervened for any purpose but be consolidated to prevent further deterioration if necessary or left as they are.

The dissemination of accurate knowledge is also significant for the comprehensive understanding of the multi-layered historical towns.

Since accuracy of knowledge is important, **reliability of historical sources**<sup>20</sup> has to be identified according to the types of historical sources as primary or secondary sources. Also, the determination of **level of investigations** of the edifices has to be mentioned since they indirectly reflect the accuracy of knowledge of the physical evidences. **Degree of knowledge on existences** of historical evidences such as their period, building type, location, building contour, height etc. are also important in order to achieve accuracy.

Since multi-layeredness is important for collective memory and constitutes the town's identity, it has to be perceivable and accessible.<sup>21</sup>

Therefore, all the sites, ruins and edifices have to be **physically accessible** for entrance and observation, hence any type of intervention should provide accessibility to physical traces.

Due to the superimposition of successive periods on top of each other, in most of the cases, the latter layer effect the perception of the former one. In addition new constructions also destroy the visual integrity of the physical traces. In consequence, interventions should contribute the **perception** of the sites, ruins and edifices within the current town together with the perception of the relations of successive periods. The term perception refers to town scale, site scale and edifice

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> The necessity of reliability in the information and adequacy of resources is mentioned in Enhancing The Values Of Urban Archaeological Sites Practical Guide(APPEAR 2005:14)
 <sup>21</sup> Accessibility is define as physical and intellectual access by the public to cultural heritage

sites in Icomos The Icomos Charter for the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites Proposed Final Draft, 2007 (Icomos 2007:6)

scale for an appropriate perception, interventions should achieve an **integral perception** of multi-layeredness in all scales.

Since multi-layeredness is important for town's identity, **physical**, **visual**, **functional and social integration** of the physical evidences with the current town should be provided by interventions for both their sustainability and their contribution to town's identity. In addition, integration may lead to social awareness and appreciation by the inhabitants.

# 2.3.3 Principles Concerning the Presentations Held in Multi-Layered Historical Towns

In order to propose principles for the presentations held in multi-layered historical towns, the current potential of the edifices for presentation has to be assessed primarily. For the determination of presentation potential, accessibility, integrity, presentation status, integration, and attraction are the key information groups that have to be analyzed.

The accessibility of the buildings and areas is one of the main criteria for their presentation. Accessibility can be perceived in two scales; firstly accessibility within the town whether the building is in the city center, on the main axes or on the periphery. Secondly, accessibility in building scale is also important for entrance and observation. For accessibility in building scale, ownership, position of the buildings and on-going excavation or restoration works have to be taken into consideration.

In addition, the integrity of the buildings are also considered since; for the evaluation, the relation of these buildings with other ones is important whether the buildings are constructed together, in the same period, having same functions or being part of the same vista.

 Table 3 Information groups used for the determination of presentation potential

PRESENTATION POTENTIAL		
<b>Accessibility:</b> Accessibility within the present city, Accessibility for entrance & observation, Ownership, On-going restoration and excavation works		
<b>Integrity:</b> Group of buildings from the same period, Group of buildings with the same function, Group of buildings constructed together, Part of a vista		
Presentation Status: In-situ (Signboards, Information panels, Tourist Routes), Ex-situ (Guide Books, Internet, Academic Sources)		
Integration	Physical Integration (Existing together with the latter elements, Combination of the remains with latter elements and forming a newly introduced whole, Utilization of the remains for new uses)	
	Functional Integration (Use by the inhabitants, Use by the tourists)	
	Visual Integration (Position / Perception, Landmark, Visual Obstacles)	
Attraction	Social & Economic (Touristic, Religious, Inhabitant's, Economic)	
	Physical (Landmark, Position, Perception, State of Survival, View point/Vista)	
	Attribution	
	Reference Point	

The edifices which do not constitute their physical entity as a whole are defined as remains. These remains have to be analyzed according to their integration with the current town. This integration is categorized as physical, functional and visual integration. The physical integration of the remains can be in different ways such as:

- Existing together with the latter elements of the town without any destruction or combination
- Combination of the remains with latter elements and forming a newly introduced whole within the existing context. (a building type changed to another and form a new building type which is still used by the inhabitants)
- Utilization of the remains for new uses
  - o Positive utilization (utilization for presentation)
  - o Negative utilization (utilization as building element or material)

As to the visual integration, position and perception of the buildings, landmarks or visual obstacles, which can be regarded as the indicator of disintegration, are the other aspects to be considered for assessing the presentation status. The use of the remains by the inhabitants or tourists is a measure for functional integration.

Attraction is another aspect, which should be analyzed both for the presentation potential and for further decisions on presentation. Attraction can be either physical or environmental such as being a landmark, position and perception of the buildings, state of survival, having vistas or social. The social attraction covers touristic, religious or economic attraction. When it comes to the associations, these associations can be understood as the special meaning for the inhabitants as being a reference point, associated with a specific event, person or a legend.

Besides the presentation potentials, the current presentation of historical buildings or areas should also be analyzed for further proposals for presentation. The presentation status of historical stratification is divided into two as in-situ and ex-situ presentation which includes signboards, information panels, internet and booklets.

As to the presentation principles, these principles aim a comprehensive understanding and enhancement of historical stratification which is an asset for the conservation and sustainability of multi-layered character of historical towns.

The multi-layered character of the town is constituted by the superimposition of successive historical periods throughout the history of the town. Therefore, **each historical period has to be differentiated** both in building scale and town scale for presentation purposes. Accordingly, the **contextual relations** of the historical periods among themselves and with the current town have to be considered.

Different from other historical towns, the continuous superimposition of historical layers is the character of multi-layered historical towns which is an important criteria of their cultural significance. Therefore, the presentations have to **strengthen the apprehension of "cultural significance of multi-layeredness".** 

One of the major problems related to multi-layered historical towns is the lack in perceiving the historical stratification. Accordingly, the presentations have to

contribute to **traceability** of historical stratification in the current town. Although the physical traces of historical stratification exist in multi-layered historical towns, in most of the cases these evidences can not be apprehended. Therefore, the presentations have to contribute to the **legibility** of the physical evidences.

For historical stratification, each historical period is constituted from urban components such as expansion areas, main axes, buildings or different function areas. Hence, the presentations have to consider each period with its urban components and achieve the **integrity** of these components in town scale.

In multi-layered historical towns, the physical traces can also be a component of a building complex or the buildings can be constructed together or have the same functions. Therefore, presentations have to achieve **integrity in site scale**, relieving the relations among the edifices.

Since multi-layered historical towns are created in time by the superimposition of different periods, the edifices from the former periods sometimes abandoned in latter periods, resulting with the loss in the integrity of the edifices. Accordingly, the presentation have to **assist the perception of the integrity** of an edifice itself and its context.

For the perception of the integrity of historical periods, accessibility is an important aspect to be considered both in town scale and building scale. Hence, the presentations have to achieve **accessibility** both in the town scale and building scale for entrance and observation.

In multi-layered historical towns, the physical evidences have to be considered with their context since the context indicates the interaction among historical periods. Therefore, the presentations have to be achieved **in-situ** as much as possible in order to correlate the physical traces in their context. Accordingly presentations should avoid **re-locating** architectural elements, fragments or small-scale monuments since every edifice has meaning with its components.

#### 2.3.3.1 Principles for In-situ Presentations

In-situ presentations include, activities aiming the apprehension of historical stratification on-site and in the historic towns such as, information panels, landscaping, urban designs, design interventions etc.

In order to put up a presentation proposal, firstly the **current presentation status** of the physical evidences have to be analyzed. Accordingly, **the presentation potentials** of the physical evidences have to be assessed for setting the priorities.

Consequently, the different quality areas play an important role in the in-situ presentations, since they are the indicators of continuous inhabitancy. Therefore, the presentations have to consider these **different quality areas as the basis** of the presentations.

Within the different quality areas, there exists different **cases representing the multi-layeredness and interaction of different historical periods within the current town** considering degree of knowledge on existences and state of survivals. These different cases have presentation potentials since they are the representatives of different relations which can be observed in multi-layered historical towns. The presentation proposals should provide a consistency and achieve a coherence for these different cases in the whole town. These cases can be:

- Different periods showing the horizontal stratification of the town
- o Different periods showing the vertical stratification of the town
- Edifices that are **demolished** but their location, period and building type are known
- Remains that are combined with latter elements, forming a newly introduced whole within the existing context
- Remains that have lost their integrity, not giving information about the whole
- Remains which are still preserved but having construction on their top
- o Remains that are still preserved with their integrity but not well

### known by the inhabitants

- Edifices that have lost their stratigraphic character by improper interventions
- Edifices of a former historical period that are damaged by a latter period
- Edifices that their **non-existence is a trace for their existence** which can be defined as negative traces
- o Buildings that are presented inaccurately
- o Monuments that are relocated for presentation purposes

## 2.3.3.2 Principles for Itinerary Preparation

In order to present the multi-layeredness, the integrity is important for effective comprehension. Hence, itinerary preparation is a way of presenting this integrity. The itineraries for the presentation of multi-layered historical towns should achieve the apprehension of historical stratification in town scale.

Since historical periods are the basic components of historical stratification, **routes presenting each historical period** should be identified in itinerary proposals. The identity areas of each period have to be considered for the identification of routes for historical periods.

The presentation of the multi-layered character is the main aim for the preparation of itineraries. Therefore, routes presenting the historical stratification or the multi-layeredness should also be identified. **The physical and functional continuity areas should be regarded as the representatives of historical stratification.** Accordingly, the routes presenting the multi-layered character have to be based on these continuity areas.

For the routes presenting the historical stratification, the edifices, open areas and other urban elements from different periods on the routes should be **differentiated** according to their periods. Finally, since historical stratigraphy is resulted by the superimposition of different historical periods on top of each other, itineraries have to include the **relations** of the edifies **in three dimension**.

#### 2.3.3.3 Principles for Information Panels

Information panels are the conventional but most effective method for in-situ presentations since they are the direct way of dissemination of information. Therefore, for an appropriate presentation of historical stratigraphy, principles should be put forward for the preparation of information panels. The information panels have to be prepared in different scales including information regarding the whole town, an area or specific building but still, the different scale information panels should have a unity and achieve a coherence.

The town scale information panels can be regarded as the introductory panels for the visitors of multi-layered historical towns. Therefore, the panels should include visual and written material showing successive historical periods which are important for the apprehension of historical stratigraphy. In addition, these information panels can include the routes of the itineraries for successive historical periods and historical stratification for the visitors and should be located on the starting point of the routes.

The area scale information panels should be utilized for the understanding of different quality areas in historic towns. Hence, these panels should be located in different quality areas and include visual and written material showing the relations of these areas within the current town and the relations of edifices from different periods.

The building scale information panels should be utilized for the understanding of the building in their context among with the historical period that they belong to. Therefore, the building scale information panels should embrace visual and written material including; descriptive information, history of the edifice and reliability of the information. In addition diachronic plan of its period can be used for the apprehension of the building's context within its historical period.

#### 2.3.3.4 Principles for Ex-situ Presentations

Ex-situ presentations include, activities aiming the apprehension of historical stratigraphy off-site by touristic books, internet and academic sources.

Since ex-situ presentations reach to a wider range of public; these presentations have more potential on the dissemination of information. Therefore the **accuracy of knowledge** becomes important for ex-situ presentations. The accuracy of knowledge depends on the type and **reliability of the sources** among with the level of investigations of the edifices. Therefore, the information types from the exactly known to hypothetical should be identified in ex-situ presentations.

One of the major problems of ex-situ presentations are the representations of the physical evidences. By the help of new presentation techniques such as virtual reconstructions; the physical evidences can be idealized or the restitutions can be utilized as the representatives of these physical evidences. However, information on the state of survivals of each edifice is important for the dissemination of accurate knowledge. Hence the **current state of survivals** and **the existence and non-existence of the historical edifices** have to be identified in virtual presentations.

In addition for the accuracy of knowledge, information on the **degree of knowledge on existences** of each edifice such as period, location, building type, building contour have to be identified in ex-situ presentations. The state of preservation which can be obtained by the types and level of intervention among with the change status is important for the identification of authenticity. Therefore, in ex-situ presentations **authenticity** of the edifices<sup>22</sup> has to be presented.

In multi-layered historical towns, physical evidences are more to stand out with their context since the context indicates the interaction among historical periods. Therefore, ex-situ presentations have to concern the **context** of the edifices or sites.<sup>23</sup> Accordingly the edifices should be presented with the relation of the historical period they belong to.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> In The Icomos Charter for the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites Proposed Final Draft, 2007; it is mentioned that the interpretation and presentation of cultural heritage sites must respect the basic tenets of authenticity in the spirit of the Nara Document on Authenticity (Icomos 2007:9)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup> In The Icomos Charter for the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites Proposed Final Draft, 2007; it is mentioned that the interpretation and presentation of cultural heritage sites must relate to their wider social, cultural, historical, and natural contexts and settings (Icomos 2007:8)

For historical stratigraphy, each historical period is constituted from urban components such as expansion areas, main axes, buildings or different function areas. Hence, the ex-situ presentations have to consider each period with its urban components and achieve the **integrity** of these components in both in edifice scale and town scale.

When the presentation principles for multi-layered historical towns are evaluated; some of these principles are valid for all historical towns such as; reversibility and renewability, encouraging in-situ conservation, sustainability, relying on the context and strengthening the appreciation of cultural significance. Besides these, there are some presentation principles which are specific to the conservation of multi-layered character that are; respecting all periods equally, adaptability, depending on the reliability of sources for presentation, depending on the degree of knowledge on existences, accessibility, perceivability, integrity, assisting the perception of integrity both in town and building scales and traceability.

### **CHAPTER 3**

## TARSUS: A MULTI-LAYERED HISTORICAL TOWN

Tarsus is a province of Mersin in the southern Mediterranean region of Anatolia. The town is situated on a huge plain land surrounded with Taurus mountains on the north and Mediterranean on the south. Berdan River (ancient Cydnus) is flowing through the center of the town but today the riverbed can hardly be observed. The town is on the junction of transportation routes throughout history and today it is an important center between Mersin and Adana.



Figure 1 Satellite view of current Tarsus and its immediate vicinity (Google earth, last accessed on 24.01.2007)

### **3.1 BRIEF LOOK ON THE HISTORY OF TARSUS**

The region located in the southern part of Turkey called Cilicia bounded by Taurus mountains on the north and Mediterranean Sea on the south whereas on the west until modern town of Silifke. It is known that Cilicia has been identified as a geographical region starting from the Hittite period and the first settlements in Cilicia are Mersin, Domuztepe and Gözlükule in Tarsus. (Steadman 1994: 14-89)

This region and Tarsus have been inhabited continuously since very early ages. In Tarsus there are evidences of uninterrupted habitation through out the Neolithic Era (7000- 4000 BC)<sup>24</sup>, Chalcolithic Era (4000-3000 BC), Period of Kingdom of Kizzuwatna, Hittite Kingdom, Que, Assyrian, Egyptian Period, Archaic and Classical Era, Hellenistic Era, Roman Period, Byzantine-Arab Invasions Period <sup>25</sup>, Anatolian Seljukid Period, Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia, Mamluk, Mongol Period, Ramazanoğulları Period, Ottoman Period and Republican Period.

The information on the earlier periods of Tarsus is obtained from the excavations by H. Goldman between 1935 –1939 which was held on the mound of Gözlükule on the southeastern part of the town center. (Goldman 1950, 1956, 1963) As a result of these excavations; it is known that the site have been settled starting from the Neolithic era (7000 BC) onwards, the town is an important settlement because of its uninterrupted occupancy. (Zoroğlu 1996:13)

In the early Chalcolithic period, the influences of Mesopotamia can be observed in the settlement because of the Ubaid ceramics found in Gözlükule mound proving the domination of Ubaid culture in southern part of Anatolia (Evrin 2002:7). Unfortunately, at the end of 3000 BC, like many settlements in Anatolia, there are traces of fires and destructions in Gözlükule resulting a few years of unoccupancy in Tarsus. (Zoroğlu 1996:16)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> Levent Zoroğlu identifies the period of Neolithic era as starting from 7000 BC and Chalcolithic age as 4000- 3000 BC. (Levent Zoroğlu, 1996:16)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> Since Tarsus was under the control of Byzantines and Arabs successively causing an unrest in the town after Romans, the period is defined as "Byzantine and Arab Invasions Period".

Kizzuwatna was an autonomous Kingdom in Cilicia region around 1650 BC and it is believed that Tarsus was the capital of the kingdom in the second millennium BC (Akgündüz 1993: 19). Kizzuwatna Kingdom was annexed to Hittites around 1500 BC and Tarsus became an important town for the Hittite Kingdom until the end of 12<sup>th</sup> century BC because of the incursions from the western Anatolia (Ener 1993:41-49). The temple from Hittite period found in Gözlükule also proves the existence of Hittite Kingdom in Tarsus (Zoroğlu 1996 :17).

It is known that after the Hittites, Cilicia region was ruled by Que Kingdom but there is not enough information on both the Kingdom and Tarsus in Que period. Around 1976 BC, the region was captured by Assyrian King Semiramis until 1612 BC when the Egyptians took the control in Cilicia. In 833, Tarsus was recaptured by the Assyrians (Akgündüz 1993:20-21). When Tarsians rebelled against the Assyrians a century later; the revolt was suppressed by Sennacherib and the settlement was destroyed accordingly (Evrin 2002:11). Sennacherib built a new town bisected by the river whereas his buildings was located on the mound of Gözlükule which is treated as a suburb in that period (Boardman 1965:12).

After the fall of Assyrians, Cilicians founded an autonomous state around 610 BC. Until 547 BC, the settlement was an important city of Cilicia (Akgündüz 1993:22). According to Xenophon, the palace of the king Syennessis was also located in Tarsus and the river Cydnus which was two hundred feet broad was passing through the middle of the city (Xenophon Book I).

From the mid 6<sup>th</sup> century to the end of 5<sup>th</sup> century BC, Cilicia region was under the indirect rulership of the Persians but archaeological evidences are not enough to obtain information on the settlement in Tarsus. It is obvious that until the mid 4<sup>th</sup> century BC, Tarsus was a satrapy of Persians (Evrin 2002:11).

In 332/333 BC, Alexander the Great conquered Cilicia and Tarsus became an important center in the region (Evrin 2002:13). After the death of Alexander, Tarsus like the other cities in Cilicia was ruled by the Seleucids whose capital was Antioch. However there is not enough information on the Seleucid period of Tarsus (Zoroğlu 1996:22). In 171 BC, Tarsus rebelled to Seleucids and obtained its autonomy

together with Mallos. After the decline of Seleucid power in the region around 110 BC, piracy initiated by rough Cilicians in the region (Evrin 202:13).

The annexation of Tarsus to the Roman Empire is unknown but it was in 103 BC. when Rome decided to prevent piracy in the Cilician region. Around 92 BC, Roman commander defeated Armenian King Tigran and became the king of Cappadocia. After the rebellions and attacks of Mithridates and Tigranes in 83 BC, Romans took the power in southern part of Mediterranean (Öz 1991:26). The prosperous period of Tarsus starts after the establishment of the province of Cilicia in 64 BC when the city became its capital (Öz 1991:27). In 47 BC, Julius Caesar arrived at Tarsus and the town started to be called "Juliopolis". After the death of Caesar, Marcus Antonius came to Tarsus and granted the autonomy of eastern regions within Roman Empire (Zoroğlu 1996:24). In the Imperial period starting with Octavianus Augustus, the city develops as a prosperous settlement.

During the reign of Antonius Pius, Lycaonia and Isaura was annexed to Cilicia and Tarsus became the capital of these three regions.<sup>26</sup> After the defeat of Emperor Gordianus III against Shapur I in 242 AD, Sassanids took Tarsus, Syrian Hierapolis and Antioch accordingly (Evrin 2002:15). It was until 306 AD when the Roman Empire took the control of the region, Cilicia faced successive disturbances by the incursions of Palmyra Kingdom and Goths (Öz 1991:37).

After this disturbance period, at the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century AD, Romans dominated in the region again and Cilicia was annexed to East Province whose capital was Antioch. Moreover Cilicia was divided into eastern and western regions and Tarsus was the metropolis of eastern Cilicia. During this period, Christian Bishopric was founded in Tarsus which was also represented in latter Consuls (Zoroğlu 2004c:102)

In the early 5<sup>th</sup> century AD, due to change in administrative structure, with the split of Cilicia province into Cilicia Prima and Cilicia Secunda, Anazarbus and Tarsus

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup> Çiğdem Toskay Evrin defines these three regions as Cilicia Union, Three Eparchiae. (Evrin 2002:15)

became the capitals respectively (Bosworth 1992:269). From the 5th century AD onwards, there was a constant unrest due to the attacks of Persians and by the end of the 6th century AD, after Emperor Justinian's death, Tarsus passed under the rule of Persians like the other towns in Cilicia. After the defeat of Persians in 626 AD, Cilicia and Isaura were subjected to the Byzantine domination (Evrin 2002:21).

From 637 onwards, Arab invasions started in Cilicia region (Zoroğlu 1996:269). The region is a frontier between Byzantines, Umayyads and Abbasids. It is known that when Abbasid caliph Muawiya came to Cilicia, the castles between Antioch and Tarsus were already deserted so he placed his own troops (Öz 1991:40). After Muawiye, the rule of Tarsus was interchanged between Arabs and Byzantines several times leading to the destruction of the city. In 787, Abbasid Caliph Harun Reşid took the control of Tarsus and started reconstructions in the city including the fortifications. Following the Abbasid period, the continuous incursions in the region between the Byzantines and the Abbasids continued until 965 when Cilicia and Cyprus was repossessed by the Byzantines. After 965 Tarsus was annexed to Seuleukeia province and the capital shifted from Seuleukeia to Tarsus (Öz 1991:44).

After the establishment of political power by Great Seljuks and the subjugation of Iran, Mesopotamia and eastern parts of Anatolia. In 1082 Anatolian Seljuk commander Süleyman Şah conquered Çukurova region and Tarsus. This was the time of the first Crusade, they became the new political actors in the region capturing Antioch. In one years time, Anatolian Seljuks took the control of Adana, Masisa, Anazarba whereas Crusaders founded the principality of Antioch (Öz 1991:47).

When the Seljukids dominate the eastern parts of Anatolia, Armenians were located on the Taurus mountains and Çukurova. Due to the lack of authority, Armenians founded a kingdom composed of small principalities and in Tarsus region, Roupenian dynasty took the control initiating the existence of Armenians in Cilicia (Ghazarian 2000:53). In 1198, after the coronation of Leon who was the leader of Armenian principality in Tarsus, the principality was named by the scholars as "Lesser Armenian Kingdom" (Öz 1991:52).
As it was the case for the Byzantines and Arabs before, Tarsus changed hands between the Armenian Kingdom and Anatolian Seljuks until the Mongol arrival at Anatolia. The power of Anatolian Seljuks decreased in Cilicia since the Armenian Kingdom had an agreement with Mongol; Tarsus was under the control of the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia until the Mamluk period. Due to the weakening of Mongols in southern east of Anatolia, Mamluks of Egypt broadened their territories until Tarsus in 1266. However Armenian Kingdom together with Mongols defeated Mamluks and Leon III was crowned in 1271 as the King of Armenia under the patronage of Mongols (Akgündüz 1993:56-58).

From the 13<sup>th</sup> century onwards, Mongols collaborated with Armenians against Mamluks whereas Mamluks made incursions to Cilicia together with Turkmens resulting with the foundation of Dulkadiroğulları Principality in Elbistan and their dominance in Cilicia region (Çalı 2003:36). After the death of Leon VII, the Kingdom of Armenia had ceased in Cilicia (Çalı 2003:39). Ramazanoğulları Principality was founded in Adana, Tarsus, Sis, Misis, Ayas and Payas starting from 1336-1375 (Akgündüz 1993:77). However, the region passed through hands between Mamluks and Karamanoğulları until 1517 when Ramazanoğulları was annexed to the Ottoman Empire. The Ottoman rule points to an end in the position of the city as a boundary settlement between the confrontations of successive regional powers for a millennia (Çalı 2003:86). After Pir Mansur Bey ceased in 1604, the region was directed by a governor appointed from the capital (Çalı 2003:88).

