

THE CASTLE OF SALONA (AMFISSA, MUNICIPALITY OF DELPHI, CENTRAL GREECE) A PROPOSAL FOR HOLISTIC APPROACH TO CULTURAL MANAGEMENT

Christos Merantzias

*Assistant Professor, Department of Cultural Heritage Management & New Technologies,
University of Patras, Greece
hmerantz@upatras.gr*

Abstract

The Castle of Salona (municipality of Delphi) offers a unique possibility for the region of Central Greece to render the time distance a field of productive understanding of the historical continuity. However, the current conditions of its maintenance does not correspond, in the minimum, to the demands of a management, which resonates the claims of contemporary societies with self-consciousness. In this perspective, we propose alternative management methods of the Castle of Salona, so as to restore the continuity in its use, which move complementarily to the value-based model of the management of the official bodies treating the cultural heritage as the visible evidence of the living experience of the past. A necessary condition for this is that the user of the specific place has previously acquired a specific 'ethos,' which renders the past a lived experience of the present. The interpretive model proposed acknowledges the necessity of the connection of an architectural entity such as the place embedded in daily life of the residents of the town of Amfissa with the surrounding space, a connection from which springs the living present of the town.*

Key words: *Castle of Salona, holistic approach to cultural management, value-based cultural management, cultural topiography, cultural embeddedness*

Introduction

The forlorn Castle of Salona, with a high degree of risk for its visitors due to the potential collapse of parts of its walls, is rendered today the testimony of a use, which has the character of an abuse due to the interventions by public bodies (pine plantation, wood railings, bracing for musical events, wood rest benches, steel electrical lighting stakes or litter bins without a functional use any more, flagpoles) and by individuals (a stone fountain, a considerable amount of litter). Its utilization by the local community of Amfissa and the individual stakeholders is not but a functional discontinuity in the uses of the Castle with interventions which, in the majority of cases, are, historically and culturally, offensive. The Castle, thus, is rendered the uncanny space of the past being fully detached from the modern town of Amfissa and the daily life of its residents. The non-specialist is incapable of understanding the complex historical correlations, the depth of historical experience and the multitude of cultural peculiarities (Monioudi-Gavala, 2001), which the successive 'users' of the Castle accumulated in the course of centuries, thus rendering it unique in its kind as its successive phases correspond to diverse cultural entities (the ancient Greek, the Roman, the Byzantine, the Frankish, the Catalan, the Ottoman and the Modern Greek).

Furthermore, as it does not respect the surrounding space in its historical diachrony, the Castle of Salona bears witness to a condition of utter discontinuity.

Our main thesis is that, in parallel to the model of a value-based management proposed by the official bodies, there has to prevail an alternative holistic approach (Agbaje-Williams, 2008: 61–64), capable of safeguarding its continuity in space and time with which is inevitably intertwined the undisturbed knowledge of its continuity. The Castle constitutes *per se* the objectification of a duration which, in its present state, is conceived solely in terms of historical and cultural discontinuity. It is in this that we trace the presumption of the ‘epic oblivion’ of history, as the history of the town of Amfissa appears totally detached from its present. The historical vicissitudes which took place at the Castle of Salona (Rubió y Lluch, 1912: 73–96; Bon, 1937: 164–186; Lerat, 2008: 59-64, 264-274), namely the changes not only as to the shape as also to the method of construction, correspond to a cultural topiography which constitutes the cultural continuity of the Castle of Salona through the articulation of a multitude of incongruous cultural codes.

In search of identity

Any approach to the cultural management of the Castle of Salona should have as a point of departure the question whether its historical past can constitute a web of significances and further whether it creates a sense of identity through an essential feedback with the present of the town of Amfissa. Do the symbolically articulated practices stocked in the historical site of the Castle establish claims to an authentic communication with the present? The envisaging of the Castle in its present state must not be disengaged from the natural and cultural environment (Rössler, 2009: 298-305) which accommodates it, in relation primarily with what is neighborly with it.

