ARHEOLOOGILISED VÄLITÖÖD EESTIS

ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIELDWORK IN ESTONIA

2007

Koostanud ja toimetanud Ülle Tamla

> Muinsuskaitseamet Tallinn 2008

© 2008 Muinsuskaitseamet Uus 18, Tallinn 10111, Eesti National Heritage Board Uus 18, Tallinn 10111, Estonia www.muinas.ee

Esikaas: 13.–14. sajandist pärit ribiline väike klaaspudel Tartu vanalinnast.

Cover: Fragment of a 13.-14 cc small glass bottle (Ribbenflasche) from Old Tartu.

Tagakaas: Tervena säilinud keskaegne nahkjalats Tartu vanalinnast.

Back cover: Well preserved leather shoe from Old Tartu.

Toimetuskolleegium / Editorial Board:

Ants Kraut
Friedrich Lüth
Erki Russow
Leena Söyrinki-Harmo
Toomas Tamla
Ülle Tamla
Jaan Tamm
Juris Urtāns
Kalev Uustalu
Heiki Valk

Kujundus ja küljendus: Jaana Kool

ISSN 1406-3972

TARTU ÖLIKOOLI RAAMATUKOGU SUNDEKSEMPLAR

REVIEW OF THE ARTICLE "ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITORING DURING RECONSTRUCTION WORK IN TALLINN OLD CITY HARBOUR" BY KRISTIN ILVES Friedrich LÜTH

The author presents the monitoring of a salvage of a 18th century shipwreck that was detected during reconstruction works in the Tallinn Old City Harbour.

The article consists of two major points:

- A) A critical remark on the management of an accidental shipwreck find
- B) The description of the results of the monitoring of the shipwreck.

A) The article wants to show that a wrong decision has been taken by the National Heritage Board of Estonia during reconstruction works. As far as the very short introduction gives an insight into the actual situation the shipwreck was found during reconstruction works that were already ongoing. This is a so called accidental find that has to be handled due to the legal situation in the country. Whether or not there is a possibility to use an accidental find in order to invent a full research oriented rescue-excavation is not described in the article and as far as reviewer is informed on the legal situation in Estonia and elsewhere in Europe it seems hardly possible or, to turn this around, most impossible to act in such a way as the author obviously expects from heritage agencies. Now, if the author wants to critizise the decision made by the National Heritage Board, she should describe the full legal procedure that led to the permission for reconstruction works in the old town harbour of Tallinn and then show on the basis of legal acts how the National Heritage Board could have taken another decision than it took.

To the reviewer it seems that the author is a very well engaged young researcher that is deeply involved with research on shipwrecks. But on the other side this young researcher has obviously no experience and furthermore no knowledge about legal procedures and management structures and decision taking processes.

Reviewer therefore would advice to either extend the part on the decision taking process including a fairly developed analysis of the legal possibilities and then draw criticism on mistakes, that run against the legal possibilities of the National Heritage Board or withdraw the critical part on the management, as there is no sufficient background in the present manuscript.

B) Concerning the description and the analysis on the find of a shipwreck itself this article seems reasonable. Slightly underdeveloped is the part on the dating and reviewer is in doubt why no dendrochronological analysis has taken place on the wood of the shipwreck. This would ease the interpretation of a coin find which in the present article is the main dating item. It remains undescribed whether even an attempt was undertaken to use the wood samples for dendrochronological dating. The author could be advised if the wood is still present, to deliver such a dating or in the case the wood is not preserved, describe why she has not undertaken a dendrochronological analysis. The dendro-data would not only deliver information on the age of the wood but could, if lucky, also deliver information on the origin of the wood and therefore most valuable historical information on the process of shipbuilding.