In 1606, Tarsus was annexed to Cyprus province and in 1632 under Adana province (Öz 1991:61). Because of the political upheaval in the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Kavalalı Mehmet Ali Paşa who was the governor of Mısır (Egypt) province took the control of Tarsus and the region was autonomous for until 1840 (Öz 1991:66). From the 19<sup>th</sup> century onwards Tarsus has lost its importance since Mersin became an important harbor and trade center in the region and Tarsus was annexed to Mersin province (Akgündüz 1993:120).

In the Turkish Republican period, Tarsus was an administrative district of Mersin which was the important commercial center. Due to the development of industrial region between Adana and Tarsus, the population increased and the development of the town shifted to western part of the town in 1950s (Bilgen 1986:9). Today Tarsus is an important industrial center between Mersin and Adana which is susceptible to rapid industrialization.

#### **3.2 ANALYSIS & EVALUATION OF HISTORICAL PERIODS OF TARSUS**

Tarsus, as a multi-layered historical town, is formed as a collective creation process and continuous inhabitancy that buildings, edifices and open areas overlay in time creating the character of these historical towns. Due to this continuous inhabitancy throughout history, the identification of successive historical periods contributing to this specific character is a necessity for the evaluation of Tarsus. Moreover, owing to the condition of constant changing of political rule, successive wars and destruction, the identification is also a challenge because of the complexity of the historical stratification.

Accordingly, the successive historical periods, transformation processes, the integrity of each phase with its own components (expansion area, main axes, edifices, different functional areas, etc.) and the interactions with the components of other periods becomes essential for the interpretation of this historical continuity and sustainability of multi-layered historical character.

#### 3.2.1 Determination of Historical Periods Based on Diachronic Survey

For the identification of urban transformation periods (units), documentary and historical research are utilized from visual, graphic and written sources together with site survey. When the written and illustrated documents on Tarsus are studied, the information about the town's history and its past urban form are very limited and although there is a continuous habitation in Tarsus; because of Cilicia's historical milieu, as a frontier city of continuous battles and destructions, today Tarsus itself hardly represents its past.

According to the history of Tarsus, there are different periods starting from the Neolithic Era. However, due to the insufficiency of historic sources, excavations or survived edifices and physical traces within the current town all of these periods can

not be identified as historical layers. In addition, some periods did not effect the whole character of the town but constructed or transformed some buildings and utilized the existing ones. By considering the availability of information and effect of historical periods on the town's character and physical reflections in the current town, the historical periods which can be defined as the historical units of the diachronic survey as:

- 1- Hellenistic Period
- 2- Roman Period
- 3- Medieval Period
- 4- Ottoman Period
- 5- Early Republican Period

It is known that before Hellenistic period, the habitation was on Gözlükule mound where Hetty Goldman identified thirty three settlement strata (Zoroğlu 1996:36). However, due to the lack of information for constituting an urban form before Hellenistic period, the historical layers start from Hellenistic period onwards.

Although habitation exists from Neolithic period, the historical periods are identified starting from Hellenistic period since the former periods expand to the lower plain of the city but instead concentrated on Gözlükule mound. "Hellenistic Period" starts from the 4<sup>th</sup> century BC until the 1<sup>st</sup> century AD. Hetty Goldman defines 1<sup>st</sup> century BC as Hellenistic-Roman period (Zoroğlu 2004a:13) but in the thesis, "Roman Period" starts in 1<sup>st</sup> century AD which is defined as Roman Imperial period. Roman period covers late antique and Byzantine periods either. Due to the historical milieu of Tarsus, Byzantine, Arab and Armenian periods coincide from the 7<sup>th</sup> century until the 16<sup>th</sup> century as principalities period but this time, the physical evidences are considered for the identification of these successive periods and the period is defined as "Medieval Period". "Ottoman Period" starts from the 17<sup>th</sup> century until 1923; whereas "Early Republican Period" is defined as the epoch between 1923 and the late 1950s.

These five periods are considered as historical layers therefore each layer is studied separately on diachronic plans. Since urban form is the basic differentiation in historical layers, the analysis is based on the components of urban form mainly the topography and natural aspects, the urban expansion areas, built up areas as the main edifices and functions; main axes and streets among with the open areas.

The diachronic plans for each period are prepared utilizing different information sources derived from the archaeological excavations, historical maps and photographs, ancient writers, travelers etc. Consequently, the information obtained from different sources is considered according to the type and reliability of the source. First of all, the information coming from the physical evidence and archaeological surveys are considered as accurate among with the historical maps, old photographs and survey drawings. Accordingly, there are information derived from some historical maps which are not directly. This information group is differentiated from the first category as secondary information. Lastly, the information traced from the current town as the indicators of existence is also differentiated as the thirtiary information group. These three information groups mentioned above are categorized on maps<sup>27</sup> as follows:

- Information derived from the physical traces and archaeological excavations
- Information derived from the historical sources
- Information traced from the current town.

Besides, the information types also differ in information sources such as locations, building types, building contours etc. since historical and archaeological data vary in detail. It is very common that there are edifices that their locations are exactly known through archaeological trial holes but their building contours can not identified whereas there are also edifices that their locations, heights or building types can approximately derived from historical sources. Therefore, these different information types such as the location, building type, building contour and height are also differentiated on the diachronic plans.

In this thesis, the study area covers the urban expansion areas of each period and scattered remains outside the habitation area of each period in the historic town center of Tarsus.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup> The maps are prepared by Pinar Aykaç, utilizing the base map reproduced from Tarsus Halihazır Planı by İller Bankası in 2003.





# 3.2.1.1 Topography and Natural Aspects

According to the ancient geographer Strabo, Cilicia was divided into two distinctive parts as Cilicia Tracheia (rough Cilicia) which is on the slope of Taurus mountains and Cilicia Pedias (plain Cilicia) extending from Soli to Issus which is a fertile land in the coastal part (Strabo 14.5.1:V). In west Plain Cilicia, there are three important rivers; Saros, Pyramus and Cydnus, where three cities emerged; Adana, Mallos and Tarsus respectively (Ramsay 1890:359-360).



**Figure 3** Bed of Cydnus, boundaries of Rhegma and the shoreline in Antique period (Ramsay 1890)

In antiquity, Tarsus was connected to Mediterranean by a lagoon called Rhegma and this lake was the harbor of the town. When it comes to land access, the so called Cilician Gates were leading a passage between Tarsus and the central Anatolia in antiquity (Ramsay 1890:364-368) Tarsus is located on a plain land therefore the topography in the habitation area is not very not sloppy and river Cydnus was passing through the eastern part of Gözlükule mound.

# 3.2.1.2 Hellenistic Period

The urban expansion area is unknown in this period but it is for sure that the city had fortifications as in other Hellenistic towns of Anatolia. The existence of fortifications can be proved by the reinforcement of the city fortifications in Hellenistic period (Arrian cited in İTÜ 1989:44).

The Hellenistic remains are very poor on the mound of Gözlükule (Zoroğlu 2004:374) which can be an indicator of the urban expansion area, not including Gözlükule mound. However, there was a connection between the city fortifications leading to the mound.<sup>28</sup> From the Gözlükule excavations, a house with baths was found from the Hellenistic period on the mound (Goldman 1935:547). Besides Gözlükule, there exists another mound in the town on the northeastern part of Gözlükule which was not excavated (ITU 1989:44).

The Hellenistic town had Hippodamian type plan with perpendicular street arrangement. The main axis of the town, which can be associated with Seleucids, was unearthed by the excavations held in 1995 (Zoroğlu 2004a:374). This main street is 7m in width constructed by polygonal basalt in convex shape and letting the rainwater access from the side channels to the sewage system underneath.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup> The connection of Gözlükule to the fortifications is stated by Robinson in order to explain the poor archaeological findings from Hellenistic period on the mound. (Robinson 1951:129)







**Figure 7** Topography and Natural Aspects of Tarsus 62

# TOPOGRAPHY & NATURAL ASPECTS Topography River **Current Tarsus**



Figure 8 Hellenistic Period in Tarsus





**Figure 7 a)** Main axes in Hellenistic period (author, October 2006) **b)**Hellenistic Sewage System (Hikmet Öz archive)

The street dates back to the Hellenistic period with deep sewage system and direction and width, the street is a part of the main axis of the town in east-west direction (Zoroğlu 2004a:375). The drainage was not only for the rainwater but also for the water coming from a fountain (*nymphaeum*) placed probably towards the city gate on the west end of the street (Zoroğlu 2004a:11-12). It is known that in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BC, construction movements started in Tarsus and the infrastructure and other streets may have been built after this period (Zoroğlu 1996:59).

#### 3.2.1.3 Roman Period

In Roman period, the town expanded to the northern part of Gözlükule and had fortifications with three gates, which are Sea Gate on the southwestern part, Adana Gate on the northwest and Demirkapı on the northeast leading to the Cilician Gates on Taurus mountains (Hellenkemper and Hild 1990:435). Today, only the sea-gate which is now called the Cleopatra Gate survived from the town's fortifications but in 1935, Hetty Goldman identified some wall fragments on the southern part of Gözlükule as the continuation of the towns fortifications (Goldman 1935:528). Since the fortifications were restored in Arab period, there are some arguments on the construction date of Cleopatra Gate but by looking at the profile of the arch and



Figure 10 Roman period in Tarsus

65





Figure 11 Roman Period in Tarsus

66



niches on both sites, the gate can be dated to the 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD (Zoroğlu 1996:33) which proves that it had no connection with the Egyptian princess of the 1<sup>st</sup> century BC. Since the city walls are reinforced in Arab period, it is accepted that the contour of the fortifications and the location of the city gates were the same as late Antique period.<sup>29</sup>

According to the fortifications and the location of the city gates, cardo is the axes connecting Cleopatra Gate and Demirkapı whereas decumanus is perpendicular to this axis leading from the location of Adana Gate. In the district of Demirkapı, another street was exposed during an excavation for the foundation of a new building but since there is a new construction on top, this street can not be observed today (Zoroğlu cited in Aşkın 2006:78).

Since Cydnus was passing through the center of the city (Strabo:14.5.12), a bridge was built in the junction of cardo and decumanus of the Roman city (Öz 1998:3). By the excavation of Makam Mosque by the municipality, one arch of this bridge is found and it is observed that the bridge continues to the east as a result of the construction of Vakıf Bank building in 1989. The bridge is situated on the main street of the town in east-west direction (Öz 1998:55). While mentioning Cydnus river flowing through the middle of the town, Procopius of the 6<sup>th</sup> century AD, gives information on the bridges and marketplaces within the city. (Procopius V:341)

Parallel to the decumanus of the city, as a result of the excavations in the Cumhuriyet Square, a colonnade with shops were revealed on the eastern side of the street. Due to the relation among the level of street and the height of the stylobate, it can be proposed that the street and portico were constructed in different periods (Zoroğlu 2004a:375).

On the very north of this main street, in 1932 during the shift of the cemetery to new town cemetery, an ancient building was unearthed and according to the inhabitants, the building had a pool with sitting area around and a corridor connecting the pool to

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>29</sup> The contour of the fortifications is derived from the map showing the possible route of fortifications. Appendix I (Rother 1971:189)

other spaces (Öz 1998:16). On the southern part of this antique building, during the construction of Courthouse in 1948, a Roman villa was unearthed with mosaic floor which is named as the mosaic of Tarsus and has been exhibited in Antakya Museum ever since.

In the city center, on the junction of cardo and decumanus, Roman Baths, locally known as Altından Geçme, literally meaning "passing under" in Turkish, was located which dates back to the 2<sup>nd</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> century AD (Adıbelli 2007:14). Owing to the detection of infrastructure and sewage system underneath Eski Hamam which is very close to the Roman Baths, the building is said to extent underneath that bath from Principalities period (Öz 1998:65). The remains of another bath from the Roman period was found in Cumhuriyet Mahallesi but since there are not any surveys or excavations, it is hard to give an exact date for the building (Kültür Bakanlığı 2002).

Donuktaş is another important edifice in the town which lead discussions about its function and building type. According traveler Barbara, the building was an ancient palace; to Holland Consul Barker, the tomb of Sardanapol and to French Consul Gille again a tomb (Öz 1998:49). As a result of excavations started in 1980s, the edifice is defined as a temple from Roman period dating back to the 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD. (Baydur, Seçkin 2001) and according to Levent Zoroğlu, it was probably built during Hadrian's reign (Zoroğlu, 1996:68-70). Due to the border of the fortifications, the temple is seemingly located outside the fortifications and in Hellenkemper and Hild, the temple is located in the extra mural zone (Hellenkemper and Hild 1990:435) whereas in Tarsus Conservation Plan report, the temple is thought to be inside the boundaries of the fortifications. (ITU 1989:44)

In his book Geographica, while mentioning Cydnus River passing through the middle of the town. Strabo mentions a gymnasium on the side of the river (Strabo 14.5.12). According to Victor Langlois, the gymnasium mentioned by Strabo is located on the mound of Gözlükule (Langlois 1947:38). The building which Langlois mentions on the northern hills of Gözlükule is defined as the Roman theatre on a map of Gözlükule by Hetty Goldman but today only the slope of the *cavea* can be observed.



Figure 10 Location of the theatre on Gözlükule mound (Goldman 1935:528)





In the garden of the Tarsus American college on the west of the mound, huge vaults were found and interpreted as the hippodrome of the Roman period (Goldman 1935:528). This can be related to the stadium which is mentioned by Langlois (ITU 1989:43). On the northwestern part of Cumhuriyet Square, there was a well and foundation walls from Roman period are interpreted as the Well and House of St. Paul who was born in Tarsus but the association of these remains with St. Paul has nothing to depend on.



**Figure 12 a)**The plan of the vaulted building in the garden of Barbaros Hayrettin High School (Ministry of Culture, registration sheet) **b)** Vaulted building in the garden of Barbaros Hayrettin High School (Hikmet Öz archive)

On the northern part of the Adana gate, a vaulted building was found outside the city fortifications but the function of the building can not be identified. (Kültür Bakanlığı 1998)<sup>30</sup>

During the reign of Justinian around the 6<sup>th</sup> century AD, due to the floods of Cydnus inside the city, the riverbed was shifted and a three arched bridge was constructed on the new which was called "Justinian Bridge" (Zoroğlu, 1996: 73-74). The change of the riverbed was also mentioned in Procopius's Secret History (Procopius XVIII :225).

The Necropolis of the Roman period is on the northern part of the city leading to the waterfalls, the outside the city fortifications (See Appendix J). There exists rock-cut tombs in the waterfalls on Cydnus which were submerged by the shift of the river bed in Justinian reign (Zoroğlu 1996:66). On the northeast of the waterfalls, there are remains which are thought to be an aqueduct because of the channel on the upper part of the edifice (Zoroğlu 1996:66). The aqueduct was constructed in the same period as Cleopatra Gate and dates back to Roman Period (Çıplak 1968:307). The existence of two aqueducts bringing water to Tarsus is also mentioned

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>30</sup> The information on the vaulted building is obtained from Registration Sheet prepared by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism in 1998, Inventory number 33-10-1.0

approximately in the same location in *Tabula Imperii Byzantini* (Hellenkemper and Hild 1990:435).

According to Ammianus, after the death of Emperor Julian the Apostate in 363 AD, a temple with a tomb was built outside the city fortifications on the road leading to Taurus Mountains (Öz 1998:7). From this description the tomb is to be located on the north, outside the Adana Gate but the exact location of this tomb can not be identified today. According to Hikmet Öz, the location of the tomb is on İstiklal (Devrim) Primary School or in the location of a transformer in the current town (Öz 1998:7). During the construction of İstiklal Primary School, sarcophagus of Achilleus was found (ITU 1989:46). On the southeastern part of the Cleopatra Gate, in the location of Köylü Garajı, Roman tombs were unearthed (Yurtseven 2006:i).

There are some here sayings about the other antique buildings in the town like the palaces underneath Dumlupinar Primary School and Vakiflar Çarşısı but there are not any physical evidences supporting these sayings. In addition, another edifice was mentioned underneath Old Mosque and the reason may some architectural fragments found underneath Old Mosque during construction works. (Öz 1998:5-6).

# 3.2.1.4 Medieval Period

In 787-8 AD, Harun Reşit started the reinforcement of city fortifications against Byzantines. Cleopatra Gate (*Bab al-Bahr*) was also repaired in this period and today the ditches of the fortifications can be traced parallel to Muvaffak Ziya Uygur Street (Öz 1998:13). <sup>31</sup> Langlois mentions a tower remain on the northern part of the town which can be a tower of the fortifications (Langlois 1947:47). According to Arab geographer Ahmet Yakuti, The city had double walls with six gates and river Cydnus which is named as Berdan in Arabic sources was passing through the city. The comprehensive information on the city gates is obtained from Tarsusi and he names the five gates of the fortications as Bab al Sham, Bab al-Safsaf, Bab al-Jihad, Bab Qalamiyya and Bab al-Bahr (Bosworth 1992:272-281).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>31</sup> The contour of the city fortifications is derived from the map showing the possible route of fortifications. Appendix I (Rother 1971:189)



Figure 15 Medieval Period inTarsus

72



Following the reinforcement of city fortifications, a congregation mosque was built in the city and in 833, when Caliph Mamun died, his body was buried on the left of the congregational mosque. (Bosworth 1992:273-274)



a) b)
Figure 14 a) Demirkapi in the 19<sup>th</sup> century (Mutafian,1988) b) Tomb of Caliph Memun,
Prophet Şit and Lokman (author 07.2007)

From the congregational mosque, today only the minaret is still standing. (Zoroğlu 1996: 46) On the south of the congregational mosque in the city center, there exists the tomb of Bilal-i Habeşi. In this period, Mencik Baba tomb was built before 1380 outside the town fortifications towards the east. (Tanrıverdi 2006:88)

From Arab reign onwards, the function of the fortifications is questionable due to the lack of physical traces indicating the settled area. After Arab periods, Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia took the control of the town and started constructions of churches. Vipratet who visited Tarsus in the beginning of the 8<sup>th</sup> century, during the reign of Leon II, mentions a church dedicated to St. Pierre and St. Sophie (Çıplak 1968:311). According to Langlois, St. Pierre Mosque was built in the location of today's Great Mosque. (Langlois 1947:39) The older walls on the lower part of the Great Mosque can belong to this Church. (Hild and Hellenkemper

1990:93) However these wall fragments are also interpreted as the walls belonging to a mosque in Mamluk period. (Zoroğlu 1996:45)



Figure 15 The older wall fragment on the lower part of Great Mosque (author 07.2007)

Besides St Pierre Church, another church was built in the city center which is still existing and called Old Mosque today. The church was built between 9<sup>th</sup>- 10<sup>th</sup> centuries. There are two other churches built in this period. There are two more churches built in Armenian period. One of them was in the location of Sakarya Primary School (Öz 1998:39) and the other was in the location of 19<sup>th</sup> century St. Paul Church (Zoroğlu 1996:43).

In Principalities reign, important public buildings of Islamic architecture were built in the town. From the inscription panel on the entrance gate, it is known that Great Mosque of Tarsus was built in 1579 (Zoroğlu 1996:45). Kırkkaşık Bedesteni which has organic relations with Great Mosque proves that these two buildings are

constructed together in order to form a complex. In this period, the Armenian Church in the town center is turned into a mosque and a minaret was constructed respectively in 1415 (Tanrıverdi 2006:22). Although the tomb of Bilal-i Habeşi on the southern part of Great Mosque dates back to Arab period, the mescid has to be built in principalities period according to its architectural characteristic (Zoroğlu 1996:49). The establishment of a foundation for the name of Bilal-i Habeşi is in 1519, therefore the building has to be built before 1519 (Tanrıverdi 2006:43).

On the northern part of Great Mosque, a public bath which is named as Yeni Hamam was built between 1569-1589. On the intersection of two main streets of the city, Kubatpaşa Medresesi was constructed by Kubatpaşa between 1517-1520. (Tanriverdi 2006:112-82). On the city center, another public bath, Eski Hamam was constructed in this period but the exact date of construction is not known. The oldest Foundation Charter of Eski Hamam dates back to 1651, therefore the building has to be constructed before this date (Tanriverdi 2006:120). On the north eastern part of the city in Reşadiye district of the current town, Tahtalı Mescid was built before 1543, again in the principalities period. The tomb on the skirts of Gözlükule mound also from this period.

The connection of Cydnus River with Mediterranean was still existing in the beginning of the 6<sup>th</sup> century by the map of Piri Reis but this relation is not mentioned in other historical sources. The map also depicts the town fortifications therefore, it can be said that the fortifications were still existing in this period.



Figure 16 Connection of Cydnus with Mediterranean in the 16<sup>th</sup> century. (Piri Reis)

# 3.2.1.5 Ottoman Period

For the determination of physical character of Tarsus in the Ottoman Period, there are two maps which are utilized. The first map is an earlier one and the other is from 1919 prepared by French. The former one dates back to the 19<sup>th</sup> century since the railway is showed on the map whereas the latter one is prepared in 1919 when French invaded the region. (See Appendix G-H)

According to Evliya Çelebi, Tarsus town fortifications are round double fortifications with ditches and have a perimeter of five thousand feet. Evliya Çelebi's description for the town fortifications is important since the round shape proves the continuity of the town fortifications in the Ottoman period. There exists three gates which are Adana Gate, Demirkapı and Geribiz Gate. He also mentions a citadel on the northern part of the town.

Meanwhile, Necati Çıplak mentions six gates named as Kilikya Gate, Kidnos Gate, Donuktaş Gate, Selefki Gate, Demirkapı and Geribiz Gate. In 1876 Adana Province Yearbook, the fortifications were almost demolished (Akgündüz 1993:157-160) and the settled area expanded outside the fortifications of the town. (See Appendix H) The condition of the fortifications is not exactly known in this period but it is known that in 1835, the town fortifications in poor condition were demolished by Mısırlı İbrahim Paşa (Doğukan A.Ş. 1995).

Adana-Mersin railway construction which was connecting Anatolia to Tarsus, is initiated in 1883 by English. The construction is finished in 1886. It is known that there was a train station from Ottoman period on the western part of the city, however this buildings has not survived until present (Akpolat M. 2004:88).

During Ottoman period, the city center was a real commercial center with a lot of Hans. Although most of Hans are demolished today, the location and names of the buildings are obtained from a map showing the historic commercial center of the town (See Appendix K). Yeloğlu Han and Saray Hanı was in the city center; on the northern part of Great Mosque, there was Gön Hanı; on the southwestern part of the town, there were Düven Hanı, Hindi Han, Niğdeli Han , İmat Han and Toros Han; whereas on the very north of Tarsus American College; Abacı Han, Gümrük Han and Müftü Han were situated. Hikmet Öz mentions Dutlu Han, Kırkkaşık Hanı, Şadırvanlı Han, Gozmanın Hanı, Kuyulu Han, Kapılı Han, Göçerler Han and Tısoğlu Han but the locations of these Hans are unknown (Öz 1998:36).