The restoration of the Castle of Salona shall have to be placed at the focal point of a comprehensive investigation on its co-belongingness with the historical place and time. In fact, it assumes a wider scope as thereby as an axis there are opened up concentric circles of action which enable a quasi-dialogue with the historical past, but also with the present: the Castle and the hinterland, the Castle and the archaeological site of Delphi, the Castle and the Delphian landscape, the Castle and the olive grove of Amfissa, the Castle and the Tanneries (*Charmena*), and so on. Consequently, the understanding of its history must not be restricted exclusively to the specific, disengaged from these wider cultural entities, facticity of a secluded architecture. The desideratum should be to connect experientially the managerial model to be adopted, whichever this may be, with the experiential ‘we’ of the community. This can become feasible only if we take into consideration the cultural environment of the residents of contemporary Amfissa. And this is so as the cultural management has to be directly related to the management of differences pertained to the use of the cultural heritage which are at most differences between conflicting conceptualizations of the past. Additionally, the standing legislative framework related to the cultural heritage works in favor of the strengthening of the power structures which legitimate the intervention of specialists and in particular of the archaeologists of the Archeological Service, who bear the responsibility for the implementation of the relevant legislation (Geering & Roberts, 1992; Leone & Preucel, 1992: 115–135). Under these circumstances, what is strengthened is not only the institutional, but also the symbolic power of archaeology in the eyes of the local communities which arguably leads to the discouraging of a vital relation of local community with the historical remnants.

Certainly, the devaluation of the Castle of Salona has been the outcome of wider transformations which pertain to issues related to the genesis of the modern Greek nation-state

(Noutsos, 2006: 148–166). Within this framework, there was granted a priority to the study of Greek antiquity against the modern Greek culture, including the Byzantine and, even more, the Ottoman culture. The positive appraisal of the ancient Greek ideal has driven the Greek state, but also the modern Greek society as a whole, to draw ideals and values from the ancient ancestors and to underrate the recent history (Hamilakis, 2007: 57–124). The recent past has functioned preventively in the need of the modern Greek state for historical diachrony and, due to this demerit, there has been created a huge confusion of mentalities, the result being the idealization of antiquity as the only means for a secure national identity. Furthermore, in the case of the Castle of Salona, the proximity of the town of Amfissa to Delphi functioned radically for the reorganization of the land as the Pan-Hellenic sanctuary of antiquity and its archaeological space were signified by counterpoint to monuments, such as the Castle of Salona.

Through the quest for national identity, based mainly on the ideals of Greek antiquity, what has been devalued is not only the Castle of Salona, but also the popular culture related to the traditional professions of the town, e.g. of the tanner, the roper, the bell-maker. From the Greek Revolution onwards, the constitution of the local identity was made possible not on the basis of cultural heterogeneity and complexity, but as an ideal of purity for which the Greek antiquity served as a tool for the cultivation of national consciousness. However, a historical place such as the Castle of Salona testifies *par excellence* to the cultural heterogeneity due to the succession of diverse civilizations. The Greek War of Independence did not but confirm the triumphal reinstatement of a Western-type education, an example being that of Itea which, vis-à-vis the anarchic urban planning organization of Amfissa, expressed the new Kapodistrian ideal of urban planning constitution introduced by the first Prime Minister of Greece, John Kapodistrias (1776–1831). As a consequence, the only sustainable national consciousness would have to operate intermediately, extinguishing the discontinuous cultural heterogeneity of the recent past. Modern Greek nation-state oriented its physiognomy to a distant past which ignored the ‘humble analogies’ of the Modern Greek as also the Ottoman social reality.

Phenomena such as the degradation of the traditional professions of the town of Amfissa, and even their disappearance, the negligence until very recently of its tannery district (*Charmena*)—it is noteworthy that the educational documentary on show at the Dimitsana Hydromotion Museum, Peloponnese, produced by the Cultural Foundation of the Bank of Piraeus, on the skin processing stages has been shot at the tannery district of Amfissa (Zarkia, 1997: 21–29)—, the irreparable destruction of the mural paintings of Neo-Byzantine aesthetics of the Metropolitan Church of Amfissa by Spyros Papaloukas (1892-1957) (Kotidis, 1993: 202–205), all these constitute a multitude of case studies which does not demonstrate only the matter of social changes occurred before, and even after the World War II, but also witness, in the most evident way, the dissenting cultural significations which have made up the identity of the town of Amfissa. The latter must immediately restore its relation to its protean past and reassess its cultural diversity as a unique source of wealth which can affect positively its present and future.