Figure 19 Tarsus in Ottoman period

OTTOMAN PERIOD	
В	vildings
the	at are exactly known due to physical evidences vived until present
I- Government House Aunicipality Building Makam Mosque Gön Han Saray Hani Abacı Han Saray Hani Abacı Han Courch of St. Paul I- Greek Church I- Greek Church I- Greek Church I- Greek Church I- Armenian Church I- Torsus American College Io- Church of St. Paul I- Greek Church I- Armenian Church I- Clock Tower I- Mültü Han Civic Hospital Potestant Church I- Athal Mosque Receive Constraint Market Samizade Mustafa Haşim Tarsusi Mescidi I- Tors Han Z- Küçük Minare Mosque Samizade Mustafa Haşim Tarsusi Mescidi I- Joüven Han Z- Fikan Tekke S- Küçük Minare Mosque A- Iman Samizade Church I- Setting Church I- Setting Church I- Setting Church Samizade Mustafa Haşim Tarsusi Mescidi S- Toros Han Z- Fikan Tekke S- Küçük Minare Mosque S- Küçük Minare Mosque S- Küçük Minare Mosque S- Küçük Minare Mosque S- Küçük Minare Mosque S- Küçük Minare Mosque So Armenian Church Si- Firench School S- Küçük Han So Armenian Church Si- Firench School S- Küçük Han So Armenian Church Si- Firench School S- Küşüt Han So Armenian Church Si- Firench School So Armenian Church Si- Kiyazi Efendi Mescidi So Niyazi Efendi Mescidi So Niyazi Efendi Mescidi So Niyazi Efendi Mescidi So Niyazi Efendi Mescidi So So So So So So So So So So So So	
ОВ	uildings whose locations are not exactly known
14- Ayşe Sıdıka Hanım Library & Medrese 15- Küçük Minare Medresesi 39- Railway Station	
//// o	pen Areas
36- Turkish Cemetery 37- Arab Cemetery 38- French Military Cemetery	
St	reets
Bu	uilding Blocks
///// Po	ossible Settled Area
Tr	aces of the fortifications
1.000	difices that have prvived until present
Ro	ailway
c	ontour Lines
Ri	ver
c	urrent Tarsus
L	

Kırkkaşık Bedesteni was still important for commercial activities in the town center. There were other commercial buildings like Yahşibey Caravansarai with six shops, Uzun Çarşı, Debbağlar Çarşısı among with other traditional Ottoman shops that some of them are still existing today. (Poş 2005:255) In Ottoman period, Rasim Dokur Cotton factory which is important for the industry of the town was built in 1911.<sup>32</sup>



a) b)
Figure 18 a) Saray Hanı in 1960s (Hikmet Öz archive) b)Ottoman commercial center in 1960s (Hikmet Öz archive)

As to the traditional residential buildings from the Ottoman period, most of them are constructed in the 19<sup>th</sup> century whereas there are a few which were constructed in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century (Yanılmaz 2000:21). Although there were a lot of districts in the Ottoman period, today besides a few Ottoman residential buildings, only Tekke, Tabakhane, Kızılmurat, Şehit Kerim and Caminur districts can be defined as Ottoman residential quarters. There are also residential buildings attached to the Roman baths in Ottoman period.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>32</sup> The date of construction is obtained from the registration sheet prepared by Ministry of Culture and Tourism.



**Figure 19** Ottoman residential buildings attached to Roman baths (<u>http://ddc.aub.edu.lb/projects/jafet/blatchford/html/126.html</u>, last accessed on 12.01.2007)

The religious buildings from Ottoman period is mostly constructed in the 19<sup>th</sup> century such as, Eski Hal of Yeni Hal Mosque (1811), Küçük Minaret Mosque, Niyazi Efendi Mosque and Makam Mosque with a minaret was added in 1867 (Tanrıverdi 2006:53) in different quarters of Tarsus. On the northern part of Niyazi Efendi Mosque, Ayşe Sıddıka Hanım Library and medrese was located (Tanrıverdi 2006:13). In 1865, after the destruction of the minaret of Great Mosque, Ziya Bey constructed a clock tower.

The information on the other public buildings such as churches, hospitals and administrative buildings are obtained from the map of Tarsus prepared in 1919. First of all, Church of St. Mary from the Armenian period was still in use in the 20<sup>th</sup> century in Cumhuriyet District. In the same district there is another Armenian Church, a Protestant Church and Greek Orthodox Church which is known as Church of St. Paul. There was also a Maronite Church in Tarsus which is in Old Mosque Quarter. According to the map showing the commercial center of Tarsus, there was another Armenian Church near Abacı Han in Ottoman period.

Tarsus American College Foundation was established in 1888 and started education

life in the same year as a complex on the very north of Gözlükule. The first school buildings were constructed in 1907 which is Christie Hall and Stickler Hall in 1911. Sadık Paşa Konağı which served as the guesthouse of the college was constructed in the same period (Halifeoğlu 2007:27-33). On the east of Tarsus American College Complex, there exist Misak-ı Milli Primary School which was constructed in the 19<sup>th</sup> century and which is still used as a primary school. There exists a civic and a military hospital on the northeastern part of the town.

There are three cemeteries in historic town center. Arab cemetery is on the southern part of the town in Duatepe district, French military cemetery is located in Demirkapi and Turkish cemetery which is also called Yılancık is located near Cumhuriyet Square (Öz 1998:14).



Figure 20 Yılancık Turkish Cemetery in 1960s.(Hikmet Öz archive)



Figure 21 Water sources in Tarsus and its vicinity (Ulutaş 2006)

The 19<sup>th</sup> century map showing the water resources in the region, do not depict the relation of the lake Rhegma with Tarsus and according to Charles Texier, who visited the region in the first half of 19<sup>th</sup> century, "the connection was until a half century ago, when the ships were accessing the lake from the Mediterranean" (Texier 2002:482).

# 3.2.1.6 Early Republican Period

With the introduction of the Republican period, Mersin started to be an important commercial and administrative center in the region, but on the other hand Tarsus continued its significant role within the region. The urban expansion area is widened in the Republican period compared to Ottoman period towards west to the train station and towards Adana. (See Appendix L) In this period, Çukurova Factory was built on the northern edge of the town. The first plan of the town was also prepared by Hermann Jansen in 1937, in the Early Republican period but never implemented.

Courthouse is built in 1948 (Öz 1998:18) and afterwards in 1954, Market Hall was constructed on the northern part of the Courthouse (Öz 1988:9). In 1930s, Şar Cinema and Theater was opened which will effect the social life of the inhabitants for a long time. Tarsus Municipality Park which is an important recreation area for the inhabitants was also constructed in the early Republican period (Öz 1988:7).

The railway station building was built in 1949 (1940-1955) in the Second Nationalist Style which is still used as the train station of Tarsus (Akpolat M. 2004:80). After shifting of Yılancık Cemetery to the new cemetery area in 1932, the area became an important square which is called Cumhuriyet Square in later years (Öz 1998:16).

#### 3.2.1.7 Current Town

Tarsus today, is a town annexed to Mersin and serves as an important node between Mersin and Adana. The town has five historic districts which are Tekke, Tabakhane, Şehit Kerim, Caminur and Kızılmurat that are together registered as urban conservation site. In the town center, there are a lot of edifices from different periods such as Roman, Armenian, Principalities, Ottoman and Early Republican. The town center still functions as the commercial and administrative center whereas the new development areas are especially on the Mersin- Adana street and Ali Menteşeoğlu Street together with the northwestern part of the town.

When historical periods of Tarsus are evaluated, the urban expansion areas superimpose with enlargement in latter periods since town center is continuously inhabited. The main axes and boundaries of the city is almost continuous until the late Ottoman period when the city fortifications are demolished. Physical continuity of the edifices are generally on the intersection of the two main axes of the town whereas on the periphery of the historic town, this physical continuity can not be observed. The area where Great Mosque is located has a functional continuity since in almost all periods, the area is a religious center. After 1923, Mersin became an important commercial and administrative center in the region as a province of Turkish Republic but Tarsus continued its significance within the region. On the other hand, a remarkable transformation occurred after 1950s due to the development of industrial sector in the region between Tarsus-Adana.



Figure 24 Tarsus in Republican Period





Figure 25 Current Tarsus, town center (aerial photograph of Tarsus in 1992, obtained from TC Genelkurmay Başkanlığı Harita Genel Komutanlığı)

# CURRENT TARSUS

#### 3.2.2 Determination of Different Quality Areas Based on Diachronic Survey

Cultural significance specific to multi-layered historical towns considers the collective creation process of these towns and regarding each historical period, their interaction among each other and with the current town as valuable. Like other multi-layered historical towns, the existence of historical periods coming on top of each other reveal the character of multi-layeredness in Tarsus. As to the cultural significance of Tarsus, the different quality areas which are the indicators of these successive periods have to be identified since they are the basis of cultural significance, different from the other single period historic towns. Following the diachronic survey; in order to define the relations between the historical periods among each other as well as the current town, the diachronic plans are superimposed resulting with the identification of different quality areas as identity areas, continuity areas, reserve and risk areas. These different quality areas that are the key value types in the determination of cultural significance for multi-layered historical towns.



Figure 24 Historical periods of Tarsus



Figure 25 Edifices that have survived to the present





Figure 28 Different Quality Areas in Tarsus


Figure 29 Different Quality Areas in Tarsus

FERENT QUALITY AREAS	
	Identity Areas of Different Historical Periods
	Reserve Areas
	Risk Areas
	Continuity Areas
	Edifices from Republican Period
	Edifices from Ottoman Period
	Edifices from Principalities Period
	Edifices from Armenian Period
	Edifices from Armenian Period
	Edifices from Roman Period
:::	Open Areas from Republican Period
:::	Open Areas from Ottoman Period
	Open Areas from Roman Period
	Streets from Republican Period
	Streets from Ottoman Period
	Streets from Principalities Period
	Streets from HellenisticPeriod
••••	Mounds from
	Hellenisic Period Hypothetical Fortifications
	Hypothetical streets
-	from Arab Period
	Hypothetical streets from Roman Period
	Hypothetical streets from Hellenistic Period
	Railway
	River
	Contour Lines
	Current Tarsus

#### 3.2.2.1 Identity Areas

Identity areas can be considered as having representativeness or rarity value of each historical period. In this respect, considering the existing knowledge and survived edifices; areas representing each historical period is identified as identity areas of Hellenistic, Roman, Medieval (separated as Arab and Principalities reigns) and Ottoman period.

#### - Identity Areas of Hellenistic Period

The information on the physical evidences are very limited for Hellenistic period. Therefore, due to the survived edifices such as the Hellenistic villa on Gözlükule mound and the excavated site of colonnaded street are defined as the identity areas since they are the only representatives of Hellenistic Period in Tarsus.

## - Identity Areas of Roman Period

For Roman Period, the knowledge on existence and survived edifices are the basic criteria for the determination of identity areas. The archaeological site of Donuktaş which is the Roman Temple, the excavation site of Roman Baths are identified as the identity areas having both representative and rarity values.

#### - Identity Areas of Medieval Period

The physical evidences from Medieval period differ according to their construction dates and architectural styles which can be identified as edifices from Arab, Armenian and Principalities reign. However; the only survived edifice from Armenian reign is Old Mosque. Thus, Old Mosque can be determined as the identity building of Armenian reign. As to the edifices from Arab reign, there exists a few buildings thus it is not possible to mention identity areas but identity buildings which are Cleopatra Gate, Minaret of Great Mosque, tomb of Prophet Daniel. As to the physical evidences from Principalities reign, the area including Great Mosque, Kırkkaşık Bedesteni and Yeni Hamam can be defined as the identity area of Principalities reign.

## - Identity Areas of Ottoman Period

There are a number of buildings survived from Ottoman period; it is possible to differentiate identity areas according to functions within the period. Firstly, the area covering residential buildings on 42<sup>nd</sup> and 37<sup>th</sup> streets and the buildings on the street in front of St. Paul's well is identified as the identity area representing residential zone of Ottoman period. On the very north of Great Mosque, there exists the commercial center including traditional shops together with the Hans. This area is identified as the commercial identity area of Ottoman Period. Besides the commercial center, Rasim Dokur Factory complex on the southern part of the town can be defined as the industrial zone. The area on the south-eastern part of the town center consist of churches that are used by non- Moslem community of Tarsus such as Protestants, Armenians and Catholics. The area including these religious buildings can be identified as the religious zone of non- Moslem community. For Moslem community, the religious buildings such as Old Mosque and Great Mosque from former period are used whereas there were other mosques scattered in the quarters of the town. Therefore, it is not possible to define a specific religious zone for Moslem community of Tarsus.





#### - Identity Areas of Early Republican Period

For the Early Republican Period, the identity areas are determined based on the survived edifices and functions. The industrial identity area of the period is on the northeastern part of the town which is the Çukurova Factory complex. Consequently, the area covering Market Hall and Courthouse building is defined as the public identity area. Since there are a few residential buildings survived from early Republican period, it is hard to define a residential identity zone.

#### 3.2.2.2 Identity Areas of Multi-Layeredness

The identity areas of multi-layeredness can be defined as continuity areas where edifices from different periods come on top of each other or in the same area horizontally related. These areas have both continuity and sustainability value together with the representativeness of historical stratification. The continuity areas can be divided into two as functional continuity areas and physical continuity areas.

Functional continuity areas can be defined as the areas where buildings with similar functions coincide in a specific area or the areas where buildings preserve their function in successive periods. The religious zone around the Great Mosque is an important religious area including religious buildings in different periods. The area including Ottoman shops and Hans can be defined as the commercial continuity area since this area is still serves as the commercial center of the town including new commercial buildings.

When it comes to the physical continuity areas, these areas have maximum superimposition of edifices from different historical periods and defined according to the relations of the historical periods as continuity areas having horizontal and vertical continuity.





- Areas Presenting Horizontal Continuity

In Tarsus most of the areas have horizontal continuity where the buildings form different periods are located in the same area but not overlapping. These areas presenting horizontal continuity are:

- the area around Gözlükule including the complex of Tarsus American College and SEV Primary School
- the area covering the Church of St. Paul, Roman Baths, Cotton Factory and depot buildings from Ottoman period
- the area including Courthouse, Hellenistic road and mound, Roman portico and Market Hall
- The Well of St. Paul and its nearby environment embracing Eski Hal Mosque, Cinema Building, Ottoman Courthouse and Ottoman residential buildings
- In the city center, on the junction of the two main streets, the area on the north including Old Mosque, Roman Baths, Old Bath, Şahmeran Çay Bahçesi and Saray İşhanı (the locations of Ottoman period Hans, Saray Hanı and Yeloğlu Han)
- Demirkapı Area where the antique and Arab period city gate is located together with Principalities period tomb and Republican Period Mosque

# - Areas Presenting Vertical Continuity

Since there are not enough excavations for the identification of vertical stratification two areas are designated where vertical stratification is observed.

- The first area is the mound of Gözlükule that has vertical stratification starting from Neolithic period until Arab period.
- Another area showing vertical stratification is the area around Makam Mosque, where Roman Bridge, Arab period tomb, another building from latter period and Makam Mosque from Ottoman period come on top of each other.

## 3.2.2.3 Reserve Areas

Reserve areas can be defined as the areas having archaeological and cultural deposits without any threat for destruction by the development of the current town, having archaeological potential. In the case of Tarsus, these areas are:

- The archaeological sites around Gözlükule
- The area around Barbaros Hayrettin High School including a vaulted building from Roman Period.
- The Roman Necropolis area
- The area around waterfalls where rock-cut tombs are located

#### 3.2.2.4 Risk Areas

The risk areas are the areas where superimposed layers are susceptible to urban development causing deterioration and loss of physical evidences of past settlements. Theses areas are identified as:

- The gardens of Tarsus American College and SEV Primary School. In these areas the existence of the Roman stadium and theatre is known both from the archaeological survey and from construction digs but since they are not in the boundaries of the 1<sup>st</sup> degree archaeological site, the construction of new buildings can result with the destruction of archaeological data
- The area on the southern part of the town centre, Roman tombs near Köylü Garajı
- The empty lot on the southwest of Kubatpaşa Medresesi where a hospital construction is going on. Although these area is not designated as a mound because of its topography, the area can be rich in archaeological deposits

# 3.2.3 Determination of Levels of Historical Layers with Respect to the Level of the Current Town

The levels of historical periods have to be determined for understanding and evaluation of the relations of successive historical periods in vertical direction. Due to the topography of Tarsus, the levels of historical periods are not varying with the current town except Gözlükule. Since Gözlükule has been inhabited in Neolithic Era

onwards, the current height of the mound varies between 30 to 41 meters. As a result of the excavations of Hetty Goldman, thirty three strata are found on the mound (Zoroğlu 1995:36). The Neolithic Era is below 32 meters, Chalcolithic Era is between 32 up to 30.5 meters whereas Bronze Age is between 27 to 8 meters. The Iron Age levels are 15.80 to 12.20 meters. Hellenistic levels start approximately from 12.20 meters and late Hellenistic and Roman periods start from 11.50 meters. The level of Arab period which is defined as Islamic period by Hetty Goldman is between ground level to 6 meters below. <sup>33</sup>

Different from Gözlükule, on the plain land of Tarsus, the habitation levels differ. Since there are not enough excavations for the determination of each historical layer, therefore the levels are identified from one scholar to another. According to Nezahat Baydur, antique settlement of Tarsus starts from 4-4.5 meter below the ground level, whereas Schaffer gives a depth of 6 meters and Ramsay 2 meters (ITU 1989:50). In this study, the levels are identified according to the excavations in different parts of the town and from level differences of existing historical buildings with the current level of the town. Therefore the levels are defined relatively and it is not possible to make a comparison between the levels in different parts of the town.

- The concrete ground level of Roman Baths (Altından Geçme) is 6 m below the current level whereas opus sectile floor covering is 5.56 m below current level. Also the level of pool in the caldarium section is on -6.60 m and the hypocaust system is on -7.85 m level.<sup>34</sup>
- The superstructure of Arab tomb underneath Makam Mosque is 1.20 m below current level whereas the ground level of the burial room is at 7.65 level.<sup>35</sup>
- The ground level of Roman Bridge in the town center is 6.70 m below ground level.<sup>36</sup>
- The colonnaded street on Cumhuriyet Square is 5m below current level.<sup>37</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>33</sup> The levels of historical periods are determined from the evaluation of the section of Gözlükule mound by Levent Zoroğlu (Zoroğlu 1996:38-42) <sup>34</sup> (Athalii 2007:1415,142)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>34</sup> (Adıbelli 2007:145,146)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>35</sup> Measured Drawing prepared by Nurgül Nernekli

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>36</sup> Measured Drawing prepared by Nurgül Nernekli

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>37</sup> (Zoroğlu 2004b:374)

- Hellenistic sewage system is 1.50 m below the level of colonnaded street.<sup>38</sup>
- Roman rock-cut tombs in the waterfalls are 4-5 m from current level.<sup>39</sup>
- Vaulted building from an unknown period underneath Makam Mosque is 4 m below current level.40
- The wall fragments near St. Paul's well start from 1 m below the current layer and the original floor level of the edifice is -2.55 m.<sup>41</sup>
- The remains of the Roman Baths in Cumhuriyet Mahallesi starts from 2.5 -3m below the current level.<sup>42</sup>
- The original floor level of Yeni Hamam is approximately 1.60 m below the current level. 43
- The original floor level of Kubatpaşa Medresesi is approximately 1.20 m below the current level.
- The ground level of Eski Hamam is approximately 1.20 m below current level.
- The original floor level of Old Mosque is approximately exceeding 1 m below the current level.44
- The portico near the colonnaded street is 60-70 cm above the level of the street.45
- The ground level of Makam Mosque is 0.50 m below the current level and the addition from Republican period is at the same level with the current town.46

Since there are not enough archaeological surveys and excavations, it is not possible to assess the depth of archaeological or cultural deposits in the current town. Instead, only local levels can be identified where excavations or surveys are held.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>38</sup> (Zoroğlu 2004:11)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>39</sup> Ministry of Culture, registration sheet

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>40</sup> Measured Drawing prepared by Nurgül Nernekli

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>41</sup> The levels are obtained from measured drawings prepared by SAYKA Ltd. Şti.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>42</sup> Ministry of Culture, registration sheet

<sup>43 (</sup>Uçar 2000:26)

<sup>(</sup>Zoroğlu 1996:52)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>45</sup> (Zoroğlu 2004b:376)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>46</sup> Measured drawings prepared by Nurgül Nernekli

## **3.3 CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT STUDIES IN TARSUS**

After the determination of different quality areas as the indicators of cultural significance; for the determination of presentation principles, firstly the approaches to historical stratification is analyzed throughout the conservation history of Tarsus. Today, in current Tarsus, there are two 1<sup>st</sup> degree archaeological sites which are the area including Gözlükule mound and its nearby surroundings and the area of Donuktaş and its immediate surrounding whereas urban conservation site is the town center including Kızılmurat, Caminur, Cami Cedit, Tabakhane and Sofular districts.

Although there are a few buildings registered as cultural properties in 1966; the declaration of historical sites is in 1977 by Gayrimenkul Eski Eserler ve Anıtlar Yüksek Kurulu (GEEAYK). Gözlükule mound and Roman Temple (Donuktaş) and its surrounding is registered as the 1<sup>st</sup> degree archaeological sites and the town center including Ottoman residential zones are registered as Urban Conservation Site. The boundaries of archaeological sites did not change in time whereas the boundaries of urban conservation site have slight changes in 1985 and finalized in 1989 Urban Conservation Plan.

The information on the interventions held in Tarsus are available starting from the 19<sup>th</sup> century onwards.<sup>47</sup> The first development plan was prepared by Herman Jansen in 1937. The former conservation and development studies includes the development and conservation plans together with the interventions on the valorization and de-valorization of the historical periods of Tarsus for the determination of presentation approaches to historical stratification.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>47</sup> The intervals are determined by taking the dates of conservation and development plans as reference points. The decisions are classified by the information coming from conservation and development plans which are mentioned in the masters thesis of Yeşim Gürani (Gürani 1999) whereas the for the interventions, Tarsus Belediye Tarihi (Öz 1988), and registration sheets prepared by the Ministry of Culture are used as the reference sources.





The decisions and interventions are categorized as valorization an de-valorization. The term valorization is used for decisions or interventions such as landscaping, refunctioning, liberation etc. for presentation purposes; registrations or restorations, excavations or surveys for both conservation and research purposes whereas the term de-valorization is used for decisions or interventions causing a loss in multilayered character or demolishment.



Figure 31 Conservation and Development Process in Tarsus

## 3.3.1 Interventions before 1937

The information on the interventions related to the physical periods starts from the 19<sup>th</sup> century, beginning with the involvement of foreign travelers in Tarsus. Although the involvement initiates the investigations in this period, there were also interventions leading to the demolishment of important physical evidences.

# - Decisions on Valorization

In the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Tarsus was realized by foreign travelers and first archeological surveys and excavations were held in this period (ITU 1989:43).

# - Decisions on De-valorization

Before 1937, the most important intervention was the demolishment of city fortifications by Mısırlı İbrahim Paşa in 1835 (Doğukan A.Ş. 1995). In addition, on top of İtfaiye Tepesi which is a mound from the Hellenistic period, a watching tower and water tank were constructed. In the town center on the intersection of the two main axes, Yeloğlu Han was demolished by a fire and this area was

left as a public open area which is still used today (Öz 1988:7).

## 3.3.2 1937 Development Plan by Hermann Jansen

German architect Prof. Dr. Hermann Jansen, who prepared the development plans of cities like Ankara, Adana, Mersin and Gaziantep; was invited by the mayor of Tarsus in 1936 for the preparation of Tarsus's development plan. The plan was finished by 1937 and this plan can be accepted as the first development plan of Tarsus. Unfortunately, due to economic insufficiencies, the plan could not be realized (Gürani 1999:18). In this development plan, there exist recommendations on railway, highway and airway system; commercial and industrial zones, settlement areas, liberated areas etc. He proposed the industrial region in the west part of the railway and the commercial region in its existing place, the city center.<sup>48</sup>

Jansen proposed a ring road around the city and the main axis of the town was shifted to the north western side of City-Gate (Cleopatra Gate). He also suggests liberating the surrounding of the gate and greening this area. While this new axis is opened, he finds it necessary to conserve İş Bankası, Municipality, two mosques and the Courthouse. He also suggests forming a recreational area on the mound of Gözlükule by raising the mound from ground level with the permission of American excavation team. He prohibits construction on the garden of Tarsus American College.

As to the waterfall region on the north of the town, he again recommends the conservation of watermills, the bridge and building a restaurant seeing the waterfall. In the plan, he also points out the importance of Great Mosque and its nearby surrounding, reflecting a historical character. He also recommends functioning Kırkkaşık Bedesteni as a museum and disallowing construction on the square in front of Great Mosque and Kubatpaşa Medresesi.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>48</sup> The decisions of the Development Plan are derived from the unpublished plan report prepared in 1937 by Hermann Jansen obtained from Hikmet Öz



Figure 34 Interventions before 1937 in Tarsus





#### Decisions on Valorization

First of all, the main axis of the town is proposed to be shifted towards northwest because of the Cleopatra Gate. Also liberation and plantation around Cleopatra Gate was proposed by demolishing the houses surrounding the gate. Important public buildings which are İş Bankası, Municipality building, Makam Mosque, Old Mosque and Courthouse Building recommended to be conserved. Also a traditional building with columns which is on the southeastern part of the Municipality building is also recommended to be conserved but from Jansen's definitions, the location of the building could not be identified. Landscaping and plantation is proposed for Gözlükule mound together with a vista tower and café on the lower part of the mound. Jansen also suggest elevating the mound for perception of the town by consulting the excavation team. On the northern part of the town outside the city center, the development plan proposes the conservation of the watermills around the waterfalls and introduction of a restaurant on the waterfalls. Kirkkasik Bedesteni in the center of the town on the very north of Great Mosque is suggested to be utilized as museum. Besides the buildings, the plan offers the conservation of open areas such as the garden of Tarsus American College, the square in front of the Great Mosque, Kırkkaşık and Yeni Hamam and the green area extending to Kubatpaşa Medresesi. Together with the conservation, new constructions are restricted in these open areas.

#### 3.3.3 Interventions between 1937 – 1958

Due to the high increase in the population, new settlements have formed in the south of the town with the enlargement of Mersin- Adana highway leading to the shift of urban expansion area. The historical tissue shrinks into small scattered districts in the town center and due to the new settlements new streets and the new buildings are created replacing the traditional residential buildings (Bilgen 1989:9). Although the plan of Hermann Jansen was not implemented, some of his suggestions are realized during this period such as the enhancement of Gözlükule, waterfalls. In addition, there are also negative interventions on the Ottoman commercial center, resulting with the demolishment of important Hans.

### Decisions on Valorization

Gözlükule and waterfalls are landscaped and enhanced for recreation purposed among with the surrounding areas of the Great Mosque and Makam Mosque were enhanced. In addition, Kubatpaşa Medresesi was restored in this period (Öz 1988:9).

## Decisions on De-valorization

The area behind the old hospital which belongs to treasury (which is called *Kale Yeri*) and the southern part of Gözlükule were divided into lots and sold to the inhabitants. In the commercial center, Saray Hanı, Gön Hanı, Gozmanın Hanı, Şadırvanlı Han were demolished on purpose and new commercial zones were formed (Öz 1988:9).

## 3.3.4 1958 Development Plan

The first planning study which was implemented was carried in 1958 by development plan act numbered 6785 before the demographic increase, and the shift in the urban structure in Tarsus. The plan was prepared by Y. Müh. Mim. Kemali Söylemezoğlu and Y. Müh. Mim. Adnan Kuruyazıcı. With the introduction of the development plan, buildings constructed before 1958 accepted as authorized buildings. Road profiles are designed and 2 storey residential buildings are proposed by the plan. However there are not any decisions on the valorization or de-valorization of historical periods of Tarsus (Gürani 1999:18).







Figure 37 1958 Development Plan

## 3.3.5 Interventions between 1958-1967

This period is important in the conservation history of Tarsus, since the first registrations of monuments were started. However, the residential buildings were not considered as cultural heritage, a large number of traditional residential buildings from Ottoman period on the northern part of the town were demolished between 1958 to 1967.

#### Decisions on Valorization

First registrations as cultural heritage started in 1966 by the registration of Kırkkaşık Bedesteni and Kubatpaşa Medresesi.<sup>49</sup> Kırkkaşık Bedesteni is restored in 1960-1961. Also İtfaiye Tepesi which is a Hellenistic mound in the town center on the northwestern part of Courthouse is landscaped (Öz 1988:10).

## Decisions on De-valorization

In this period two important governmental buildings from Ottoman period which are old government house and municipality building are demolished. Likewise, traditional buildings on both sides of Adana and Mersin road are demolished due to the widening of the road (Öz 1988:11).

## 3.3.6 1967, 1974 Revision Plans

The revision plans are prepared due to the development of the city between 1960-1965 and the flood in 1968. As a result of the flood in 1968, in the year 1969; disaster houses are built in Kemalpaşa and Feviz Çakmak Districts and the region in the eastern part of Berdan River. Due to the increase in population, education facilities, commercial regions and administrative buildings are planned in the town center. For industrial and small scale arts and crafts, a space is proposed on the northern part of Tarsus. The northern part of the town-center is suggested to be renewed. Also the new development area is suggested to be in the northeastern part where agricultural facilities are not possible (Gürani 1999:21).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>49</sup> The information on the registration of these buildings is obtained from the registration sheets prepared by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism.









Although the decisions of the revision plans are not directly related to historical periods but these decisions have some indirect effects on the historical town center of Tarsus.

# Decisions on Valorization

Small scale commercial and production activities in Market Hall are proposed to be transferred to Seksenikiler District (Doğukan A.Ş. 1995).

# Decisions on De-valorization

By the revision plans give permission to the construction of multi-storey buildings in the town center which is a decision effecting the town's silhouette. Also the traditional buildings are proposed to be renewed which will effect the authenticity of traditional buildings (Doğukan A.Ş. 1995).

# 3.3.7 Interventions between 1974-1982

The period, especially year 1977 is significant in the conservation history of Tarsus since the urban and archaeological sites are registered in this period among with important public buildings and a small number of traditional residential buildings.

# Decisions on Valorization

The most important decision in this period is the registration of historical sites by GEEAYK<sup>50</sup> in 1977. This registration includes 5 districts in the town center as urban site and the area around Donuktaş and Gözlükule as the 1<sup>st</sup> degree archaeological sites. Following the declaration of conservation sites, important public buildings which are Eski Hal Mosque, Eski Hamam, Well of St. Paul, Roman Baths, Old Mosque, Makam Mosque, Gön Hanı, Yeni Hamam, Great Moque, Tomb of Mencik Baba, Donuktaş, Church of St. Paul, Sadık Paşa Housa, Misak-ı Milli Primary School, Justinian Bridge and a few traditional residential buildings from Ottoman period are registered.<sup>51</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>50</sup> Gayrimenkul Eski Eserler ve Anıtlar Yüksek Kurulu

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>51</sup> The information on the registration of these buildings is obtained from the registration sheets prepared by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism





In addition, waterfalls, St Paul Well, Municipality Park, Cleopatra Gate and its surrounding were enhanced for touristic attraction (Öz 1988:11). During this period, in 1978, Christie Hall of Tarsus American College was restored along with Justinian Bridge which was restored in the same year.<sup>52</sup>

# 3.3.8 1982 Structure Implementation Development Plan by Y. Mim. Fahri Yetman

1982 Plan is important for both the valorization decisions of public buildings and the information on the town's development history. Firstly, general information on the town's geography, climate, and geology are examined together with the statistical information on economical, social, commercial, industrial, demographical, educational aspects. The urban expansion areas of 1948, 1958 and 1982 are analyzed for proposals for new development areas. In 1982, the town consist of 31 districts and the districts, which are close to the city center are very dense in terms of residential buildings different from the districts on the periphery.<sup>53</sup>

In the development plan, the eastern part of the town on Adana highway together with the existing industrial region and the uninhabited area in between is proposed as the industrial region of the town. Instead of an isolated administrative district, the plan suggests increasing the number of storey of existing administrative buildings The other administrative buildings that need large settlement area are proposed to be on the periphery of the town.

## Decisions on Valorization

In 1982, waterfalls, Gözlükule and its surrounding, Donuktaş, Roman Baths, Cleopatra Gate, Old Mosque, Makam Mosque and Great Mosque are suggested to be conserved. In addition, recreation areas are proposed around the waterfalls and areas along Berdan River.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>52</sup> The information on the registration of these buildings is obtained from the registration speets prepared by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>53</sup> The information on the plan decisions is obtained from the masters thesis of Yeşim Gürani (Gürani 1999)



Figure 41 1982 Development plan

## 3.3.9 Interventions Between 1982-1989

Although there were registration of traditional residential buildings from Ottoman period, the boundaries of the urban conservation site is also narrowed in this period.

Decisions on Valorization

In this period, a high number of residential buildings from Ottoman period are registered among with Çukurova Factory which was registered in 1985.<sup>54</sup> Between 1982 and 1992, excavations were held in Donuktaş which is a Roman temple on the periphery of the town.

## Decisions on De-valorization

In 1985, the boundaries of urban conservation site was narrowed. (ITU 1989:3)

# 3.3.10 1989 "Tarsus Urban, Archaeological and Natural Sites Conservation Plan" İTÜ

1989 Urban Conservation Plan comprises three archaeological sites Gözlükule, Donuktaş, the mound near Market Hall and the urban conservation site that is separated into two regions. The first region is area on the west part of Makam Mosque that is bounded by İtfaiye road, 25<sup>th</sup> Street, 30<sup>th</sup> Street in northwest; Ali Menteşeoğlu Street on east and Mersin- Adana road on south. The second area is on the eastern part of Makam Mosque is bounded with Adana road on west, 146<sup>th</sup> street on east , 152<sup>nd</sup> and 145<sup>th</sup> street on the south.<sup>55</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>54</sup> The information on the registration of these buildings is obtained from the registration sheets prepared by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>55</sup> The information on the Urban Conservation Plan of Tarsus is obtained from the plan report prepared in 1989 (ITÜ 1989b)



Figure 42 Interventions between 1982-1989 in Tarsus



Figure 43 1989 Conservation Plan

The aim of the conservation plan is set as to conserve historical, archaeological, natural, architectural and functional values and integrate these areas with values into current town. The main objectives of the plan is functional sufficiency, social and cultural integration, create an affirmative environment in architectural and urban aspects, reach a healthy and positive comfort condition, flexibility with optimum cost and economic support.

In order the assess the current state, a detailed analysis was held including historical and archaeological research, transportation axes, land-uses, current uses, conditions, building types, land ownership, accessibility

For the determination of values of the traditional buildings, the level of interventions and registration status are analyzed for monumental buildings. When it comes to traditional dwellings, periods, inscription panels, original uses of the interior and exterior spaces; architectural elements are analyzed and a typology is made. Also the change status of buildings and building lots are also analyzed together with the ownership distribution.

For the identification of archaeological deposits and determination of values specific to these deposits, a detailed literature survey was done resulting with the designation of urban expansion area of Roman period, hypothetical route of the city fortifications and location of the city gates, depth of cultural deposits, the location of the ancient harbor area and other important edifices from Roman period like gymnasium, stadium etc.

## Decisions on Valorization

Decisions on the valorization of historical stratification can be categorized as registration decisions, accessibility, land-use and functions, presentations and decisions on archaeological sites.

The urban site boundaries are enlarged according to the historical, aesthetic and technical values together with the buildings, streets and regions important for historical identity of the town.

As the accessibility decisions, the vehicular traffic is arranged as one way including the streets in the boundaries of urban conservation site. Şahmeran and 42<sup>nd</sup> Streets are proposed as pedestrian streets. For the important historical areas as St. Paul Square, Church of St Paul, Old Mosque, Market Hall and the registered archaeological site including colonnaded street, a continuous and uninterrupted pedestrian lane is proposed.

When it comes to the decisions on functions, new functions promoting St. Paul Well are proposed instead of workshops and small production functions. The scattered shops on the north of Market Hall Building can be shifted to the courtyard of the building. In addition, the commercial functions can be continued in traditional dwellings except workshops. Stickler Hall in Tarsus American College complex is proposed to be restored and serve as museum and library and for other cultural activities together with the arrangement of its garden. Traditional building on the very north of the town leading to Barbaros Hayrettin High School which was used as

a wood depot is proposed to be restored and re-functioned as public education center and handcrafts workshops. Besides the refunctioning decisions on buildings, garden of Old Bath is suggested to be arranged as a café for the inhabitants and the public space on Street 34<sup>th</sup> and 37<sup>th</sup> as children's playground.

When it comes to presentation decisions, the office block on the archaeological site behind the Courthouse is proposed to be destructed and the area should be designed as a park and be integrated with Cumhuriyet Square. The area including St. Paul Square, Old Mosque, Market Hall and registered archaeological site on the north of Court Building is considered as a whole and defined as cultural and tourist attraction areas.

Besides the presentation decisions, there were also decisions on the archaeological sites in Tarsus. According to the conservation plan, constructions are not allowed on the 1<sup>st</sup> degree archaeological sites. For the foundation constructions, these constructions should be done under the direction of an archaeologist from Tarsus Museum. In addition, the necessity of documentation for the remains exposed from foundation excavations is highlighted. Furthermore, the archaeological site behind

the Courthouse should be re-evaluated according to the archaeological surveys and excavations. Donuktaş and Gözlükule which are the 1<sup>st</sup> degree archaeological sites are proposed to be archaeological parks. To sum up, below ground conservation strategy is proposed for the archaeological heritage in Tarsus.

# 3.3.11 Interventions Between 1989-1995

The most significant intervention in this period is the excavations held in Cumhuriyet Square resulting with discoveries on the urban form of Tarsus in Hellenistic and Roman periods.

#### Decisions on Valorization

The excavations in Cumhuriyet Square was held between the years 1994 to 2001 and exposing a colonnaded street and a portico from Hellenistic and Roman periods. During this period, Municipality Park is also registered.

# 3.3.12 1995 Development Plan by Doğukan İmar İnş. Ltd. Şti.

The 1995 plan is prepared due to the necessity of the developing industry and increase in population. Because of the high level of ground water, the town is proposed to develop towards the northwestern part. The industrial zone was enlarged to the west owing to the railway and E-5 highway. Due to the development in commercial and industrial activity in Tarsus after 1965-1970s, there was an increase in commercial uses whereas the residential use decreases. High-storey residential buildings shifted to the northwestern part of the town. There are not any decisions on either valorization or de-valorization of historical stratification (Gürani 1999:26).







Figure 45 1995 Development Plan

#### 3.3.13 Studies and Interventions between 1995 – 2007

In recent years, various interventions are held in Tarsus on the valorization of historical periods in Tarsus. These interventions can be categorized as excavations, surveys, restoration and enhancement, street rehabilitation, registration and presentations by the initiation of different stakeholders such as Tarsus Municipality, Ministry of Culture and Tourism and General Directorate of Pious Foundations.

#### Decisions on Valorization

As to excavations, the Roman tombs near Köylü Garajı on the southern part of the town are excavated in 1999 by Tarsus Museum. Also in Roman Baths the excavation and liberation starts in 2005. Also Makam Mosque is excavated by the municipality in 2006.<sup>56</sup>

During this period, the traditional residential buildings around St Paul Well are documented by İstanbul Technical University between 1995 to 1996. In addition, buildings on 37<sup>th</sup> and 42<sup>nd</sup> streets are documented between 1998 to 2001. An archaeological survey is still continuing on the mound of Gözlükule by Boğaziçi University starting from 2001.

In this period, a large number of restoration and enhancement were held in Tarsus such as Sticker Hall of Tarsus American College, Cleopatra Gate in 1995, Mencik Baba Tomb in 2000, Kırkkaşık Bedesteni in 2002, Church of St. Paul in 2004, Old Mosque and Eski Hal Mosque in 2006, Kubatpaşa Medresesi and Great Mosque in 2007 which are still ongoing.

Besides the restorations, street rehabilitation of 37<sup>th</sup> and 42<sup>nd</sup> streets were done between 2002 to 2004 and the street rehabilitation project which is started in 2007 is still continuing on Şahmeran Street. In this period, Cinema Building, Mustafa Ağa Mescidi, Mustafa Haşim Tarsusi Mescidi, Aqueduct, Rock-cut tombs, vaulted building, Martyrdom and Rasim Dokur Cotton Factory Chimney are registered.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>56</sup> The information on the interventions in recent years are obtained from the web-site of Ministry of Culture and Tourism (http://www.kultur.gov.tr)




There were also enhancements held in Tarsus for presentation purposes. Urban design projects were applied in St Paul Well, Çeşmeli Square between 2002 to 2004. After the excavation of Makam Mosque, urban design project is prepared in 2007. Market Hall and Donuktaş are liberated from scattered buildings and shelters. In addition, inscription of Honour which was situated on the wall of New Baths was relocated near Cleopatra Gate whereas, Hamişzade Meydan Fountain on the garden of old municipality building is relocated near Eski Hal Mosque.

When development plans and interventions are evaluated, the main focus was the town center. The proposals and interventions are generally on the valorization of the important and well known edifices whereas the ones that have lost their physical integrity are not taken into consideration. Especially by the interventions before 1958, Ottoman Hans and commercial shops in the town center are either mostly demolished. In addition, since there are not registrations in this period, the religious building of non-Moslem community in Ottoman period and a large number of traditional residential buildings are destroyed. Besides, important public buildings from Ottoman period like hospital buildings and churches are also ignored due to the insufficient knowledge of their importance among with the remains and edifices which are outside the town center.

The development plans generally focus on the structuring and development of the town together with decisions on the conservation and enhancement of public buildings and open areas. Especially in 1937 Jansen plan and 1982 Development Plan the conservation and enhancement decisions were dominant compared to the other development plans. These decisions focus on the well-known public buildings and open areas such as Old Mosque, Makam Mosque, Great Mosque, waterfalls and Gözlükule.

The period between 1974-1982 is significant in the conservation history because of the registrations of the urban site in the town center, Donuktaş and Gözlükule archaeological sites. Besides the urban and archaeological sites, a large number of public buildings were registered in the same period. By the introduction of Urban Conservation Plan in 1989, the boundaries of registered sites are widened and an appropriate conservation strategy is proposed by the evaluation of the cultural heritage in Tarsus. Although there is an extensive research on the archaeological evidences; the plan was insufficient for putting forward conservation strategies for archaeological remains outside the registration site boundaries. After 1995, the proposals of the conservation plan started to be implemented and there is a large number of conservation activities continuing from 1997 until today.

Even though the conservation activities are increased beginning from 1995, the interventions are based on the well-known edifices from different periods, the archaeological remains, buildings that are not known by the inhabitants are not taken into consideration.

# 3.4 EVALUATION OF CURRENT PRESENTATION STATUS OF HISTORICAL PERIODS IN TARSUS

Besides the former presentation approaches on the historical stratification, the current presentation status of the historical periods should be assessed in order to determine the necessities, sufficiencies and presentation potentials.

# 3.4.1 In-situ Presentation Status of Historical Periods

The edifices from different periods such as pre-Roman, Roman, Medieval and Ottoman are presented by signboards with names of the edifices. The buildings from the Republican period generally are not presented except the Courthouse building. The edifices having signboards with the names and history of the edifices are the museums such as St. Paul's well, the Church of St. Paul and the Roman Road. Although Donuktaş and Gözlükule are the 1<sup>st</sup> degree archaeological sites, they are not well presented.



**Figure 45 a)** Church of St. Paul after restoration (author, July.2007) **b)** Information panel of Great Mosque and landscaped for presentation (author, July.2007)

The commercial center including masonry shop buildings from Ottoman period is ignored and the buildings cannot be perceived as historical edifices. Some churches from Ottoman period which are still intact, like Maronite Church and Greek Church are not presented. The remains giving idea about the former edifice like the entrance door of Gön Hanı and the door of Armenian Church and the aqueduct are not presented.

# 3.4.2 Ex-situ Presentation

The edifices from different periods such as pre-Roman, Roman, Medieval and Ottoman are ex-situ presented via tourist guide books and on internet. Generally edifices presented in booklets which are prepared by different authorities like Municipality, Ministry of Culture and Tourism Information Center, are the same edifices. In the tourism guide books and on internet, generally the history of the edifices are mentioned together with recent photographs whereas the old photographs or drawings are not represented. In books and articles, generally the edifices and areas which are excavated are studied like Gözlükule together with the amphitheatre, Donuktaş, Roman road and Roman Baths. For the Ottoman period traditional buildings, the buildings which are restored or part of the street rehabilitation project are presented rather than the ones in bad condition.



Figure 46 Tarsus tourism guide book

When in-situ and ex-situ presentations are compared, ex-situ presentation covers more edifices and more information about their existence and history than in-situ presentation. Although edifices from different periods such as Pre-Roman, Roman, Arab, Ottoman, Armenian and Principalities are presented; there are a lot of edifices that are ignored or even not known by the inhabitants therefore are not presented. These edifices are generally in bad condition or they have lost their architectural integrity whereas in some cases they are outside the city center. Usually these edifices are not easily perceived or there are not enough information about their building type or period.



Figure 49 In-situ presentation status in Tarsus





# 3.4.3 Presentation of Historical Stratifications in Touristic Tours

For the international tours<sup>57</sup>, a few of the edifices are shown within the town like the church of St Paul, St. Paul's well, Cleopatra Gate and Roman road. Two of the edifices are important for Christians since these edifices have connections with Apostle St. Paul, one is the church dedicated to him and the other is thought to be the house of St. Paul. When it comes to Cleopatra Gate, it has an attachment with the mythology that Cleopatra and Marcus Antonius met in Tarsus and entered the

city from this gate. The Roman Road is also shown since it has an archaeological importance for the city and gives idea about the town in Roman times. The tourist groups are also taken to Waterfalls for gastronomic purposes; unfortunately the rock-cut tombs along the riverbed are not mentioned.

In religious tours<sup>58</sup>, both edifices important for Christianity and Islam are shown within the town. The tomb of Prophet Daniel, Bilal-i Habeş Mescidi and the tombs of Prophets Şit, Lokman and Abbasid Caliph Mamun near the Great Mosque are shown which are buildings having connections with important religious people rather than their historical and architectural importance. For Christianity, St. Paul' Church, St. Paul's well and Old Mosque which was an Armenian Church originally are shown.

In the tours guided by Tourism Information Center of Tarsus<sup>59</sup>, almost all the edifices from different periods that are present in tourist booklets and on internet are shown like Gözlükule mound, Cleopatra Gate, Great Mosque, St Paul's Church, Tarsus traditional houses and St Paul's Well. Unfortunately, like ex-situ presentation, some of the buildings like the Ottoman shop buildings in the center of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>57</sup> International tours are generally a part of a region tour including Mersin, Adana, Antakya and generally daily tours without accommodation.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>58</sup> Religious tours are defined as "Inanç Turizmi" in Turkey and includes religious areas in Turkey and the religious tours including Tarsus also embraces Antakya and Mersin. The route is identified from the information coming from Turkish Tour Guides Association (TUREB).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>59</sup> Tours of Tourism Information of Tarsus is specific for Tarsus and defined by Tourism Information Center

the town, Greek Church, Maronite Church, important remains and Roman Temple (Donuktaş) are not presented.

In the touristic tours, the general focus is on the city center and the edifices which are easily accessible. In addition, the interventions whether the edifices are restored, landscaped or excavated is also another criteria for identifying the routes. For the religious and international tours, the main focus is on important edifices which are religiously important or have connections with historical people or events such as St. Paul, Cleopatra or Prophet Daniel.

When in situ and ex situ presentations are compared, ex-situ presentation covers more edifices and more information about their existence and history than in situ presentation. Although edifices from different periods such as Hellenistic, Roman, Arab, Ottoman, Armenian and Principalities are presented, there are a lot of edifices that are ignored and even not known by the inhabitants therefore are not presented. These edifices are generally in bad condition or they have lost their architectural integrity whereas in some cases they are outside the city center. Usually these edifices are not easily perceived or there are not enough information about their building type or period.