What I am rising as an issue, is that it is time to purify the Castle of Salona from the erratic interventions of a disheartening present which have very often transformed it hastily and to a high degree of risk into an area of recreation and occasional events. Whichever interventions have taken place in the last years—from tree planting to the theatrical bracing of poor - taste aesthetics which has been set up inside it-, witness a total lack of sensitivity to its historical past. These are interventions of a sensationalist politics of the masses which very often offends the public space and alienates its cultural identity.

Management principles which could serve as proposals

The management of the Castle of Salona must frame some principles which could also serve as proposals for future action:

- The Castle of Salona will have to be included in the framework of a topiography, in other words to be seen in a holistic way.
- The managerial intervention to the Castle must not be consumed exclusively in the short term priorities set by the technological monopoly, and the struggle of competing financial interests shall be subjugated to a long-term perspective which can only ensure its survival.
- If we take into account only the archaeological significance of the Castle of Salona, we are inevitably led to its devaluation in terms of cultural heritage, as the Castle does not belong exclusively to the past, but primarily to the present, wherein also the need for its inclusion into an integral ecosystem.
- We must focus on the operation of a kind of cultural management which focuses on the cultivation of the local community's relation to its historical consciousness.
- The decision makers in charge of the management of the Castle of Salona will have to abstain from practices of commodification which systematically ignore the lived relation of isolated cultural entities with their surrounding space.
- Restoring the connection of the Castle of Salona with the daily life of the town of Amfissa must be meant as a claim for a continuing cultural education. On these conditions, there arises the lived existence of a cultural space which has the capacity of conversing the individual material 'object' into a 'thing' embedded into a series of heterogeneous, but concentric, cultural entities (Wallace & Hannam, 2013: 99–101). The signification of the past must not only be restricted to the rigid framework of its scientific appropriation by archaeologists, without taking into account the lived experience of the present. The Castle of Salona is not only the succession of its historical phases, as primarily the vision of the archaeologist wishes, but also its deficient and selective use and misuse, and also its present state of dereliction, a situation which is related directly to the understanding of the present of the Castle as a culturally signified topiography (Roos, 2010: 112). The Castle's previous uses must not function to the detriment of the understanding of its significance for the present which formulates a different approach and concerns directly a way of envisaging the cultural heritage. Without ignoring the depth of the cultural topiography of the Castle what takes priority is to create those practices which will link the cultural heritage of this place with the actual life of the people (Poulios, 2010: 170–185). The aim here is to assume a number of activities which will reconcile the inhabitants of the place not only with the historical past, but also with the infusion of the latter into their daily life (Roos, 2010: 112).
- Furthermore, the Castle of Salona has incorporated, owing to its multiple uses, an accumulated capital of symbolic values which is due to different social formations (Bourdieu, 1990: 112–121). These heterogeneous life forms will have to constitute elements for a collective identification in the form of symbols, experiences and knowledge practices.
- The management of cultural heritage raises a number of complex political problems, given that it concerns a given community and a given place. However, the re-use of historical places with a dense historical content (Baram & Rowan, 2004: 5) is related also to its new users.
- It is obvious that no management plan constitutes *a priori* a magical solution which will reverse within a night the devaluating situation of the previous decades. The stakeholders in the management of the Castle of Salona are called, on the basis of the joint recognition of numerous adversities, to participate in a process which requires not only transparency in

decisions and readiness for response to the challenges, but also the maintenance of a quasi-dialogue with parliamentary deputies, public functionaries, environmental organizations, tourism bodies and targeted tourists, religious authorities, non-government organizations, researchers, but also with the local community, with agencies or individuals wishing to make use of the space for commercial or cultural–entertainment use. Last, but not least, what must be taken into account are the changing needs of the coming generations (Demas, 2002: 28, 31). Hence, the management must have a direct relation to the peculiarities of local identities and promote a historical self-consciousness (Olsen, et al., 2012: 77).