# 3.4.4. Presentation Potential of Historical Stratification in Tarsus

In order to propose presentation principles for multi-layered historical towns, the current presentation potential of historical stratification has to be assessed. The presentation potential includes current presentation status which is discussed in the previous part, accessibility of the edifices, integration with the current town and attraction.

As it is mentioned before, accessibility can be perceived in two dimensions; firstly accessibility within the town whether the building is in the city center, on the main axes or on the periphery. Secondly, accessibility in building scale, whether the edifices can be entered and observed. When the accessibility of the edifices and open areas are evaluated, three groups are identified as the accessibility in town-scale which are, edifices located in the town center on the main axes, on the secondary roads and on the periphery of the town.

Since the town center serves as the junction of the main roads in different historical periods, the most accessible edifices are from different periods. However the important buildings having representative value are usually on the secondary road of the town among with the Ottoman residential buildings. On the periphery of the town, there exists rare buildings from Roman and Hellenistic period as well as the representative buildings of Republican period.

As to the accessibility for entrance and observation, for the buildings which are still used, the accessibility directly depends on the functions. Generally the accessible ones have either commercial or religious functions. For residential buildings, entrance can be possible by permission. When abandoned edifices are considered, the entrance is almost impossible. Also some of the important remains from Roman period are not accessible for observation whereas for the edifices which are used as museum can easily be accessible.





Besides accessibility, the integration of the physical edifices with the current town is also another aspect to be analyzed for proposing presentation principles. The integration can be achieved in two ways which are physical integration and functional integration. For the edifices which do not constitute their physical entity as a whole, physical integration can be in three ways such as:

- Existing together with the latter elements of the town without any destruction or combination
- Combination of the remains with latter elements and forming a newly introduced whole within the existing context. (a building type changed to another and form a new building type which is still used by the inhabitants)
- Utilization of the remains for new uses
  - o Positive utilization (utilization for presentation)
  - o Negative utilization (utilization as building element or material)

For the edifices that are whole and intact, the physical integration can be achieved by visual integration, whether the edifices are perceivable or not. Furthermore, the use of the edifices by the inhabitants or tourists is a measure for their functional integration. (

When the integration of edifices and open areas in Tarsus are evaluated, edifices from different periods are physically integrated with the current town. This integration can be either for presentation purposes or per se by the inhabitants. There are also negative utilization of the remains as building material especially on the mound of Gözlükule and use as one side of their house in Donuktaş. When the functional integration is considered, commercial, religious and exhibition (museum) functions serve for the functional integration of edifices and open areas.





For the identification of presentation potential, attraction is another aspect to be considered and analyzed. This attraction can also be perceived in two dimensions such as physical and social attraction. Physical attraction includes position and perception, the state of survival, having a vista or being a landmark whereas social attraction includes tourist's attraction, inhabitant's attraction and religious attraction together with the associations of the edifices with important people or legends.

When the attraction of the edifices and open areas in Tarsus is evaluated, generally public buildings from Principalities, Armenian and Republican period have visual attraction. As to the Ottoman public buildings, due to the scale of these buildings, they are perceived as the residential tissue. For the remains from Hellenistic and Roman period, the state of survivals play an important role in visual attraction. As to the social attraction, the attribution of legends and religious people take an important part. These attributions attract both touristic an inhabitant's attraction whereas edifices serving as open air museums have touristic attraction.



Figure 56 Attraction of Historical Stratification in Tarsus

## **CHAPTER 4**

# PROPOSAL FOR THE PRESENTATION OF MULTI-LAYEREDNESS BASED ON CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE IN TARSUS

# **4.1 PROPOSALS FOR EX-SITU PRESENTATION**

Ex-situ presentation covers different types of presentation on internet, in tourist guidebooks and in academic sources. As it is mentioned before, for ex-situ presentations, the accuracy of knowledge is the most important criteria for dissemination of information.

The accuracy of knowledge depends on the types of information sources and their reliability. Therefore, for ex-situ presentations, the information sources have to be mentioned as primary or secondary sources with citations. Another factor is virtual reconstructions used in ex-situ presentations. In virtual reconstructions, the degree of knowledge has to be differentiated according to the reliability of restitution project. In multi-layered historical towns, it is for sure that most of the buildings are multiperiod. Therefore the different periods in building scale have to be differentiated either. Another aspect for virtual reconstructions is, the display of the current state of survivals of the edifices. Although the virtual reconstructions are important for the perception of ruins as a whole, it can be misleading for people that haven't seen the building or site; therefore the state of survivals of the buildings or sites has to be somehow displayed.

Another problem in ex-situ presentations is; the insufficiency in the presentation of the context of the edifices. For a total understanding of the buildings or sites, the context is the most important factor therefore, the context has to be mentioned including photos and engravings. The context covers both the immediate surrounding of the edifice and the location within the current town. Another important aspect is the historical period of the edifice and the relation of the edifice with others in its construction period. In this thesis ex-situ presentation proposal is limited to principles since the scope of ex-situ presentation is wide ranging from virtual reconstructions to interactive web sites.

# 4.2 PROPOSALS FOR IN-SITU PRESENTATION

#### 4.2.1 Proposal for Itineraries

Itineraries identifying the routes for different periods of the town and multilayeredness both serve for in-situ presentation and ex-situ presentation. Itineraries are important for the presentation of the buildings together with their context and the relations with same period buildings and buildings from different periods.

For the case of Tarsus, two types of itineraries are proposed. The starting point of both types is the southern part of the town. The first type is proposed for the presentation of historical stratification of the town including edifices and open areas from different periods and the continuity areas which reflect the historical periods and their relation. In these itineraries, the edifices, open areas etc. are differentiated according to their historical periods for understanding the historical stratification.

The second type of itinerary is for the presentation of each historical period and the integrity of the edifices within the town. For this itineraries the identity areas of each period is the base for itinerary preparation. Aiming this purpose, five itineraries are proposed for historical periods:

#### - Itinerary for Hellenistic Period

The itinerary for Hellenistic period includes Gözlükule mound, colonnaded street which is the main axis of the town in this period and the mound on the very north of the colonnaded street.

#### - Itinerary for Roman Period

For Roman period; since there exists edifices on the periphery of the town, itinerary exceeds the town center on the north to waterfalls and on the east to Justinian Bridge. The edifices upon the route are, Cleopatra Gate, Gözlükule mound, theatre,

Roman Baths in Cumhuriyet District, portico near the colonnaded street, well of St. Paul, vaulted building in the garden of Barbaros Hayrettion High School, the Roman Baths and bridge in the town center as well as the Roman temple Donuktaş.







**Figure 56** General view of the 3D Itinerary for the presentation of multi-layered character of Tarsus



Figure 57 3D itinerary for the presentation of multi-layered character of Tarsus- View 1



Figure 58 3D itinerary for the presentation of multi-layered character of Tarsus- View 2



Figure 59 3D itinerary for the presentation of multi-layered character of Tarsus- View 3



Figure 60 3D itinerary for the presentation of multi-layered character of Tarsus- View 4



Figure 61 3D itinerary for the presentation of multi-layered character of Tarsus- View 5



Figure 62 3D itinerary for the presentation of multi-layered character of Tarsus- View 6







Figure 66 Itinerary for the presentation of Roman period of Tarsus





# - Itinerary for Medieval Period

The itinerary presenting the Medieval period of Tarsus includes buildings from Arab, Armenian and Principalities period which are Cleopatra Gate,<sup>60</sup> tomb in the town center from Arab period; Church of St. Paul, Old Mosque from Armenian period; Old Bath, New Bath, Great Mosque, Kubatpaşa Medresesi from principalities period.

# - Itinerary for Ottoman Period

Since there are a lot of buildings from Ottoman period including public, residential and commercial buildings; the itinerary of this period proposes a primary route among with secondary and thirtiary routes. The primary route consists, the area of Tarsus America College, commercial zone, Cumhuriyet District, town center and the residential district of Kızılmurat. The secondary and thirtiary routes includes the districts on the northern and eastern part of the town center where there are residential quarters and few public and religious buildings.

# - Itinerary for Early Republican Period

The itinerary includes Courthouse and Market Hall area on the main axis of the town, railway station, municipality park and a few residential buildings from Early Republican Period among with Çukurova Factory on the north of the town which is an important industrial zone.

Along with the existing edifices or open areas from different historical periods, the demolished ones are also represented in order to provide a better understanding of historical stratifications. Besides the existence of the non-existing ones are also expected to be presented by different methods within the current town.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>60</sup> Cleopatra Gate is presented in the itineraries of both Roman and Medieval period since the construction of the town fortifications dates back to Roman period whereas in Arab period, the fortifications were rebuilt.



Figure 68 Itinerary for the presentation of Medieval period of Tarsus









# 4.2.2 Proposal for Information Panels

The information panels for in-situ presentations are proposed as two scaled within the current town. The first one is town scale information panels which are designed to be located in different quality areas with the type and description of the area and a map showing the relation of different periods within the area and itinerary routes including the area.

The second type is the building scale information panels which include descriptive Information, a brief history of the edifice, period of the edifice and reliability of the information together with the map of its period in order to relate the edifice with existing town and with the edifices of its period.







Figure 70 Proposal for building scale information panels

# 4.2.3 Proposal for Principles Guiding Design Interventions

For design interventions held in Tarsus, the principles will be set in order to conserve the multi-layered character and higher understanding and proper presentations. Since the design varies from one designer to another, the way how the relations are achieved and presented has to be the decision of the designer.
# 4.2.3.1 Determination of Project Areas

The project areas for the presentation of multi-layered character of Tarsus is determined as the continuity areas of the town. These areas can be divided as physical continuity and functional continuity areas. The physical continuity areas are regarded as the identity areas of multi-layeredness of the town. In Tarsus, there are two types of continuity areas as continuity areas presenting the horizontal continuity and continuity areas presenting the vertical continuity.

Functional Continuity Areas in Tarsus are:

- Ottoman commercial zone which still serves as the commercial center of historic town
- Ottoman residential zone in town center
- Great Mosque and its vicinity
- Area including Courthouse and Market Hall
- Tarsus American College complex
- Gözlükule mound

Physical Continuity Areas Presenting the Historical Stratification are:

- Area including Market Hall, Courthouse colonnaded street, portico and Hellenistic mound
- Well of St. Paul and its vicinity including Eski Hal Mosque, Republican Cinema Building and Ottoman residential buildings and Ottoman Courthouse
- Northern gate of the fortifications with Roman necropolis and vaulted building in Barbaros Hayrettin High School complex
- Demirkapı region including Tomb of Mehmet Felah, Merkez Güzeyloğlu Mosque
- In the city center, the area including Eski Hamam, Old Mosque, Roman Baths, Ottoman residential buildings, Saray Hani, Yeloğlu Han
- The area including Makam Mosque, Arab tomb, vaulted building, Roman bridge and Kubatpaşa Medresesi





The suggestions for project areas collide with the continuity areas and also within the project areas there are edifices which represent different cases presenting the interactions among the historical periods and current town in Tarsus. The suggestions for presentation projects for Tarsus can be Demirkapı which is an edifice demolished but the location, period and building type is known and also there exists an old photograph showing the gate in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. For remains that are combined with latter elements and forming a newly introduced whole within the existing context can be Maronite Church that an additional floor built on top of it and used as a residential building in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. As to remains that have lost their integrity, Gön Hanı can be an example whereas for remains having new buildings on their top can be vaulted Roman building on the northern part of the historic town. The examples can be increased with historical edifices that are not known by the inhabitants or tourist such as Ottoman hospitals, Ottoman military office, Ottoman shops in the city center or presented inaccurately such as Tomb of Daniel and St. Paul's well.

The main study area of this thesis is determined according to the juxtaposition of functional and physical continuity areas. The city center serves as the city center in different periods and includes important monumental buildings from Roman, Principalities, Armenian, Arab and Ottoman periods. Also the area is on the intersection of the two main axes of the town, cardo and decumanus in the Roman period.

Also the main study area includes different cases for historical towns such as:

- Different periods presenting the horizontal stratification of the town
- Different periods presenting the vertical stratification of the town
- Edifices that are demolished but their location, period and building type are known
- Remains that have lost their integrity, not giving information about the whole
- Remains which are still preserved but having construction on their top











Figure 74 a)Old Mosque (author July, 2007) b) Eski Hamam (author July, 2007)



Figure 75 a) Arab tomb (author July, 2007) b) Building underneath Makam Mosque (author July, 2007)



a) b) Figure 76 a) Mustafa Ağa Mescidi (author July, 2007) b) Roman bridge (author July, 2007)



**Figure 77 a)** Ottoman residential building(author July, 2007) b) Roman Baths (author July, 2007)



**Figure 78 a)** Kubatpaşa Medresesi (www.tarsus.bel.tr , last accessed on 21.12.2007) **b)** Makam Mosque (www.tarsus.bel.tr , last accessed on 21.12.2007)



Figure 79 a) Location of Yeloğlu Han (author July, 2007) b) Location of Saray Hanı (author July, 2007)

The project area has maximum stratification since different periods come on top of each other. Furthermore, the area is investigated both by archaeological surveys, excavations and restoration projects therefore the information on the buildings are available for the identification of presentation principles. Another aspect is the touristic, religious and inhabitant's attraction for the buildings such as Old Mosque, Roman Baths, Old Bath and the tomb of Prophet Daniel. In addition, since the project area is on the intersection of the main axes of the town, it is one of the most accessible sites within the current town. Besides, the edifices in the study area have physical and social attraction among with attributions such as Prophet Daniel and the Legend of Şahmeran.

After the selection of the project area, in order to propose presentation principles, the cultural significance of the edifices, their presentation potential, and the information obtained from the sources have to be analyzed.

## 4.2.3.2 Cultural Significance of Historical Buildings in the Project Area

As it was mentioned before, the project area includes, a bridge and a bath named as Altından Geçme from Roman period; a tomb called The Tomb of Prophet Daniel from Arab Period, Old Mosque which was a church from the Armenian reign in 11<sup>th</sup> century, Old Bath and Kubatpaşa Medresesi from Principalities period; Makam Mosque, Mustafa Ağa Mescidi and residential buildings from Ottoman period among with new buildings.

When the data coming from the diachronic survey is evaluated, further information is obtained on the multi-layeredness of the town. First of all, in the study area, there are two Hans from Ottoman period; Yeloğlu Han and Saray Hanı that are demolished today. In addition, because of the construction of Vakıfbank building near Makam Mosque, the continuation of the Roman Bridge underneath the building is also identified. Furthermore, according to Hikmet Öz, the hypocaust system of the Roman Baths goes underneath Old Bath but since cardo and decumanus of Roman period are known, the hypocaust system can be evaluated as the drainage system from Roman period. Again Hikmet Öz mentions an antique building underneath Saray İşhanı which is today in the location of Saray Hanı from Ottoman period and also another antique building underneath Old Mosque but there are not any further information supporting these hypothesis but still is an important data that can be

utilized in presentation proposals. From the site survey held in 2007, the continuation of the Roman Baths is observed towards west and wall fragments also seen on the western part of the baths.

With regard to the state of survival of the edifices, except Roman Bridge, Arab period tomb and Roman Baths, the other historical edifices are whole and intact. When knowledge on existences of the edifices are evaluated, they are in parallel with the state of survivals. The survived ones from Ottoman and Principalities period are known in all aspects which are building type, location, period, building contour and height. When it comes to the Arab period tomb and the Roman Bridge, the location, building type, height and periods are known. However, there exists another edifice underneath Makam Mosque but the building type, period and height of the edifice is not known (Yıldız 2007:3). For the Roman Baths, location and period are known but height and contour of the edifice still needs further investigation. As to Saray Hanı and Yeloğlu Han, their period, building type, building contour and location are known.

Considering the position and perception of the edifices, most of the buildings are over ground and can be perceived such as Ottoman period residential buildings, Makam Mosque and Old Mosque. Old Bath and Mustafa Ağa Mescidi are surrounded by new high rise buildings and sometimes the buildings are surrounded by traditional residential buildings as in the case of Kubatpaşa Medresesi that effects the perception. Roman Baths are partially over and partially underground and the part which is above ground is surrounded with new buildings on the west. These buildings also effect the perception of the continuation of the building. Arab tomb is underground and not visible because the building whose period is unknown is constructed on the tomb and on top of that building Makam Mosque was constructed. In the case of Roman Bridge, the edifice is also underground and can not be perceived because of the road construction on top and construction of Vakıf Bank on the west on top of the bridge. The river which was once passing through the project area can not be perceived either due to the new constructions in the town center.

















The shelters in the project area also important in the perception of the edifices. Municipality shelters for shoe shining effect the perception of the west façade of Old Bath whereas Şahmeran Tea House which is in the location of Yeloğlu Han obstructs the apprehension of the bath. The shelter covering outer narthex<sup>61</sup> of Old Mosque also interfere the northern façade of the mosque. The temporary shelter of Kubatpaşa Medresesi and the shelter on top of the Roman Bridge also effects the perception of the edifices.

The former interventions held in the project area have to be taken into consideration in decision-making project but due to the aim of the study, the interventions are evaluated according to their contribution to presentation and effect on multilayeredness. Most of the buildings in the project area are restored such as Kubatpaşa Medresesi, the residential buildings on the north, Old Bath and Old Mosque. Roman Baths are excavated whereas Makam Mosque, Arab tomb and Roman Bridge are both excavated and will be restored.

Besides the physical aspects, the functional and social aspects have to be considered for presentation purposes. Focusing on this aim, functional continuity of the buildings is accepted as value of the buildings therefore the current and original uses of the buildings and their relation is analyzed. Some of the residential buildings from Ottoman period, Makam Mosque, Old Bath and Mustafa Ağa Mescidi preserve their original function and Old Mosque is still used as a religious building which is considered as second degree functional continuity that a church is converted into another religious building of the latter period, the mosque. For new buildings, Saray İşhanı has similar function with Saray Hanı which is also thought the be the functional continuity of the area.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>61</sup> Son Cemaat Yeri in Turkish, which is the entrance area of the mosque for congregation.









For presentation proposals, the attraction of the edifices has to be considered. Makam Mosque and Tomb of Daniel have touristic, religious and local attraction, whereas Old Mosque has religious and touristic attraction. Roman Baths and Kubatpaşa Medresesi, since they are not religious buildings or have attribution to religious people, they attract only the tourists. Although Old Bath is an important public building of Principalities period, it only attracts the inhabitants for bathing purposes.

<b>Table 4</b> The information groups for the determination of cultural significance of Historical
Edifices (for all of the edifices in the project area See Appendix M)

	NAME	ESKİ HAMAM 1	ROMAN BATHS 2	RESIDENTIAL BUILDING 3	OLD MOSQUE
IDENTIFICATION	PERIOD	Principalities	Roman	Ottoman	Armenian
	CATEGORY	PUBLIC (Bath)	PUBLIC (Bath)	RESIDENTIAL	PUBLIC (Mosque)
	CURRENT USE	Bath	Not used	Not used Commercial	
CURRENT	REGISTRATION STATUS	Registered	Registered	Registered	Registered
STATUS	OWNERSHIP	Foundation	Municipality	Private	Foundation
	DEGREE OF KNOWLEDGE ON EXISTENCE	All aspects are known	Location Period Building Type	All aspects are known	All aspects are known
ACCURACY OF KNOWLEDGE	TYPES OF SOURCES AND THEIR RELIABILITY	Primary sources	Primary sources Primary sources		Primary sources
	LEVEL OF INVESTIGATION	Restoration	Excavation	Excavation Restoration	
	TYPE OF INTERVENTIONS	Restoration	Excavation	Restoration	Restoration
AUTHENTICITY	TYPES & LEVEL OF CHANGES	Change in Facade Organization	-	Change in Facade Organization	Semi-opened mass addition
	STATE OF SURVIVAL	Whole Intact	Scattered remains not giving information about the whole	Whole Intact	Whole Intact
SUSTAINABILITY	RELATION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL & CULTURAL DEPOSITS WITH THE CURRENT LAYER	On top of Hypocaust system of the Roman Baths	Scattered remains not giving information about the whole	On top of Roman baths	On top of an antique building
	CURRENT USE	Used	Abandoned	Used	Used

**Table 4** The information groups for the determination of cultural significance of HistoricalEdifices (continued)

	NAME	ESKİ HAMAM 1	ROMAN BATHS 2 3		OLD MOSQUE 4	
ACCESSIBILITY	ACCESSIBILITY WITHIN THE CURRENT TOWN	In the city center on secondary roads	In the city center on the main axis, road or square	In the city center on the main axis, road or square	In the city center on the main axis, road or square	
	ACCESSIBILITY FOR ENTRANCE AND OBSERVATION	Entrance at certain periods of the day	Entrance by permission	Direct entrance	Entrance at certain periods of the day	
	PHYSICAL INTEGRATION		Utilization of the remains for new uses Existing together with the latter elements of the town			
INTEGRATION	FUNCTIONAL INTEGRATION	Used in certain periods by the inhabitants	-	Everyday use by the inhabitants	Everyday use by the inhabitants	
	POSITION/ PERCEPTION	Overground surrounded Partially visible	Over and underground partially visible	Over ground and visible	-	
	LANDMARK	-	Landmark	-	Landmark	
	PHYSICAL OBSTACLES	Municipality Painting Buffet Şahmeran Tea House	Residential Buildings	-	Residential Buildings	
PRESENTATION STATUS	IN SITU PRESENTATION STATUS	Information panel (name)	Information panel (name)	-	Information panel (name) Restoration for presentation purposes	
	EX SITU PRESENTATION STATUS	Books Internet (name, text)	-	-	-	
	COMPONENT (PART OF A GROUP)	-	-	-	-	
INTEGRITY	BEING PART OF A VISTA	Roman Baths, Old Mosque, Old Bath, Residential Building	Roman Baths, Old Mosque, Old Bath, Residential Building	Roman Baths, Old Mosque, Old Bath, Residential Building	Roman Baths, Old Mosque, Old Bath, Residential Building	
CONTINUITY	FUNCTIONAL CONTINUITY	+	-	-	2 <sup>nd</sup> degree Functional continuity (church-mosque)	
	PHYSICAL CONTINUITY	+	+	+	+	
SOCIAL	ATTRACTION	-	Touristic -		Touristic, Religious, Inhabitants	
ATTRACTION	REFERENCE POINT	-	Reference point	-	Reference point	
	ATTRIBUTION	Legend of Şahmeran	-	-	-	

	NAME	ESKİ HAMAM 1	ROMAN BATHS 2	RESIDENTIAL BUILDING 3	OLD MOSQUE 4	
	VIEW POINTS (VISTAS)	Old Mosque Roman Baths	Old Mosque Old Bath	Old Mosque Roman Baths Old Bath Makam Mosque	Old Bath Makam Mosque Roman Baths	
VISUAL ATTRACTION	STATE OF SURVIVAL	Whole, intact	Scattered remains not giving information about the whole	Whole, intact	Whole, intact	
	LANDMARK	-	Landmark	-	Landmark	
	POSITION/ PERCEPTION	Overground surrounded Partially visible	Over and underground Partially visible	Overground and visible	-	
CONSERVATION NECESSITIES	THREATS	-	Exposure to open air	-	-	
	TYPES OF CHANGES	Change in Facade Organization	-	Change in Facade Organization	Semi-opened mass addition and a minaret	
	TYPE OF INTERVENTIONS	Restoration	Excavation	Restoration	Restoration	

**Table 4** The information groups for the determination of cultural significance of HistoricalEdifices (continued)

#### 4.2.3.3 Evaluation of the New Buildings in the Project Area

New buildings in multi-layered historical towns can be defined as "the latest layer in the evolution of the city" (Abada 1991:1). Therefore, the present layer which is the new buildings in current Tarsus has to be analyzed and evaluated for the conservation of historical stratification.

The relation of current layer with the former historical periods is important for the determination of presentation principles. The physical harmony of the new buildings in term of height, mass proportions etc. can be regarded as the indicator of harmony. The location of the new buildings are also important since they can be located on top of historical edifices. In this case, the historical edifice can be either totally demolished or conserved below the foundations of the new buildings or they are utilized for the construction of the new buildings as foundation walls or building material. Therefore the relation of the new buildings with the historical periods have to be identified primarily. Another aspect can be the functions of the new buildings. If a new building has a similar function with the former historical one in the

same location or area, this can be interpreted as functional continuity of the area. Furthermore, new buildings effect the perception and presentation of historical layers. The new buildings have to be analyzed according to their contribution to presentation and perception and integration of historical stratification. Similar to the analysis for historical periods, accessibility, integrity, social and visual attraction of the new buildings have to be analyzed. (Table 5)

IDENTIFICATION	NAME/ ID	SARAY İŞHANI 17	18	19	20	21	22
	NUMBER OF STOREY	2 H	6	1H	2	3	2
	CURRENT USE	Office Block	Apartment	Public	Commercial	Commercial	Residential
OWNERSHIP STATUS	OWNERSHIP	Municipality	Private	Municipality	Private	Private	Private
RELATION WITH THE HISTORICAL PERIODS	HARMONY WITH THE TRADITIONAL FABRIC	Harmonious in height	Inharmonious in height & mass proportions	in height & mass	Harmonious in height & mass proportions	Harmonious in height & mass proportions	in height & mass
	IN THE LOCATION OF A HISTORIC PERIOD	Saray Hanı	-	-	-	-	Roman Baths
ACCESSIBILITY	ACCESSIBILITY WITHIN THE CURRENT TOWN	In the city center on the main axis	In the city center on the secondary routes	In the city center on the secondary routes	In the city center on the secondary routes	In the city center on the secondary routes	In the city center on the secondary routes
	ACCESSIBILITY FOR ENTRANCE AND OBSERVATION	Direct entrance	Entrance by permission	Entrance in certain periods of the day	Everyday use by the inhabitants	Everyday use by the inhabitants	Entrance by permission
INTEGRITY	COMPONENT (PART OF A GROUP)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	BEING PART OF A VISTA	-	Old Bath	Old Bath	Roman Baths Ottoman Residential Building #3	-	-
CONTINUITY	FUNCTIONAL CONTINUITY	+	-	-	-	-	+
	ATTRACTION	-	-	-	-	-	-
SOCIAL ATTRACTION	REFERENCE POINT	+	-	-	-	-	-
	ATTRIBUTION	-	-	-	-	-	-
VISUAL ATTRACTION	VIEW POINTS (VISTAS)	Makam Mosque Old Bath	Old Bath	Old Bath Ottoman Residential Building #3	Old Bath Ottoman Residential Building #4	-	Roman Baths
	LANDMARK	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 5 The information groups for the evaluation of new buildings (for the all buildings, See Appendix N)  $\$ 

**Table 5** The information groups for the evaluation of new buildings (for the all buildings, SeeAppendix N) (continued)

NAME/ ID	SARAY İŞHANI 17	18	19	20	21	22
CONTRIBUTION TO PRESENTATION	-	-	-	-	-	-
EFFECT ON PERCEPTION	-		Destroys the perception of Old Bath		_	Blocks the perception of the continuation of Roman Baths

### 4.2.3.4 Levels of Historical Periods in the Study Area

Since there are not systematic excavations held in Tarsus, the levels are determine according to the local excavations in the study area, measured drawings prepared for restoration works and the levels of the survived edifices. When the ground levels of historical edifices are evaluated, the levels of the historical periods can be identified as follows with respect to the current level of the town.

- Roman Period: The ground levels of the edifices vary between -4.50 to -5.50 m. The level of the infrastructure starts from -6.50 m and the hypocaust system starts from -7.50 m which are obtained from the excavations and measured drawings.<sup>62</sup>
- Arab Reign: The ground levels of the edifices vary between -3.50 m to -4.50 m and infrastructure level is -7.50 m which is obtained from measured drawings.<sup>63</sup>
- Armenian Reign: The ground level of these edifices vary between -1.30m to 1.50 m which is derived from the ground level of Old Mosque.
- Principalities Reign: The ground level of the edifices vary between -1m to 1.20 m which is derived from the levels of Eski Hamam and Kubatpaşa Medresesi.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>62</sup> Levels are determined from the excavations of Roman Baths (Adıbelli 2007:145,146) and measured drawing of Roman Bridge prepared by Nurgül Nernekli in 2007.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>63</sup> Level of Arab reign is derived from the measured drawings prepared by Nurgül Nernekli in 2007.

- Ottoman Period: The ground level of the edifices are generally -0.5m up to current level of the town which is also obtained from existing buildings from Ottoman period in the project area and the measured drawings.<sup>64</sup>
- Early Republican Period: The ground level of the edifices are approximately parallel with the current level of the town which is observed from the existing buildings and measured drawings.<sup>65</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>64</sup> Level of the Ottoman period is determined from the measured drawings prepared by Nurgül Nernekli in 2007.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>65</sup> Level of the Early Republican period is determined from the measured drawings prepared by Nurgül Nernekli in 2007.



Figure 86 Sections showing the vertical relations in the Project area (Drawings are derived from measured drawings of Makam Mosque prepared by Nurgül Nernekli in 2007 and Roman Baths by, SAYKA Ltd. Sti. In 2002.)



Figure 87 Sections showing the vertical relations in the Project area (drawings are derived from measured drawings of Roman Baths by SAYKA Ltd. Sti. In 2002.)







Figure 88 Sections showing the vertical relations in the Project area (Drawings are derived from measured drawings of Makam Mosque by Nurgül Nernekli in 2007)

# 4.2.3.5 Principles for Intervention Designs for the Project Area

This evaluations constitutes the design criteria for presentation of the multi-layered character of the project area. These criteria are as follows:

- The possible expansion area of the Roman Baths has to be perceived.
- In Ottoman Period, a gap was opened on one of the walls of the Roman Baths for access to the main road. This passage as an evidence of the usage of the baths has to be shown.
- The continuation of Roman Baths towards west has to be perceived therefore, the effect of new residential buildings on the west on the perception has to be solved.
- Roman infrastructure underneath the Old Bath has to be shown together with the relation of Roman Baths.
- Yeloğlu Han which is demolished in the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century has to be presented in accordance with the knowledge of existence by demolishing Şahmeran Tea House
- Similar approach has to be reached for Saray İşhanı and the existence of Ottoman Saray Hanı in the same location has to be shown.
- Since topography is an important aspect in the formation of the town and the types of edifices especially in the project area therefore, the existence of the river passing through the city center has to be shown.
- For Ottoman Period public edifices, Makam Mosque and Mustafa Ağa Mescidi, the visual relation between these buildings has to be rebuilt and the perception of Mustafa Ağa Mescidi has to be strengthen.
- The buildings having functional continuity has to be preserved.
- The original levels of entrances to the buildings will also be shown.
- The continuation of the Roman Bridge towards Vakıfbank has to be shown and the remain on the west will also be accessed.
- The relation of Makam Mosque, the building underneath, Arab period tomb and Roman Bridge has to be shown and accessed together with the relations

in vertical.

- Because of the high rise Vakıfbank building and office blocks on the main axis of the town, Kubatpaşa Medresesi can not be perceived. The visual integration of medrese with other monumental buildings has to be set.

### 4.2.3.6 Proposal for Design Interventions in the Project Area

The objectives of the proposal is the presentation of the horizontal and vertical relations of historical stratification in the project area. Accordingly, other intentions are the presentation of the original levels of the edifices and provide the visual perception and integrity of the edifices.

First of all, for the presentation of the edifices from the same historical period, the original ground levels are exposed as the basic principle. The Roman level is - 5.50m, Medieval level is -1.50 and Ottoman level is approximately the current ground level.

Makam Mosque and Roman Bridge can be excavated in order to reveal the integral perception of the Roman Bridge and vertical relation of Makam Mosque, building underneath and Arab tomb. In addition, the level in front of Kubatpaşa Medresesi can be lowered to -1.50m for the presentation of the original ground level of Kubatpaşa Medresesi and by the demolishment of Vakıfbank the visual perception of the building is strengthened. Accordingly, the high-rise buildings surrounding Mustafa Ağa Mescidi can be demolished for strengthening the perception.

In order to present Yeloğlu Han, texture difference on the ground floor covering can be proposed, since only the location and building contour are known for Yeloğlu Han, while height of the building is not known. Besides, for the presentation of Ottoman Saray Hanı which was demolished and once located in the place of Saray İşhanı, the level of the ground can be lowered to show the relation of the foundations of Ottoman Saray Hanı and Saray İşhanı. However, if there are not any physical evidences on the existence of Saray Han, information panel including written and visual material on Saray Hanı can be placed. So as to present the Roman infrastructure underneath Eski Hamam, the area is proposed to be excavated until Roman level, -5.50m. Also for the perception of Eski Hamam, the high rise building on its north can be demolished together with the lowering until the ground level of Eski Hamam.

For the Roman Baths, it is known that the edifice is continuing towards east, therefore, the area is excavated towards east until Roman level -5.50m for the perception of the integrity of the edifice. In addition, it is known that in Ottoman period, a passage was opened through the Roman Baths. This usage of a former period remain in latter period should also be presented by conserving the passage in the Ottoman level.



















Figure 93 Proposal for the Project area, View 1



Figure 94 Proposal for the Project area, View 2



Figure 95 Proposal for the Project area, View 3

#### 4.3 ASSESSMENT OF THE RESULTS OF THE CASE STUDY

Tarsus, which is selected as the case study of this thesis creates a basis to experiment the principles set for the presentation of multi-layered character of historical towns and discuss the relevancy of the information groups used for the determination of cultural significance based on multi-layeredness.

Firstly, for the analysis and assessment of the historical stratification in Tarsus, the existing methodology which is used in urban archaeological studies, is utilized. For the case of Tarsus, the information on the historical stratification obtained from historical sources, excavations, surveys and physical traces is very limited. Hence, the historical periods and their interaction are assessed depending on the available information. Therefore, as new information on the historical stratification comes out, the evaluations have to be revised.

After the assessment of historical stratification, cultural significance concerning multi-layeredness is defined both in site and building scales so as to provide as a basis for the presentation principles to be proposed. Although the term covers varying aspects such as environmental, socio-cultural and economic aspects; due to the aim of the thesis, these aspects are only considered unless they have physical reflections on the current town. Therefore the criteria set for the assessment of cultural significance embraces the physical aspects only. The proposed process for the determination of cultural significance of the sites and buildings in Tarsus proves that there are different information groups which are required for the assessment of values, potentials and problems specific to multi-layered historical towns composing the cultural significance is essential for the conservation and sustainability of the multi-layered character of these towns.

When the conservation and development plans are evaluated; it is observed that the existing value assessments focus on the survived edifices from a specific period. Consequently, the urban history of the town, the relation of different historical periods and the demolished edifices are generally disregarded. Therefore, the
information groups proposed for the determination of cultural significance can be regarded as a basis for the conservation, development and presentation studies held in multi-layered historical towns. Furthermore, the proposed information groups can be improved with the inputs of socio-cultural economic and administrative aspects specific to multi-layered towns.

Besides the conservation and development studies, the current presentation status of historical stratification is analyzed in order to understand the approaches towards different layers and their material remains in Tarsus. This study revealed that, in the case of Tarsus, the presentation of historical stratification is restricted to well known buildings from different periods, whereas the integrity of buildings from the same period or the relation of different historical periods among each other and with the current town are neglected. In-situ presentation includes information panels, landscaping and restoration works for presentation purposes and touristic tours while ex-situ presentation includes tourism booklets, academic sources and internet. While analyzing the presentation status, the different presentation techniques and their efficiency are not discussed in the scope of the thesis.

When it comes to the presentation principles, these principles are determined based on the cultural significance of multi-layered historical towns in general. For the case of ex-situ presentation of historical stratification in Tarsus, a proposal is not put forward; instead general principles are set. Concerning in-situ presentations, proposals include different scales such as town scale, site scale and building scale in different mediums like information panels, itineraries and design interventions.

The itineraries are put forward mainly for a comprehensive understanding of the integrity of every historical period. Hence, separate itineraries are proposed for each historical period considering the urban expansion areas, buildings, edifices and open areas. In addition in order to apprehend the relations of historical periods, an itinerary is proposed for the presentation of multi-layeredness. The itineraries include not only existing edifices but also the demolished ones by differentiating their representations. Besides, for the periods having a large number of edifices that

have survived, secondary or thirtiary itineraries are also suggested. In addition, since there are almost no excavations or surveys held underneath the new buildings, the level of the itineraries generally pursue the current level of the town.

Furthermore, probable cases derived from different relations between the historical periods among themselves and with current town are also identified. These possible cases expose the probable presentation problems to be solved through design interventions and can be increased as a result of different studies held in multi-layered historical towns.

These possible cases within the different quality areas, which are defined as a result of the assessment process, are then correlated and possible project areas are distinguished in the current town. However the determination of the project area for presentation proposal depended on the availability of information, the maximum superimposition of different historical layers both horizontally and vertically and also existence of different cases presenting different design problems as it mentioned before. As for the case of Tarsus, the project area is selected as the intersection of two main axes that serve as main axes in different periods and proposals are put forward concerning the relations of historical stratification within the study area based on the general presentation principles.

For a proper presentation of historical stratigraphy, the components of urban form, such as buildings, open areas, natural features, are analyzed according to the information groups set for the determination of cultural significance of multi-layeredness. The information on the area before and after the assessment process is also compared in project area scale and it can be stated that, the design inputs change as a result of the assessment process since information on historical periods and their relations are revealed.

To conclude, the information groups proposed for the identification of cultural significance can be accepted as the basis for presentation decisions for multilayered historical towns. Depending on the cultural significance specific to these towns, presentation is a way for the understanding and dissemination of these significances. The presentation principles set in this thesis can be regarded as a part of the conservation planning that has to be integrated to the existing process and it is possible to state that these principles are essential for the conservation and sustainability of multi-layered character of historical towns.

#### **CHAPTER 5**

#### CONCLUSION

Multi-layered historical towns are created as a result of continuous superimposition of edifices, open areas and networks from different periods constituting the specific character of these towns. Therefore, the physical evidences of successive historical periods, which are the indicators of continuous inhabitancy should be considered as an integral part of the conservation process. For this purpose, the cultural significance of these physical evidences has to be delineated for the sustainability of the town's character.

Since conservation is a value-based approach, the cultural significance based on multi-layeredness is essential for the presentation of historical stratification. Accordingly, by the presentations in the view of the cultural significance of multi-layeredness; the information related to each historical period and their coexistence can appropriately be conveyed. Cultural significance of multi-layered historical towns considers the collective creation process of these towns and regarding each historical period, their interactions with each other and with the current town as valuable. Since the creation process is important for multi-layered historical towns, components of urban form are considered with their historical period in their own historical context among with continuities, transformation and interruptions in successive periods. In addition, the cultural significance is not only defined by analyzing the existing edifices but also historical ones that are demolished or transformed in time.

Consequently, the proposed information groups for cultural significance embrace the components which constitute the character of multi-layered historical towns. It has to be kept in mind that these information groups are put forward for the identification of physical aspects and relates socio-cultural, economic and managerial aspects

unless they affect the physical character. Therefore for an appropriate value-based approach, the inputs related to other aspects which are not in the scope of this thesis have to be involved. As to presentation principles, these principles which are set for the presentation of the historical stratification shouldn't be regarded as only for touristic purposes; but instead they are essential for achieving a comprehensive understanding for different stakeholders and decision-makers, which will then help for the conservation of historical stratification in multi-layered towns.

The definition of presentation principles, is based on the major criteria as to prevent the loss of any physical evidence belonging to any historical period. In addition, the historical creation process is aimed to be presented in any scale or in any medium leading to provide an awareness of their contribution to the character of these towns.

The interventions held in multi-layered historical towns need a comprehensive analysis and deeper understanding of the building or site itself such as material deterioration, restitution problems, evaluation of the changes etc. It has to be kept in mind that, the presentation principles proposed in this thesis are put forward concerning the historical stratification of the multi-layered towns. Therefore these principles have to be integrated with other conservation issues for appropriate interventions.

Since architectural approaches to same problem vary from one designer to another, the proposed presentation principles do not aim to produce archetypes. Instead, these presentation principles should be considered as design criteria for guiding the design stage for conserving and sustaining the character of multi-layered historical towns by apprehending its historical stratification.

This initiative approach can progress with further research on different issues in the conservation of multi-layered historical towns. The first issue can be setting a cultural significance assessment methodology by including socio-cultural, legislative and managerial aspects specific to multi-layered historical towns. Additionally, this assessment methodology can be integrated with the identification of cultural heritage and preparation of inventories in multi-layered historical towns. Another

issue can be the creation of a database including different quality areas, different cases presenting the historical stratification among with the principles on intervention designs and presentations. This database can be beneficial both for the integration of historical stratification to any type of interventions such as restoration, urban design, new constructions etc. and conservation of the physical evidences and their relations among each other within the current town. Furthermore, these principles have to be improved or revised by being applied on different cases.

#### REFERENCES

- ABADA G., 1991. <u>Contextual Urban Design for Reshaping the Arabic Islamic</u> <u>Historical Places</u>, Cairo, Egypt.
- ADIBELLI A. I., 2007. Excavations at the Roman Baths in Tarsus, ANMED Vol. 9.
- AKGÜNDÜZ, A. 1993. <u>Tarsus Tarihi ve Eshâb-ı Kehf</u>. Tarsus Ticaret ve Sanayi Odası Yayınları. İlmi Araştırma Serisi, No: 1. Tarsus.
- AKPOLAT M. S.,2004.<u>Tanzimat Sonrası Osmanlı Mimarlığından Bir Kesit:</u> <u>Adana-Mersin Demiryolu istasyon Binaları</u>,Hacettepe Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi Cilt: 21, Volume: 1, pp. 77-93, Ankara
- ALPAN A., 2005. Integration of urban archaeological resources to everyday life in the historic city centers Tarragona, Verona and Tarsus, Unpublished master's thesis, department of city and regional planning, Ankara, METU.
- ALTINÖZ BİLGİN A. G., 2002. "<u>Assessment of Historical Stratification in</u> <u>Multilayered Towns As a Support for Conservation Decision-Making</u> <u>Process; A Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Based Approach Case</u> <u>Study: Bergama</u>", Unpublished Doctorate Thesis, Faculty of Architecture, METU, Ankara.
- ALTINÖZ A.,G.,2003. <u>Utilizing Gis For The Assessment Of Historical Stratification In Bergama (Pergamon) As A Support For Conservation Decisionmaking Process</u>, M. O. Altan (ed.), Proceedings of the XIXth International Symposium, CIPA 2003: New Perspectives to Save the Cultural Heritage, Antalya (Turkey).
- APPEAR, 2005. <u>Enhancing The Values Of Urban Archaeological Sites</u> <u>Practical Guide</u>, <u>www.in-situ.be/draft\_en.pdf</u>, (last accessed 22.09.2007)
- AŞKIN, E., 2006. <u>Kent Planı ve Mimari Yapılanması Açısından Cilicia ve Lycia Bölgelerindeki Roma Dönemi Kentlerinin Karşılaştırılması,</u> Unpublished masters thesis, Department of Archaeology, Mersin Üniversitesi, Mersin.

- AVRAMİ E. et al. (ed.), 2000. <u>Values and Heritage Conservation</u>, Research Report, The Getty Conservation Institute, Los Angeles
- BAKIRER Ö., 1982. <u>Mimarlık Tarihi Araştırmalarında Belgelerin Katkıları</u>, TC Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 1. Milli Kültür Şurası, Sayı:36.
- BELGE B., 2005. <u>Urban Archaeological Issues And Resources in İzmir</u> <u>Historic City Centre: An Exploratory Case Study</u>, Unpublished masters thesis, Department of City and Regional Planning, METU, Ankara.
- BIDDLE M., 1973. <u>The Future of London's Past: a survey of the</u> <u>archaeological implications of planning and development in the nation's</u> <u>capital</u>, Rescue, London.
- BIDDLE, M. 1980., <u>The Experience of the Past: Archeology and History in</u> <u>Conservation and Development. In Conservation as Cultural Survival.</u> Renata Holod (ed). Philadelphia: The Aga Khan Award for Architecture.
- BİLGEN P., 1986. <u>Problems and Potentialities of Traditional Houses in</u> <u>Contemporary Use: A case study in Tarsus</u>, Unpublished masters thesis, Department of Architecture, METU, Ankara.
- BİLGİN A.G., 1996. <u>Urban Archaeology: as the Basis for the Studies on the Future of the Town Case Study, A Case Study: Bergama</u>, Unpublished master's thesis, department of Architecture, METU, Ankara.
- BAYDUR N. and SEÇKİN N., 2001. <u>Tarsus Donuktaş Kazı Raporu</u>, TASK Vakfı Yayınları, İstanbul.
- BOARDMAN J., 1965. <u>Tarsus, Al Mina and Greek Chronology</u>, the Journal of Hellenic Studies, Vol. 85, pp. 5-15.
- BOSWORTH E.C., 1992. <u>The City of Tarsus and the Arab- Byzantine</u> <u>Frontiers in Early and Middle Abbasid Times</u> *Oriens*, Vol. 33, 1992, pp. 268-286.
- ÇALI A., 2003. <u>Ramazanoğulları Beyliği</u>, Unpublished masters thesis, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Tarih Anabilim Dalı, Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.

- CARVER, M. 1987. <u>Underneath English towns: interpreting urban</u> <u>archaeology.</u> Batsford, London.
- COUNCIL OF EUROPE, 1991. '<u>Urban Archaeology in Today's Towns'</u>, January 24, (draft report), MPC(91)1, Strasbourg.
- COUNCIL OF EUROPE, 2000. <u>European Code of Good Practice:</u> <u>"Archaeology and the Urban Project</u>.
- ÇIPLAK N., 1968. İçel Tarihi, Ankara.
- Council of Europe, 2002. <u>European Cultural Heritage: A review of polices</u> <u>and practice</u>, volume II, Council of Europe
- COUNCIL OF EUROPE, 1989. <u>Recommendation No R(89)5 Concerning the</u> <u>Protection and Enhancement of the Archaeological Heritage in the Context</u> <u>of Town and Country Planning Operations</u>, International Documents Regarding The Preservation of Cultural And Natural Heritage, Madran E., Özgönül N. (ed.), 1998,ODTÜ Ankara, pp.351-356.
- DOEVEDANS K., SCHRAM K., 2005., <u>Creation/Accumulation City</u> Theory, Culture & Society SAGE, London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi),Vol. 22(2): 29–43
- DOĞUKAN İMAR İNŞ. LTD. ŞTI., 1995. Tarsus İmar Planı.
- DRDÁCKÝ M.,2004., <u>Planning and Management of Historic Cities a</u> <u>Czech Approach and Example of a World Heritage City of TELČ</u>, ITAM – ARCCHIP, <u>http://www.arcchip.cz/w03/w03 drdacky.pdf</u>, (last accessed 17.01.2007)
- ENER K., 1993. <u>Tarih Boyunca Adana Ovasına Bir Bakış</u>, İstanbul.
- ENGLISH HERITAGE, 2001. <u>Policy Statement On Restoration,</u> <u>Reconstruction, And Speculative Recreation Of Archaeological Sites</u> <u>Including Ruins ,</u> <u>http://www.helm.org.uk/upload/pdf/Restoration%2C\_Reconstruction%2C\_an</u> <u>d Speculative Recreation of Archaeological Sites including ruins %2820</u> <u>01%29.pdf (last accessed 19.11.2007)</u>

- ENGLISH HERITAGE, 2006. Capturing the Public Value of Heritage, <u>www.helm.org.uk/upload/pdf/Public-Value.pdf</u>, (last accessed on 22.11.2007)
- EVRİN, Ç.T., 2002. <u>Tarsus Republic Square Late Roman Cooking Wares</u> -<u>2001</u>, Unpublished masters thesis, Department of Archaeology and History of Art, Bilkent University, Ankara.
- FEILDEN B. M., JOKILETHO J., 1993. <u>Management Guidelines for World</u> <u>Cultural Heritage Sites</u>, ICCROM, Rome.
- GANIATSAS, V.,1996. <u>Heritage Management Through Contemporary</u> <u>Design: A Philosophical Approach</u>, ICOMOS 11<sup>th</sup> General Assembly And International Symposium "The Heritage and Social Changes" 5-9, October 1996.
- GHAZARIAN J.C., 2000. <u>The Armenian Kingdom in Cilicia during the Crusades</u>, The integration of Cilician Armenians with the Latins 1080-1393, Routledge.
- GOLDMAN H. 1963. "The Iron Age." Excavations at Gözlü Kule, Tarsus. Vol. II. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- GOLDMAN H.,1935. <u>Preliminary Expedition to Cilicia, 1934, and Excavations</u> <u>at Gözlü Kule, Tarsus</u>, American Journal of Archaeology, Vol. 39, No. 4. (Oct. – Dec., 1935), pp. 526-549.
- GOLDMAN H.,1936. <u>Excavations at Gözlü Kule</u>, Tarsus, American Journal of Archaeology, Vol. 41, No. 2. (Apr. Jun., 1937), pp. 262-286.
- GOLDMAN H., 1956. "From the Neolithic through the Bronze Age." Excavations at Gözlü Kule, Tarsus. Vol. II. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- GOLDMAN, H. 1950. "<u>The Hellenistic and Roman Periods</u>." Excavations at Gözlü Kule, Tarsus. Vol. I. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- GÜRANİ Y., 1999. <u>Tarsus Evlerinin İç Mekan Organizasyonunda 1800-1998</u> <u>Yılları Arasında Meydana Gelen Değişimlerin Analizi</u>, Unpublished masters thesis, Department of Interior Design, Çukurova Üniversitesi, Adana.