- The need for cultural management has an increasing significance in the environment of a growing tourism industry (Fowler, 1987: 409-423; Smith, et al., 1992: 43–47).
- It must not be taken for granted that a specific managerial practice cultivates a historical receptivity of a certain type. Historical consciousness is a dialectics of the present and the past and has to do with the receptivity of the individual towards the past, that is the way in which it is projected into it. The restoration of a material remainder is by itself a one-way road as it obeys to a managerial model which focuses on individual objects. Conversely, this whole effort must not be exhausted in the reconstruction of the Castle or in any managerial interventions, whether mild or not. If the management of heritage is not socially imbedded into the local community, it will not have an appeal to the consciousness of people.
- The functions of maintenance and restoration promise a reversible situation which is produced by the application of specialized practices. These practices are based on a restoration model which promotes creation of a stylistic unity where the new predominates. The archaeologist, the restorer, the architect assume the role of a mediator between the material remnant and its re-signification. Furthermore, through renovation, they desire to attribute authenticity to tradition. With the restoration of the material remnant what is also linked to it is the authentic understanding of the historical past. The restoration, though, should also implicate the projection not to the past, but to the future in which it is after all interested. Primarily, the management is *par excellence* the practice that encourages not only the formation for the authentic projection of the past to the present, but also the documentation of a reception of the past to the present. This is the confirmation of an appropriation of the past led by technological advances which aims to legitimate the understanding of the past in the present. The desideratum is something more than the relics of the past, thus installing a relation of duration between the users of the cultural heritage through its adoption into a lived experience (Prangnell, et al., 2011: 149–150).
- In its present state the Castle of Salona condenses the evolution of a broad space with its various demographic, economic, social and political transformations. The managerial approach of it embodies a wider dimension which enables the interconnection of cultural and natural resources (Athanasopoulos & Wandsnider, 2004: 10). The narratives of place correspond to spatial indications, manifest, e.g., in the material tokens of the diverse building phases of the Castle. These narratives are intertwined, however, with wider geographies, indicating a topographic itinerary which is articulated on a space common in all of them. The Castle of Salona is a hike which instead of being realized on foot is traced through the succession of its building phases. Consequently, the topographical performances of the Castle set within a wider spatial system help us perceive the various levels of its semantic determination. Upon each of its Walls one can in fact reconstruct several architectural phases each with its significant practices: the ancient Greek system of the well-chiseled huge stones in rows for which the joints of the lower zone do not correspond to the joints of the higher one or the Medieval system of construction with tiles, sand, flintstones, lime, egg, the ground-up tile.

From place to space

The space functions multifocally, enclosing a multitude of symbolic alterities. As a consequence, the space is constituted by a variety of uses and practices, thus resembling a written text which is read by various users in different eras. The Castle of Salona, as a unitary space, is constituted by the differences of its topiography. The uses of the different 'topoi' within it contribute to understanding that the greater the knowledge of the individual places, the deeper there was rendered the consciousness on space. We find ourselves before a process where a material phenomenon of the past finds a symbolic meaning within the present (Carman, 2002: 194).

From the aforementioned what is rendered evident is that the difference of place and space contains two substantial determinations. The place can be reduced to the dead material remnants, to the 'remains of history,' while the space disposes a breadth which exceeds the inertia of the 'object,' the data of the mere restoration which has nothing to add to the historical residues, nothing more than preserving them in the diachrony, so that the latter are not deprived of the authority the past has charged them with. The space does not elevate only the place of memory, but also it accelerates the historical transitions and changes, the mutual accretions, the exclusions and conflicts, as it moves always towards the signification of the past by the present consciousness. The space constitutes a part of the historical self-consciousness and simultaneously also of the construction of a specific cultural identity (Clarke, 1988: 44–49; Moser, 1996: 32–42). Consequently, the issue is not merely to restore a material remnant but to enrich the historical self-consciousness on an individual as well as a collective level or, in managerial terms, to see how the perception of the archaeological value of an object can be reshaped within the present day's wider formation (Rockman, 2012: 5).

The desideratum of the transformation of a place into a space, wonderfully documented within the literature of cultural management (Davison, 1991: 1–13; Fowler, 1992) or else the actualization of the place as space, is essentially the course from the inside to the outside, that is to an opening which fractures the commitments of the place as it is through the historical consciousness that the said actualization is attempted. How is this transition achieved? An effort has to be made so as to read all the narratives on place without ignoring the fact that the restoration of space is made textually possible through the reading of dead 'things' or else inert 'things.' Such is, by analogy, the significance of mythology in the effort to constitute historical consciousness or the one of folk fairy tale where myth and fiction cause for the awakening of dead and inactive 'objects' or of dead 'topoi' of the past. What space needs are new travelling narratives to be incorporated in the educational system. This is the reason why we are in need of itineraries which multiply moves within a cultural map and will be constantly enriched with new paths where the narratives will also increase. What we need are narrative assumptions of itineraries as only thereby can exist a consciousness of space. The local truncation of the unitary narrative of the Castle of Salona is articulated in a cohesive space, in the framework of both an urban environment and a rural landscape. This structural allocation of space with its local restrictions is a culturally active practice which offers to us the certainty that we belong to a community and share a common past (Lowenthal, 1990).