- HALİFEOĞLU M.,2007. <u>Tarsus Amerikan Kolejinin Kuruluşu, Gelişimi ve</u> <u>Faaliyetleri</u>, unpublished masters thesis, Department of History, Fırat Üniversitesi, Elazığ.
- HILD, F., & HELLENKEMPER, H. 1990. <u>Kilikien und Isaurien</u>. Tabula Imperii Byzantini 5. Teile 1 & 2. Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Vienna.
- ICOMOS 1964., International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration Of Monuments and Sites <u>http://www.international.icomos.org/charters/venice\_e.pdf</u> (last accessed 19.12.2007)
- ICOMOS, 1987. <u>Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban</u> <u>Areas, Washington,</u> <u>http://www.international.icomos.org/charters/towns\_e.htm</u> (last accessed: 24.01.2008.)
- ICOMOS, 1988. <u>Burra Charter</u>, Australia <u>http://www.icomos.org/australia/burra.html</u> (last accessed on 24.01.2008)
- ICOMOS, 1992., <u>Charter for the Protection and Management of the</u> <u>Archaeological Heritage, www.international.icomos.org/charters/arch\_e.htm</u> (last accessed 13.10.2007)
- ICOMOS, 1993, <u>Archaeological Heritage Management</u>, International <u>Scientific Symposium</u>, 10<sup>th</sup> General Assembly, Sri Lanka.
- ICOMOS, 1994, <u>Archaeological remains, in situ preservation</u>, International Conference, ICAHM, Montréal.
- ICOMOS, 1994b. <u>Nara Document on Authenticity</u>, <u>http://www.international.icomos.org/naradoc\_eng.htm</u>, (last accessed 24.01.2008)
- ICOMOS,2005., <u>Ename Charter</u>, Revised Third Draft, 5 July 2005 <u>www.georgewright.org/231enamecharter.pdf</u> (last accessed 17.11.2007)

- ICOMOS, 2007. <u>The Icomos Charter for the Interpretation and Presentation</u> of <u>Culltural Heritage Sites</u> Proposed Final Draft, <u>http://www.enamecharter.org/downloads/ICOMOS\_Interpretation\_Charter\_N</u> <u>10-04-07.pdf</u> (last accessed 11.01.2008)
- ISRAEL ANTIQUITIES AUTHORITY, 2003. Policy for the Conservation of the Built Heritage, <u>www.iaaconservation.org.il/images/files//pdfdocs/policy\_e.pdf</u> (last accessed on 30.11.2007)
- İTÜ, 1989. <u>Tarsus Kentsel, Arkeolojik, Doğal Sit Alanları Koruma Amaçlı</u> <u>İmar Planı</u>, Mimarlık Fakültesi, İstanbul.
- KUTAY D., 1993. <u>Assessment of values and objectives of presentation of classical period archaeological sites case study</u>: <u>Zeus Altar, Pergamon, unpublished master</u>'s thesis METU.
- LANGLOIS, V., 1947. <u>Eski Kilikya</u>. M. Rahmi Balaban (trans.), Mersin Halkevi Yayınları. Mersin.
- MACKAY, R., 1993. <u>'Statutory Protection and Predictive Plans –</u> <u>Archaeological Heritage Management in Sydney</u>', Archaeological Heritage Management Scientific Symposium of the 10<sup>th</sup> General Assembly of ICOMOS, Colombo, Sri Lanka.
- MADRAN E., ÖZGÖNÜL N., 1998. International Documents Regarding The <u>Preservation Of Cultural And Natural Heritage</u>, ODTÜ Ankara.
- MARTÍ A. N., 2005 <u>Excavation, exhibition, conservation or preservation</u>. Technical criteria for a decision-making process APPEAR Position Paper (4).
- MASON R., 2002. <u>Assessing the values of Cultural Heritage</u>, Research Report, The Getty Conservation Institute, Los Angeles.
- MASON, R., AVRAMI E., 2000 <u>Heritage Values and Challenges of</u> <u>Conservation Planning</u>, Management Planning for Archaeological Sites: Proceedings from the International Workshop. Eds. J. Teutonico and G. Palumbo. Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute
- MINISTRY OF CULTURE AND TOURISM, registration sheets.

- MOMIRSKI, L.A., 1994. <u>Interpreting the Site Archaeological Presentation</u> <u>between Project and Audience</u>, Archaeological remains, in situ preservation, International Conference, ICAHM Montréal 1994.
- MUTAFIAN C., 1988. La Cilicie au Carrefour des Empires, Paris.
- ÖZ H., 1998. <u>Bilinmeyen Tarsus</u>, Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, Ankara.
- ÖZ, H. 1991. <u>Tarsus Tarihi</u>. Kocaoluk Yayınevi. Istanbul.
- ÖZ, H., 1988. <u>Tarsus Belediyesi Tarihi</u>, Tarsus Belediyesi, Tarsus
- PIRI REIS, Kitabi Bahriye, TTK Yayınları, 2003.
- POŞ A., 2005. <u>Osmanlı Döneminde Tarsus (1516-1923)</u>, İlâhiyat Fakültesi Dergisi,Çukurova Üniversitesi, Sayı I,Cilt 5, Ocak-Haziran 2005,pp243-279.
- POUND C., 2002. <u>Lessons from Heritage, The Conservation Of Urban</u> <u>Heritage:</u> Macao Vision International Conference <u>http://www.macauheritage.net/vision/pdf/vision\_121.pdf</u> (last accessed 23.10.2007)
- PROCOPIUS, <u>Buildings</u>, Book V <u>http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Procopius/Buildings/5\*.</u> <u>html</u> (last accessed 09.12.2007)
- PROCOPIUS, The Anecdota or Secret History, Chapter XVIII <u>http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Procopius/Buildings/5\*.</u> <u>html</u> (last accessed 09.12.2007)
- RAMSAY W.M. 1890. <u>The Historical geography of Asia Minor</u>. John Murray. London. <u>http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0016-</u> <u>7398%28190310%2922%3A4%3C357%3ACTATGT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-L</u> (last accessed 22.09.2007)
- RAMSAY W.M. 2000. <u>Tarsus (Aziz Pavlus'un Kenti)</u>, Zoroğlu L. (trans.) Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara.

- RIEGL A. 1903. <u>Der moderne Denkmalkultus, sein Wesen, seine Entstehung</u> (Vienna, 1903). K. W. Forster and D. Ghirardo (trans.), "<u>The modern cult of</u> <u>monuments: its character and origin,</u>" Oppositions 25 (1982), pp. 21-50.
- ROBINSON H, 2007. Review: Excavations at Gözlü Kule, Tarsus: Volume I, the Hellenistic and Roman Periods by Hetty Goldman, The Classical Journal, Vol. 47, No. 3 (Dec., 1951), pp. 129-133.
- ROTHER L., 1971: <u>Die Stadte der Çukurova: Adana-Mersin-Tarsus,</u> <u>Geographischen Instituts der Univeritaet Tübingen</u>, Tübingen.
- SEVIN, V., 1999. <u>Anadolu Arkeolojisi</u>. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Der Yayınları, İstanbul.
- SILVIO M. Z., JOKILETHO J., 1997. Journal of Architectural Conservation No: 1 March, p 37-51.
- SOMMELLA 1984., <u>Archaeology and Planning</u>, Colloquy organized by the Council of Europe and Region of Tuscany, October 22-25, Florence.
- STEADMAN S.R., 1994. <u>Isolation vs. interaction : prehistoric Cilicia and its</u> role in the near eastern world system (Turkey), University of California, Berkeley, PhD Dissertation, Daii Vol 55-09a
- STRABO,<u>Geography</u>,14.1.V, <u>http://www.abu.nb.ca/Courses/NTIntro/Images/StraboTarsus.htm</u> (last accessed, 13.11.2007)
- TANRIVERDI H.G., 2006. <u>Tarsus'ta Türk İslam Mimarisi</u>, unpublished master's thesis, Department of History of Art, Erciyes Üniversitesi, Kayseri.
- TEXIER C., 2002. <u>Küçük Asya Vol III.</u>, Suat A. (trans)., Enformasyon ve Dokümantasyon Hizmetleri Vakfı, Ankara.
- TILDEN, F., 1957. <u>Interpreting Our Heritage</u>, The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill.
- TORRE M. (ed.) 1995. <u>The Conservation of Archaeological Sites in the</u> <u>Mediterranean Region</u>, An International Conference Organized by the Getty Conservation Institute and the J. Paul Getty Museum, 6-12 May 1995.

- TUNA N., 1999. "<u>The urban archaeology in Turkey</u>," Report on the Situation of Urban Archaeology in Europe, Leech R. (ed.), Council of Europe Publishing (Strasbourg: 1999), pp. 217-228.
- UÇAR M., 2000. <u>Tarsus'ta Korumnası Gerekli Bölgesel Kent Dokusunun</u> <u>Değerlendirilmesi Üzerine Bir Araştırma</u>, Unpublished master's thesis, department of Arhitecture, Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- ULUTAŞ S., 2006. <u>Şer-iye Sicillerine Göre Tarsus'ta Ekonomik Yapı</u>, Unpublished masters thesis, Tarih Bölümü, Mersin Üniversitesi
- UNESCO,1992. <u>Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of World</u> <u>Heritage Convention</u>, WHC/2 Revised, United Nations Education and Cultural Organization.
- UNEP, 1988. <u>Conclusions and Recommendations of Workshop on the Methodology of Studying and Presenting The Spatial Development of Historic Buildings and Town</u>, International Documents Regarding The Preservation Of Cultural And Natural Heritage, Madran E., Özgönül N. (ed.), 1998,ODTÜ Ankara, pp.342-344.
- UNEP, 1989. "<u>Conclusions and Recommendations of Workshop on the Evaluation of Historic Buildings and Sites United Nations Educational Program", International Documents Regarding The Preservation Of Cultural And Natural Heritage, ardan E., Özgönül N. (ed.), 1998, ODTÜ, Ankara.</u>
- UZZELL D.L., 1990. Interpretation and the Re-Presentation of the Past, Culture, Space, History, METU, Ankara 8-12 July 1990.
- XENOPHON, <u>Anabasis</u>, H.G Dakyns (trans.), Ancient History Sourcebook, <u>http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/ancient/xenophon-anabasis.html</u>
- YANILMAZ B.G., 2000. <u>Tarsus Sungurlar Evi</u>, Unpublished master's thesis, Department of Architecture, İTÜ, İstanbul.
- YILDIZ A., 2007. <u>Tarsus Makam-ı Danyal Cami Kurtarma Kazisi</u>, ANMED 2007-5.
- YURTSEVEN F., 2006. <u>Ovalık Kilikia-Tarsus'daki Roma Dönemi Mezarına</u> <u>Ait Buluntular</u>, unpublished master's thesis, Department of Archaeology, Mersin Üniversitesi, Mersin.

- ZANCHETTI S.M. and J. JOKILETHO, 1997. <u>Values and Urban</u> <u>Conservation Planning: Some Reflection on Principle and Definition</u>, Journal of Architectural Conservation 3(1) pp. 37-51.
- ZOROĞLU L., 1996. <u>A Guide to Tarsus</u>. Dönmez Offset, Ankara.
- ZOROĞLU L., 2004a. <u>Tarsus or Antioch on the Cydnus</u>, VIII Simposio Paolino, a cura di L. Padovese, Instituto Francescano Di Spritualita Pontificion Ateneo Antoniano, Roma 2004.
- ZOROĞLU L., 2004b. Antioch on the Cydnus, TOPOI, Suppl.5. 2004.
- ZOROĞLU L., 2004c. <u>Luwilerden Çukurovalılara Adı Değişmeden Kalan</u> <u>Tarsus, Sırtı Dağ Yüzü Deniz Mersin</u>, ed. Özden F., Karabuda G., Yapı Kredi Yayınları, İstanbul 2004.pp91-109
- ZOROĞLU L., 2006. <u>Tarsus and Antioch during the Hellenistic Age</u>, IX Simposio Paolino, a cura di L. Padovese, Instituto Francescano Di Spritualita Pontificion Ateneo Antoniano, Roma 2006.

## **APPENDIX A**

# EXAMPLES RELATED TO THE EX-SITU PRESENTATION OF HISTORICAL STRATIFICATION



**Figure 96** The graphical reconstruction of Tomb I and its immediate vicinity (Web Site of Appia Antica Project, (<u>http://www.appia.itabc.cnr.it/appia\_3d.php</u>, accessed on 21January 2008)



**Figure 97** The graphical reconstruction of Tomb I (Web Site of Appia Antica Project, (<u>http://www.appia.itabc.cnr.it/appia\_3d.php</u>, accessed on 21January 2008)



**Figure 98** The general view of Theatre C in Troy, Çanakkale, Turkey (Web Site of Project Troia, (<u>http://www.uni-tuebingen.de/troia/vr/vr0210\_en.html</u>, accessed on 01 January 2008)



**Figure 99** The graphical reconstruction of Theatre C of Troy IX (Web Site of Project Troia, (<u>http://www.uni-tuebingen.de/troia/vr/vr021001\_en.html</u>, accessed on 01 January 2008)

#### **APPENDIX B**

# EXAMPLES RELATED TO THE IN-SITU PRESENTATION OF HISTORICAL STRATIFICATION



**Figure 100 a)** Itinerary for the presentation of Roman period in Zaragoza **b)** Itinerary for the presentation of Moorish period in Zaragoza (<u>http://cmisapp.zaragoza.es/ciudad/turismo/es/enlace/paseos.htm.</u>, last accessed on December 17, 2007)



**Figure 101 a)** Itinerary for the presentation of Renaissance period in Zaragoza b) Itinerary for the presentation of Baroque period in Zaragoza (<u>http://cmisapp.zaragoza.es/ciudad/turismo/es/enlace/paseos.htm</u>, last accessed on December 17, 2007)



**Figure 102** Map showing the phases of Roman period in Nyon, Switzerland. (<u>http://keepps.tripod.com/Nyon/nyonpresent/presenthome.htm</u>, last accessed December 17: 2007)



**Figure 103** Information panels of Walking Tours of Nyon (<u>http://keepps.tripod.com/ Nyon</u>/<u>nyonpresent/5nicole/5nicole.htm</u>, last accessed December 17: 2007)



Figure 104 London Rose Theater (Website of APPEAR, <u>http://www.in-situ.be</u>, last accessed on January 13, 2008)



Figure 105 The Roman Theater of Zaragoza (<u>http://img68.imageshack.us/img68/2341 /teatredecaesaraugusta7zi.jpg</u>, last accessed on December 8, 2007)



Figure 106 Urban archaeological site in Brussels (Website of APPEAR <u>http://www.in-situ.be</u>, last accessed on January 13, 2008)



**Figure 107** The presentation of remains in Crypta Balbi (<u>http://appearfr.english-heritage.org.uk/print/?63</u>, last accessed on 14 January 2007)



**Figure 108** TimeScope utilized in the Ename Project for the presentation of ruins of Abbey Church (<u>http://www.ename974.org/Eng/pagina/archeo\_concept.html</u>, last accessed: 22.01.2008)



Figure 109 Kedumim Square in Old Jaffa with Visitors Center underneath (Vedat Aykaç February 2008)



Figure 110 Visitors Center underneath Kedumim Square (Vedat Aykaç February 2008



a)

b)

**Figure 111 a)** Old Municipal Building of Jaffa before the bombardment **b)** Old Municipal Building of Jaffa after the bombardment in 1948 (<u>http://archnet.org/library/images/oneimage.jsp?location\_id=8931&image\_id=41438</u>, accessed on 22 January 2008)



**Figure 112 a)** The demolished wall of Jaffa Old Municipal Building (Vedat Aykaç, September 2005) **b)** The presentation of Jaffa Old Municipal Building foundations (Vedat Aykaç, September 2005)

#### **APPENDIX C**

#### GLOSSARY

#### **Multi-layered historical towns**

"Multi-layered historical towns" are the agglomeration of different layers and their relation with each other, forming a physical entity that contributes to the town's character and urban identity<sup>66</sup>

#### **Cultural significance of multi-layeredness**

"Cultural significance of multi-layeredness" refers the values specific to the historical stratification which is formed as a result of collective creation process and continuous inhabitancy.

#### Presentation

"Presentation" more specifically denotes the carefully planned communication of interpretive content through the arrangement of interpretive information, physical access, and interpretive infrastructure at a cultural heritage site. It can be conveyed through a variety of technical means, including, yet not requiring, such elements as informational panels, museum-type displays, formalized walking tours, lectures and guided tours, and multimedia applications and websites. (Icomos 2007:3)

#### **In-Situ Presentations**

"In-situ presentations" include, activities aiming the apprehension of historical stratification on-site, in the historic towns such as, information panels, landscaping, urban designs, design interventions etc.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>66</sup> "Multi-layered towns" is a term initiated by Güliz Bilgin Altınöz in her Phd Thesis (Bilgin Altınöz G., 2002) which is defined as towns which have been continuously inhabited since early ages onwards and where still inhabitation exists.

#### **Ex-Situ Presentations**

"Ex-situ presentations" include, activities aiming the apprehension of historical stratigraphy off-site by touristic books, internet, virtual reconstructions and academic sources.

#### **Diachronic Surveys**

"Diachronic survey"<sup>67</sup> is the analysis of historical periods that overlap throughout the history of multi-layered towns separately for an integral understanding of horizontal relations of the edifices in each period.

#### Valorization

Valorization is "giving added value"<sup>68</sup> to cultural heritage. The process of valorization is firstly to understand the cultural significance and then the enhancement and apprehension of this cultural significance.

### **De-valorization**

De-valorization is weakening or diminishing values of cultural heritage due to the misinterpretation or ignorance of cultural significance.

#### **Different Quality Areas**

"Different quality areas" are the areas presenting different relations of historical layers among themselves and with the current town.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>67</sup> The term "diachronic documentation" is used by Güliz Bilgin Altınöz in her master's thesis to define the documentation each period separately for the understanding of the integrity of each period in itself. (Bilgin, A. G., 1996)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>68</sup> (Avrami et al 2000:8)



226

Table 6 Value types defined by different scholars , charters and organizations

**VALUE TYPES** 

**APPENDIX D** 

#### **APPENDIX E**

## **1937 DEVELOPMENT PLAN BY HERMANN JANSEN**



Figure 113 1937 Development plan by Hermann Jansen (Hikmet Öz archive)

#### **APPENDIX F**

## OTTOMAN MAP SHOWING TARSUS AND ITS VICINITY



Figure 114 Ottoman map showing Tarsus and its vicinity (Hikmet Öz archive)

APPENDIX G

# OTTOMAN MAP OF TARSUS (BEFORE 1919)



Figure 115 Ottoman map of Tarsus (before

1919) (Hikmet Öz archive)

# **APPENDIX H**

# FRENCH MAP OF TARSUS (1919)



Figure 116 French map of Tarsus (1919)

(Hikmet Öz archive)

# **APPENDIX I**

# MAP OF TARSUS IN THE LATE 20<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY



Figure 117 Map of Tarsus in the late 20th Century (ROTHER L., 1971)

### **APPENDIX J**

## THE CONSERVATION SITES OF TARSUS



**Figure 118** The conservation sites of Tarsus (Ministry of Culture and Tourism registration sheet)

# APPENDIX K

## MAP OF TARSUS COMMERCIAL CENTER



Figure 119 Map of Tarsus Commercial Center (ROTHER L., 1971)
## APPENDIX L

### **1948 TARSUS MAP**



Figure 120 1948 Tarsus Map (Gürani 1999)

### APPENDIX M

# INFORMATION GROUPS FOR THE DETERMINATION OF CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE OF HISTORICAL EDIFICES

**Table 7** Information Groups for the Determination of Cultural Significance of Historical Edifices

	NAME	ESKİ HAMAM-1	ROMAN BATHS -2	RESIDENTIAL BUILDING-3	OLD MOSQUE-4
IDENTIFICATION	PERIOD	Principalities	Roman	Ottoman	Armenian
	CATEGORY	PUBLIC (Bath)	PUBLIC (Bath)	RESIDENTIAL	PUBLIC (Mosque)
	CURRENT USE	Bath	Not used	Commercial	Mosque
CURRENT STATUS	REGISTRATION STATUS	Registered	Registered	Registered	Registered
	OWNERSHIP	Foundation	Municipality	Private	Foundation
	DEGREE OF KNOWLEDGE ON EXISTENCE	All aspects are known	Location Period Building Type	All aspects are known	All aspects are known
ACCURACY OF KNOWLEDGE	TYPES OF SOURCES AND THEIR RELIABILITY	Primary sources	Primary sources	Primary sources	Primary sources
	LEVEL OF INVESTIGATION	Restoration	Excavation	Restoration	Restoration
	TYPE OF INTERVENTIONS	Restoration	Excavation	Restoration	Restoration
AUTHENTICITY	TYPES & LEVEL OF CHANGES	Change in Facade Organization	-	Change in Facade Organization	Semi-opened mass addition
	STATE OF SURVIVAL	Whole Intact	Scattered remains not giving information about the whole	Whole Intact	Whole Intact
SUSTAINABILITY	RELATION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL & CULTURAL DEPOSITS WITH THE CURRENT LAYER	on top of Hypocaust system of the Roman Baths	Scattered remains not giving information about the whole	On top of Roman baths	on top of an antique building
	CURRENT USE	Used	Abandoned	Used	Used
ACCESSIBILITY	ACCESSIBILITY WITHIN THE CURRENT TOWN	In the city center on secondary roads	In the city center on the main axis, road or square	In the city center on the main axis, road or square	In the city center on the main axis, road or square
	ACCESSIBILITY FOR ENTRANCE AND OBSERVATION	Entrance at certain periods of the day	Entrance by permission	Direct entrance	Entrance at certain periods of the day