Valorized for decades through circumstantial plans the use of the Castle of Salona precluded the possibility to constitute an organic part of the life of the town of Amfissa. What must imbue the venture of its management is the cultivation of a holistic approach to it, which will certainly contain clear witnesses in the form of narratives of space. In these narratives there will be a place for the intellectual life of the region of Amfissa, the folk tradition and the disdained professions of

the craftsmen, the oral tradition, the cultural codes of the daily life, the local farming, last but not least the topography of the fortified Castle in the past as a safe place at a high position with the seat of power controlling the countryside around it.

Conclusion

In this paper our aim has been to propose an alternative holistic approach which should be based on: a. the documented reading of the past with the systematic depiction on the part of experts, the participation of the maximum number of the citizens of the town and the submission of proposals on the basis of achieving a creative synthesis of views, b. the education of the local agencies and collective bodies, from municipal representatives to educators, c. the inclusion of the Castle of Salona into the present of the town of Amfissa which will arise not from the occasional participation in the local cultural life (concerts, theatrical performances or fragmentarily coincidental cultural happenings unrelated to the place). d. The local human resources which will have to be coordinated aiming at the creation of a unitary body in a period where, on the one hand, the scientific demands are complex and based on interdisciplinarity and, on the other hand, the financial burdens are inapproachable for small places. The cultural heritage management will have, therefore, to be based on the synergy of the sovereign state power and its institutional representatives with the local political bodies and the autonomous social groups, last but not least with the scientific and managerial authorities. This synergy will be effective if the following two conditions are met: a. the solid knowledge of the legal stakeholders framework, which is often complex and Daedalian b. the strict attachment to the contemporary scientific data in the area of cultural management. In conclusion, the management of the Castle of Salona will have to adopt a holistic view which is opposed to the narrow view of a technocratically oriented value-based management, in order to create new forms of incorporation in the local community and cultivate a new mentality vis-à-vis the past as an antidote to the inflictions of the depreciating modern cultural condition.

* An earlier version of this article was presented at the conference *The Castle of Salona (Amfissa). A Historical Journey—Opportunities for Future Preservation and Promotion of its Cultural Heritage*, organized by the 24th Ephorate of Byzantine Antiquities, the 10th Ephorate of Prehistoric & Classical Antiquities, and the Municipality of Delphi, Cultural Center of Amfissa, Greece, 22–24 November 2013.