<b>Table 7.</b> Information Groups for the Determination of Cultural Significance of Historical
Edifices (continued)

	NAME	ESKİ HAMAM-1	ROMAN BATHS -2	RESIDENTIAL BUILDING-3	OLD MOSQUE- 4
	PHYSICAL INTEGRATION	-	Utilization of the remains for new uses Existing together with the latter elements of the town	-	-
INTEGRATION	FUNCTIONAL INTEGRATION	Used in certain periods by the inhabitants	-	everyday use by the inhabitants	Everyday use by the inhabitants
	POSITION/ PERCEPTION	Overgrown surrounded Partially visible	Over and underground partially visible	Over ground and visible	-
	LANDMARK	-	Landmark	-	Landmark
	PHYSICAL OBSTACLES	Municipality Painting Buffet Şahmeran Tea House	Residential Buildings	-	Residential Buildings
PRESENTATION STATUS	IN SITU PRESENTATION STATUS	Information panel (name)	Information panel (name)	-	Information panel (name) Restoration for presentation purposes
	EX SITU PRESENTATION STATUS	Books Internet (name, text)	-	-	-
	COMPONENT (PART OF A GROUP)	-	-	-	-
INTEGRITY	BEING PART OF A VISTA	Roman Baths, Old Mosque, Old Bath, Residential Building	Roman Baths, Old Mosque, Old Bath, Residential Building	Roman Baths, Old Mosque, Old Bath, Residential Building	Roman Baths, Old Mosque, Old Bath, Residential Building
CONTINUITY	FUNCTIONAL CONTINUITY	+	-	-	2 <sup>nd</sup> degree Functional continuity (church-mosque)
	PHYSICAL CONTINUITY	+	+	+	+
SOCIAL	ATTRACTION	-	Touristic	-	Touristic, Religious, Inhabitants
ATTRACTION	REFERENCE POINT	-	Reference point	-	Reference point
	ATTRIBUTION	Legend of Şahmeran	-	-	-
	VIEW POINTS (VISTAS)	Old Mosque Roman Baths	Old Mosque Old Bath	Old Mosque Roman Baths Old Bath Makam Mosque	Old Bath Makam Mosque Roman Baths
VISUAL ATTRACTION	STATE OF SURVIVAL	Whole, intact	scattered remains not giving information about the whole	whole, intact	Whole, intact
	LANDMARK	-	Landmark	-	Landmark
	POSITION/ PERCEPTION	Overground surrounded Partially visible	Over and underground partially visible	Overground and visible	-

**Table 7.** Information Groups for the Determination of Cultural Significance of Historical

 Edifices (continued)

NAME		ESKİ HAMAM-1	ROMAN BATHS -2	RESIDENTIAL BUILDING-3	OLD MOSQUE- 4
	THREATS	-	Exposure to open air	-	-
CONSERVATION NECESSITIES	TYPES OF CHANGES	Change in Facade Organization	-	Change in Facade Organization	Semi-opened mass addition and a minaret
	TYPE OF INTERVENTIONS	Restoration	Excavation	Restoration	Restoration

**Table 8** Information Groups for the Determination of Cultural Significance of Historical Edifices

	NAME	MAKAM MOSQUE-5	VAULTED BUILDING-5A	TOMB-6	ROMAN BRIDGE-7
IDENTIFICATION	PERIOD	Ottoman	Unknown	Arab	Roman
	CATEGORY	PUBLIC (Mosque)	PUBLIC(not known)	PUBLIC (Tomb)	PUBLIC (Bridge)
	CURRENT USE	Not used	Not used	Not used	Not used
CURRENT STATUS	REGISTRATION STATUS	Registered	Not registered	Not registered	Not registered
	OWNERSHIP	Foundation	Foundation	Foundation	Foundation
	DEGREE OF KNOWLEDGE ON EXISTENCE	All aspects are known	Location	All aspects are known	Location Period Building Type
ACCURACY OF KNOWLEDGE	TYPES OF SOURCES AND THEIR RELIABILITY	Primary sources	-	Primary sources	Primary sources
	LEVEL OF INVESTIGATION	Restoration Excavation	Excavation	Excavation Consolidation	Excavation
AUTHENTICITY	TYPE OF INTERVENTIONS	Restoration Excavation	Excavation	Excavation / Consolidation	Excavation
	TYPES & LEVEL OF CHANGES	Mass addition	-	-	-
	STATE OF SURVIVAL	Whole Intact	Scattered remains not giving information about the whole	intense remains forming a part of a whole	intense remains forming a part of a whole
SUSTAINABILITY	RELATION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL & CULTURAL DEPOSITS WITH THE CURRENT LAYER	on top, utilizing the remains	On top of Roman Bridge next to the tomb and underneath Makam mosque	On top of Roman bridge underneath Makam Mosque	Underneath a historical building
	CURRENT USE	Abandoned	Abandoned	Abandoned	Abandoned
ACCESSIBILITY	ACCESSIBILITY WITHIN THE CURRENT TOWN	In the city center on the main axis, road or square	In the city center on the main axis, road or square	In the city center on the main axis, road or square	In the city center on the main axis, road or square
	ACCESSIBILITY FOR ENTRANCE AND OBSERVATION	Entrance at certain days	Entrance at certain days	Entrance at certain days	Entrance by permission

	NAME	MAKAM MOSQUE-5	VAULTED BUILDING-5A	TOMB-6	ROMAN BRIDGE-7
INTEGRATION	PHYSICAL INTEGRATION	Existing together with the latter elements of the town Combination of the remains with latter elements and forming a newly introduced whole within the existing context	Existing together with the latter elements of the town	Existing together with the latter elements of the town	Existing together with the latter elements of the town Combination of the remains with latter elements and forming a newly introduced whole within the existing context
	FUNCTIONAL INTEGRATION	Not used	Not used	Used seldom by the inhabitants	Used seldom by the inhabitants
	POSITION/ PERCEPTION	Overground and visible	Over and underground Partially visible	Underground construction on top Partially visible	Underground construction on top Partially visible
	LANDMARK	Landmark	-	-	-
	PHYSICAL OBSTACLES	-	Makam Mosque	Roman Bridge Makam Mosque	Building on the south Makam Mosque
PRESENTATION	IN SITU PRESENTATION STATUS	Information panel (name) Design for presentation purposes	Design for presentation purposes	Information panel (name) Design for presentation purposes	-
STATUS	EX SITU PRESENTATION STATUS	Books Internet Academic (name ,text, location)	-	-	Books Internet Academic (name ,text, location)
	COMPONENT (PART OF A GROUP)	Roman Bridge, Mosque, Tomb	Makam Mosque, Tomb	Makam Mosque Romn Bridge	Makam Mosque Tomb
INTEGRITY					
	BEING PART OF A VISTA	Roman Baths, Old Mosque, Old Bath, Residential Building	-	-	-
CONTINUITY	BEING PART OF A VISTA FUNCTIONAL CONTINUITY	Old Mosque, Old Bath, Residential	-	- +	-
CONTINUITY	FUNCTIONAL	Old Mosque, Old Bath, Residential Building	-	- + +	+
SOCIAL	FUNCTIONAL CONTINUITY PHYSICAL CONTINUITY ATTRACTION	Old Mosque, Old Bath, Residential Building + + Religious, Touristic, Inhabitants	-		- + Touristic, Inhabitants, Religious
	FUNCTIONAL CONTINUITY PHYSICAL CONTINUITY	Old Mosque, Old Bath, Residential Building + + Religious, Touristic,	- - + -	+ Religious, Touristic,	Touristic, Inhabitants,

**Table 8.** Information Groups for the Determination of Cultural Significance of Historical Edifices (continued)

N	NAME		VAULTED BUILDING-5A	TOMB-6	ROMAN BRIDGE-7
	VIEW POINTS (VISTAS)	Old Mosque Roman Baths	Makam Mosque Tomb	-	Makam Mosque Tomb
VISUAL ATTRACTION	STATE OF SURVIVAL	whole, intact	scattered remains not giving information about the whole	intense remains forming more than one part of a whole	intense remains forming a part of a whole
	LANDMARK	Landmark	-	-	-
	POSITION/ PERCEPTION	Overground and visible	Over and underground Partially visible	Underground construction on top Partially visible	Underground construction on top Partially visible
	THREATS	-	-	Deterioration in the building material	Infrastructure of the city
CONSERVATION NECESSITIES	TYPES OF CHANGES	Addition of a minaret Mass addition	-	-	-
	TYPE OF INTERVENTIONS	Restoration Excavation	Excavation	Excavation Consolidation	Excavation

**Table 8.** Information Groups for the Determination of Cultural Significance of Historical

 Edifices (continued)

**Table 9.** Information Groups for the Determination of Cultural Significance of Historical Edifices

	NAME	12	13	14	15	16
	PERIOD	Ottoman	Ottoman	Ottoman	Ottoman	Ottoman
IDENTIFICATION	CATEGORY	Residential	Residential	Residential	Residential	Residential
	CURRENT USE	Not used	Not used	Residential Commercial	Commercial	Commercial
CURRENT STATUS	REGISTRATION STATUS	Registered	Registered	Registered	Registered	Registered
	OWNERSHIP	Private	Private	Private	Private	Private
	DEGREE OF KNOWLEDGE ON EXISTENCE	All aspects are known	All aspects are known	All aspects are known	All aspects are known	All aspects are known
ACCURACY OF KNOWLEDGE	TYPES OF SOURCES AND THEIR RELIABILITY	Primary sources	Primary sources	Primary sources	Primary sources	Primary sources
	LEVEL OF INVESTIGATION	-	-	-	Restoration	Restoration
AUTHENTICITY	TYPE OF INTERVENTIONS	-	-	-	Restoration	Restoration
Administra	TYPES & LEVEL OF CHANGES	-	-	-	-	-
	STATE OF SURVIVAL	Whole Intact	Whole intact	Whole intact	Whole intact	Whole intact
SUSTAINABILITY	RELATION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL & CULTURAL DEPOSITS WITH THE CURRENT LAYER	-	Can be on top of Roman Baths	Can be on top of Roman Baths	-	-
	CURRENT USE	can be on top of Roman Baths	Abandoned	Residential Commercial	Commercial	Commercial

**Table 9.** Information Groups for the Determination of Cultural Significance of Historical Edifices (continued)

NAME		12	13	14	15	16
ACCESSIBILITY	ACCESSIBILITY WITHIN THE CURRENT TOWN	In the city center on the secondary roads	In the city center on the secondary roads	In the city center on the secondary roads	In the city center on the secondary roads	In the city center on the secondary roads
	ACCESSIBILITY FOR ENTRANCE AND OBSERVATION	Entrance by permission	Entrance by permission	Entrance in certain times	Entrance in certain times	Entrance in certain times
	PHYSICAL INTEGRATION	-	-	-	-	-
	FUNCTIONAL INTEGRATION	Not used	Not used	Used by the inhabitants	Used by the inhabitants	Used by the inhabitants
INTEGRATION	POSITION/ PERCEPTION	Overground and visible	Overground and visible	Overground and visible	Overground and visible	Overground and visible
	LANDMARK	-	-	-	-	-
	PHYSICAL OBSTACLES	-	-	-	-	-
PRESENTATION	IN SITU PRESENTATION STATUS	-	-	-	-	-
STATUS	EX SITU PRESENTATION STATUS	-	-	-	-	-
INTEGRITY	COMPONENT (PART OF A GROUP)	Residential buildings	Residential buildings	-	-	-
	BEING PART OF A VISTA	-	-	-	Kubatpaşa Medresesi	Kubatpaşa Medresesi
CONTINUITY	FUNCTIONAL CONTINUITY	-	-	Partial continuity	-	-
	PHYSICAL CONTINUITY	+	+	+	+	+
	ATTRACTION	-	-	-	-	-
SOCIAL ATTRACTION	REFERENCE POINT	-	-	-	-	-
	ATTRIBUTION	-	-	-	-	-
	VIEW POINTS (VISTAS)	Roman Baths	-	-	-	-
VISUAL	STATE OF SURVIVAL	Whole intact	Whole intact	Whole intact	Whole intact	Whole intact
ATTRACTION	LANDMARK	-	-	-	-	-
	POSITION/ PERCEPTION	Overground and visible	Overground and visible	Overground and visible	Overground and visible	Overground and visible

NAME	12	13	14	15	16	17
CONSERVATION NECESSITIES	THREATS	-	-	-	-	-
	TYPES OF CHANGES	-	-	-	-	-
	TYPE OF INTERVENTIONS	-	-	-	Restoration	Restoration

**Table 9.** Information Groups for the Determination of Cultural Significance of Historical Edifices (contined)

### **APPENDIX N**

#### INFORMATION GROUPS FOR THE EVALUATION OF NEW BUILDINGS

	NAME/ ID	SARAY İŞHANI 17	18	19	20	21	22
IDENTIFICATION	NUMBER OF STOREY	2 H	6	1H	2	3	2
	CURRENT USE	Office Block	Apartment	Public	Commercial	Commercial	Residential
CURRENT STATUS	OWNERSHIP	Municipality	Private	Municipality	Private	Private	Private
RELATION WITH THE HISTORICAL PERIODS	HARMONY WITH THE TRADITIONAL FABRIC	Harmonious in height	Inharmonious in height & mass proportions	in height & mass	Harmonious in height & mass proportions	Harmonious in height & mass proportions	in height & mass
	IN THE LOCATION OF A HISTORIC PERIOD	Saray Hanı	-	-	-	-	Roman Baths
ACCESSIBILITY	ACCESSIBILITY WITHIN THE CURRENT TOWN	In the city center on the main axis	In the city center on the secondary routes	In the city center on the secondary routes	In the city center on the secondary routes	In the city center on the secondary routes	In the city center on the secondary routes
	ACCESSIBILITY FOR ENTRANCE AND OBSERVATION	Direct entrance	Entrance by permission	Entrance in certain periods of the day	Everyday use by the inhabitants	Everyday use by the inhabitants	Entrance by permission
	COMPONENT (PART OF A GROUP)	-	-	-	-	-	-
INTEGRITY	BEING PART OF A VISTA	-	Old Bath	Old Bath	Roman Baths Ottoman Residential Building #3	-	-
CONTINUITY	FUNCTIONAL CONTINUITY	+	-	-	-	-	+
	ATTRACTION	-	-	-	-	-	-
SOCIAL ATTRACTION	REFERENCE POINT	+	-	-	-	-	-
	ATTRIBUTION	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 10 Information Groups for the Evaluation of New Buildings

NAME/ ID		SARAY İŞHANI 17	18	19	20	21	22
VISUAL ATTRACTION	VIEW POINTS (VISTAS)	Makam Mosque Old Bath	Old Bath		Old Bath Ottoman Residential Building #4	-	Roman Baths
	LANDMARK	-	-	-	-	-	-
	CONTRIBUTION TO PRESENTATION	-	-	-	-	-	-
	EFFECT ON PERCEPTION	-	Blocks the perception of Old Bath	Destroys the perception of Old Bath	-	-	Blocks the perception of the continuation of Roman Baths

Table 10. Information Groups for the Evaluation of New Buildings (continued)

Table 11 Information Groups for the Evaluation of New Buildings

	NAME/ ID	23	24	25	26	27	28
IDENTIFICATION	NUMBER OF STOREY	2	3	1	1	1	2
	CURRENT USE		Residential Commercial	Service	Residential	Residential	Residential
CURRENT STATUS	OWNERSHIP	Private	Private	Private	Private	Private	Private
RELATION WITH THE HISTORICAL PERIODS	HARMONY WITH THE TRADITIONAL FABRIC	in height & mass	Harmonious in height & mass proportions	in height & mass	in height & mass	Harmonious in height & mass proportions	in height & mass
PERIODS	IN THE LOCATION OF A HISTORIC PERIOD	possibly on top of Roman Baths	possibly on top of Roman Baths	-	possibly on top of Roman Baths	possibly on top of Roman Baths	possibly on top of Roman Baths
ACCESSIBILITY	ACCESSIBILITY WITHIN THE CURRENT TOWN	In the city center on the secondary roads	In the city center on the main axis	In the city center on the secondary routes	In the city center on the secondary roads	In the city center on the secondary roads	In the city center on the secondary roads
	ACCESSIBILITY FOR ENTRANCE AND OBSERVATION	Everyday use by the inhabitants	Everyday use by the inhabitants			Entrance by permission	Entrance by permission

NAME/ ID	NAME/ ID			25	26	27	28
INTEGRITY	COMPONENT (PART OF A GROUP)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	BEING PART OF A VISTA	-	Old Mosque	-	Roman Baths	-	-
CONTINUITY	FUNCTIONAL CONTINUITY		-	-	+	+	+
	ATTRACTION	-	-	-	-	-	-
SOCIAL ATTRACTION	REFERENCE POINT	-	-	-	-	-	-
	ATTRIBUTION	-	-	-	-	-	-
VISUAL ATTRACTION	VIEW POINTS (VISTAS)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	LANDMARK	-	-	-	-	-	-
	CONTRIBUTION TO PRESENTATION	-	-	-	-	-	-
PRESENTATION	EFFECT ON PERCEPTION	-	-		Blocks the perception of the integrity of Roman Baths		-

Table 11 Information Groups for the Evaluation of New Buildings (continued)

Table 12 Information Groups for the Evaluation of New Buildings

	NAME/ ID	29	30	31	32	33	34
IDENTIFICATION	NUMBER OF STOREY	1	2	1	2	1	2
	CURRENT USE	Commercia I	Commercial Residential	Residential	Residential	Residential	Commercia I
CURRENT STATUS	OWNERSHIP	Private	Private	Private	Private	Private	Private
RELATION WITH	HARMONY WITH THE TRADITIONAL FABRIC	Harmoniou s in height	Harmoniou s in height	Harmoniou s in height	Harmoniou s in height	Harmoniou s in height	Harmoniou s in height
HISTORICAL PERIODS	IN THE LOCATION OF A HISTORIC PERIOD	-	possibly on top of Roman Baths	possibly on top of Roman Baths	possibly on top of Roman Baths	possibly on top of Roman Baths	-
ACCESSIBILITY	ACCESSIBILITY WITHIN THE CURRENT TOWN	In the city center on the main axis	In the city center on the main axis	In the city center on the secondary roads	In the city center on the secondary roads	In the city center on the secondary roads	In the city center on the main axis
	ACCESSIBILITY FOR ENTRANCE AND OBSERVATION	Everyday use by the inhabitants	Everyday use by the inhabitants	Everyday use by the inhabitants	Everyday use by the inhabitants	Everyday use by the inhabitants	Everyday use by the inhabitants

NAME/ ID		29	30	31	32	33	34
	COMPONENT (PART OF A GROUP)	-	-	-	-	-	Commercial buildings
	BEING PART OF A VISTA	Old Mosque	-	-	Old Mosque Roman Baths	-	Commercial buildings
CONTINUITY	FUNCTIONAL CONTINUITY	-	-	-	-	-	-
	ATTRACTION	-	-	-	-	-	-
SOCIAL ATTRACTION	REFERENCE POINT	-	-	-	-	-	-
	ATTRIBUTION	-	-	-	-	-	-
VISUAL ATTRACTION	VIEW POINTS (VISTAS)	Makam Mosque	-	Old Mosque	Old Mosque	Old Mosque	Old Mosque Makam Mosque Roman Baths Ottoman Residential Building #3
	LANDMARK	-	-	-	-	-	-
PRESENTATION	CONTRIBUTION TO PRESENTATION	-	-	-	-	-	-
	EFFECT ON PERCEPTION	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 12 Information Groups for the Evaluation of New Buildings (continued)

Table 13 Information Groups for the Evaluation of New Buildings

	NAME/ ID	35	36	37	38	39	VAKIFBAN K 40
IDENTIFICATION	NUMBER OF STOREY	3	5	1H	4	2	5
	CURRENT USE	Commercial	Commercial	Commercial	Commercial Residential	Commercial	Commercial
CURRENT STATUS	OWNERSHIP	Private	Private	Private	Private	Private	Private
RELATION WITH THE HISTORICAL PERIODS	HARMONY WITH THE TRADITIONAL FABRIC		Inharmoniou s in height	Harmonious in height	Harmonious in height	Harmonious in height	Inharmoniou s in height
	IN THE LOCATION OF A HISTORIC PERIOD	-	-	-	-	-	on top of Roman Bridge

Table 13 Information Group	s for the Evaluation of New	Buildings (continued)

NAME/ ID		35	36	37	38	39	VAKIFBAN K 40
	ACCESSIBILITY WITHIN THE CURRENT TOWN	In the city center on the main axis	In the city center on the main axis	In the city center on the secondary roads	In the city center on the secondary roads	In the city center on the main axis	In the city center on the main axis
	ACCESSIBILITY FOR ENTRANCE AND OBSERVATION	Everyday use by the inhabitants	Everyday use by the inhabitants	Used seldom by the inhabitants	Used seldom by the inhabitants	Everyday use by the inhabitants	Everyday use by the inhabitants
INTEGRITY	COMPONENT (PART OF A GROUP)	Commercial buildings	Commercial buildings	Commercial buildings	Commercial buildings	Commercial buildings	Commercial buildings
	BEING PART OF A VISTA	Commercial buildings	Commercial buildings	-	-	Commercial buildings	Commercial buildings
CONTINUITY	FUNCTIONAL CONTINUITY	-	-	-	-	-	-
	ATTRACTION	-	-	-	-	-	-
	REFERENCE POINT	-	-	-	-	-	+
	ATTRIBUTION	-	-	-	-	-	-
SOCIAL ATTRACTION	VIEW POINTS (VISTAS)	Old Mosque Makam Mosque Roman Baths Ottoman Residential Building #4	Old Mosque Makam Mosque Roman Baths Ottoman Residential Building #3	-	-	-	Old Mosque, Roman Baths, Makam Mosque,
	LANDMARK	-	-	-	-	-	+
	CONTRIBUTION TO PRESENTATION	-	-	-	-	-	-
	EFFECT ON PERCEPTION	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 14 Information Groups for the Evaluation of New Building	ngs
--	-----

	NAME/ ID	41	42	43	44
IDENTIFICATION	NUMBER OF STOREY	4	2	2	2
	CURRENT USE	Residential Commercial	Commercial	Commercial	Commercial
CURRENT STATUS	OWNERSHIP	Private	Private	Private	Private
RELATION WITH THE HISTORICAL PERIODS	HARMONY WITH THE TRADITIONAL FABRIC	Inharmonious in height & mass proportions	Harmonious in height	Harmonious in height	Harmonious in height
	IN THE LOCATION OF A HISTORIC PERIOD	-	-	-	-
ACCESSIBILITY	ACCESSIBILITY WITHIN THE CURRENT TOWN	In the city center on the secondary roads		In the city center on the secondary roads	In the city center on the secondary roads
	ACCESSIBILITY FOR ENTRANCE AND OBSERVATION	Used seldom by the inhabitants	Used seldom by the inhabitants	Used seldom by the inhabitants	Used seldom by the inhabitants
	COMPONENT (PART OF A GROUP)	-	-	-	-
INTEGRITY	BEING PART OF A VISTA	Makam Mosque Mustafa Ağa Mescidi	Mustafa Ağa Mescidi	-	-
CONTINUITY	FUNCTIONAL CONTINUITY	-	-	-	-
	ATTRACTION	-	-	-	-
	REFERENCE POINT	-	-	-	-
	ATTRIBUTION	-	-	-	-
	VIEW POINTS (VISTAS)	-	Mustafa Ağa Mescidi	Kubatpaşa Medresesi	Kubatpaşa Medresesi
SOCIAL ATTRACTION	LANDMARK	-	-		
	CONTRIBUTION TO PRESENTATION	-	-	-	-
	EFFECT ON PERCEPTION	Blocks the perception of Mustafa Ağa Mescidi and Roman Bridge	Blocks the perception of Mustafa Ağa Mescidi and Roman Bridge	-	Effects the perception of Kubatpaşa Medresesi