References

- Agbaje-Williams, B. 2008. Rethinking Cultural Resources Management. A Culturist and Generic Model for Development. In: F. P. McManamon, A. Stout and J. A. Barnes, eds. *Managing Archaeological Resources. Global Context, National Programs, Local Actions*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, pp. 55-65
- Athanassopoulos, E. F. & Wandsnider, L. 2004. Mediterranean Landscape Archaeology. Past and Present. In E. F. Athanassopoulos and L. Wandsnider, eds. *Mediterranean Archaeological Landscapes. Current Issues*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, pp. 1-13.
- Baram, U. & Rowan, Y. 2004. Archaeology after Nationalism: Globalization and the Consumption of the Past. In: Y. Rowan and U. Baram, eds. *Marketing Heritage. Archaeology and the Consumption of the Past*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press, pp. 3–23.
- Bon, A. 1937. Forteresses médiévales de la Grèce centrale. *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, 61: 136–208.
- Bourdieu, P. 1990. *The Logic of Practice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Carman, J. 2002. *Archaeology and Heritage. An Introduction*. London & New York: Continuum.
- Clarke, D. 1988. Poor Museums, Rich Men's Media: an Archaeological Perspective. In: J. Bintliff, ed. *Extracting Meaning from the Past*. Oxford: Oxbow Books, pp. 44-49
- Davison, G. 1991. The Meanings of 'Heritage'. In: G. Davison and C. McConville, eds. *A Heritage Handbook*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin, pp. 1-13.
- Demas, M. 2002. Planning for Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites. A Values-Based Approach. In: J. M. Teutonico and G. Palumbo, eds. *Proceedings Management Planning for Archaeological Sites. An International Workshop Organized by the Getty Conservation Institute and Loyola Marymount University May 2000 Corinth, Greece*. Los Angeles, CA: The Getty Conservation Institute, pp. 27-54.
- Fowler, P. 1987. What Price the Man Made Heritage?. *Antiquity*, 61: 409-423.
- Fowler, P. 1992. *The Past in Contemporary Society*. London: Routledge.
- Geering, K. & Roberts, C. 1992. Current Limitations on Aboriginal Involvement in Aboriginal Site Management in Central West and Northwest New South Wales. In: J. Birckhead, T. DeLacy and L. Smith, eds. *Aboriginal Involvement in Parks and Protected Areas*. Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press, pp. 207-214.
- Hamilakis, Y. 2007. *The Nation and Its Ruins. Antiquity, Archaeology, and National Imagination in Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kotidis, A. 1993. *Modernism and Tradition in the Greek Art of the Mid-War*. Thessaloniki: University Studio Press.
- Leone, M. P. & Preucel, R. W. 1992. Archaeology in a Democratic Society: A Critical Theory Perspective. In: L. Wandsnider, ed. *Quandaries and Quest: Visions of Archaeology Future*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University, pp. 115-135.
- Lerat, L. 1952. *Les Locriens de l'ouest. I. Topographie et ruines*. Paris: De Boccard
- Lerat, L. 2008. *Oi Esperioi Lokroi. I. Topografia kai ereipia*, trans. by B. Karabetsou and D. Chatzivasileiou. Salona: Municipal Library.
- Lowenthal, D. 1990. *The Past is a Foreign Country*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Monioudi-Gavala, D. 2001. *The Castle of Chios. Fortifications and the Surrounded Town Nowadays Since the Middle Ages*. Chios: Entypo.
- Moser, S. 1996. Science and Social Values: Presenting Archaeological Findings in Museum Displays. In: L. Smith and A. Clarke, eds. *Issues in Management Archaeology*. University of Queensland, St Lucia: Tempus Anthropology Museum Press, pp. 32-42.
- Noutsos, P. 2006. *Kay Points in the Debate on the Nation*. Athens: Ellinika Grammata.
- Olsen, B., Shanks M., Webmoor, T. & Witmore, C. eds. 2012. *Archaeology. The Discipline of Things*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Poullos, I. 2010. Moving Beyond a Values-Based Approach to Heritage Conservation. *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites*, 12/2: 170-185.
- Prangnell, J., Ross, A. & Coghill, B. 2011. Power Relations and Community Involvement in Landscape-based Cultural Heritage Management Practice: an Australian Case Study. In: E. Waterton and S. Watson, eds. *Heritage and Community Engagement. Collaboration or Contestation?*. Abington, Oxon and New York: Routledge, pp. 148-163
- Rockman, M. 2012. Introduction: A L'Enfant Plan for Archaeology. In: M. Rockman and J. Flatman, eds. *Archaeology in Society. Its Relevance in the Modern World*. New York and London: Springer, pp. 1-20.

- Roos, A. 2010. Defining Cultural Heritage at Gummingurru, Queensland, Australia. In: C. Phillips and H. Allen, eds. *Bridging the Divide. Indigenous Communities and Archaeology into the 21st Century*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, pp. 107-128.
- Rössler, M. 2009. The Anthropological Study of Landscape. In: M. Bollig and O. Bubenzer, eds, *Studies in Human Ecology and Adaptation. African Landscapes. Interdisciplinary Approaches*. New York: Springer, pp. 297-325
- Rubió y Lluch, A. 1912. *On the Catalan fortresses of Continental Greece*, trans. by G. Mavrakis. Athens: Estia.
- Smith, L., Clarke, A. & Alcock, A. 1992. Teaching Cultural Tourism. Some Comments from the Classroom. *Australian Archaeology*, 34: 43-47.
- Wallace, T. & Hannam, K. 2013. Cultural Sensitivity and Embeddedness. In: C. Walker and N. Carp, eds. *Tourisme and Archaeology. Sustainable Meeting Grounds*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, pp. 91-109.
- Zarkia, K. 1997. The skin and tannery. In: S. Papadopoulos, ed. *Open-Air Hydropower Museum*. Athens: ETBA Cultural Technological Foundation, pp. 21-29.