

pca

european journal of
postclassicalarchaeologies

volume 6/2016

SAP Società Archeologica s.r.l.

Mantova 2016



EDITORS

Gian Pietro Brogiolo (chief editor)

Alexandra Chavarría (executive editor)

ADVISORY BOARD

Martin Carver (University of York)

Matthew H. Johnson (Northwestern University of Chicago)

Giuliano Volpe (Università degli Studi di Foggia)

Marco Valenti (Università degli Studi di Siena)

ASSISTANT EDITOR

Francesca Benetti

LANGUAGE EDITOR

Rebecca Devlin (University of Florida)

EDITORIAL BOARD

Gilberto Artioli (Università degli Studi di Padova)

Andrea Breda (Soprintendenza BB.AA. della Lombardia)

Margarita Diaz-Andreu (ICREA - Universitat de Barcelona)

José M. Martín Civantos (Universidad de Granada)

Girolamo Fiorentino (Università del Salento)

Caterina Giostra (Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore di Milano)

Susanne Hakenbeck (University of Cambridge)

Vasco La Salvia (Università degli Studi G. D'Annunzio di Chieti e Pescara)

Bastien Lefebvre (Université Toulouse - Jean Jaurès)

Alberto León (Universidad de Córdoba)

Tamara Lewit (Trinity College - University of Melbourne)

Federico Marazzi (Università degli Studi Suor Orsola Benincasa di Napoli)

Dieter Quast (Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum Mainz)

Andrew Reynolds (University College London)

Mauro Rottoli (Laboratorio di archeobiologia dei Musei Civici di Como)

Colin Rynne (University College Cork)

Post-Classical Archaeologies (PCA) is an independent, international, peer-reviewed journal devoted to the communication of post-classical research. PCA publishes a variety of manuscript types, including original research, discussions and review articles. Topics of interest include all subjects that relate to the science and practice of archaeology, particularly multidisciplinary research which use specialist methodologies, such as zooarchaeology, paleobotany, archaeometallurgy, archaeometry, spatial analysis, as well as other experimental methodologies applied to the archaeology of post-classical Europe.

Submission of a manuscript implies that the work has not been published before, that it is not under consideration for publication elsewhere and that it has been approved by all co-authors. Each author must clear reproduction rights for any photos or illustration, credited to a third party that he wishes to use (including content found on the Internet). For more information about **ethics** (including plagiarism) and copyright practices and guidelines please visit the web site www.postclassical.it.

PCA is published once a year in May, starting in 2011. Manuscripts should be submitted to editor@postclassical.it in accordance to the guidelines for contributors in the webpage <http://www.postclassical.it>

Post-Classical Archaeologies's manuscript **review process** is rigorous and is intended to identify the strengths and weaknesses in each submitted manuscript, to determine which manuscripts are suitable for publication, and to work with the authors to improve their manuscript prior to publication.

This journal has the option to publish in **open access**. For information please visit the web site www.postclassical.it

How to **quote**: please use "PCA" as abbreviation and "Post-Classical Archaeologies" as full title.

Cover image: courtesy of Schaffhausen, Stadtbibliothek (Switzerland), Gen. 8, f. 271v – Klosterneuburger Evangelienwerk, retrieved from www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/sbs/0008/271v/0/Sequence-1030

"Post-Classical Archaeologies" was approved on 2015-05-13 according to ERIH PLUS criteria for inclusion. Classified A by ANVUR (Agenzia Nazionale di Valutazione del sistema Universitario e della Ricerca).

DESIGN

Paolo Vedovetto

PUBLISHER

SAP Società Archeologica s.r.l.
Strada Fienili 39/a, 46020 Quingentole, Mantova
www.archeologica.it

PRINTED BY

Tecnografica Rossi, Via I maggio, Sandrigo (VI)

Authorised by Mantua court no. 4/2011 of April 8, 2011

For subscription and all other information visit the web site www.postclassical.it

CONTENTS PAGES

EDITORIAL

5

RESEARCH - RECYCLING AND REUSE IN THE MIDDLE AGES

- R. Fleming The ritual recycling of Roman building material in late 4th- and early 5th-century Britain

7

- S. Paynter, C. Jackson Re-used Roman rubbish: a thousand years of recycling glass

31

- A. Sebastiani Glass and metal production at Alberese. The workshops at the manufacturing district of Spolverino

53

- F.-D. Deltenre, L. Orlandi «Rien ne se perd, rien ne se crée, tout se transforme». Transformation and manufacturing in the Late Roman *villa* of Aiano-Torraccia di Chiusi (5th-7th cent. AD)

71

- S. Bertoldi Santa Cristina in Caio (Buonconvento, Si): productive reuse during the Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages

91

- C. Fernández-Ochoa, F. Gil Sendino, J. Salido La actividad metalúrgica en el yacimiento Veranes (Gijón, España): de la villa romana al asentamiento tardoantiguo y altomedieval

109

BEYOND THE THEME

- F. Curta Postcards from Maurilia, or the historiography of the dark-age cities of Byzantium

141

- M. Asolati Trasparenze ponderali: contrappesi monetali di vetro nell'Anatolia bizantina

163

DOSSIER - WORLD HERITAGE AND THE PUBLIC

- M. Díaz-Andreu** Introduction to the Dossier "World Heritage and the Public" 189
- M. Díaz-Andreu** Social values and the participation of local communities in World Heritage: a dream too far? 193
- Q. Gao** Social values and archaeological heritage: an ethnographic study of the Daming Palace archaeological site (China) 213
- G. Alexopoulos, K. Fouseki** Gender exclusion and local values versus universal cultural heritage significance: the Avaton debate on the monastic community of Mount Athos 235
- T.S. Guttormsen, J. Taylor, G. Swensen** Heritage values conceptualised as heritage routes. Visions and challenges towards public diversity 255
- M. Maluck** Spatial planning as a way to stakeholder involvement in cultural heritage management. Examples from Northern Europe 273
- D. Rodwell** Community values vs World Heritage values: bridging the gap 295
- G.P. Brogiolo** The UNESCO network "The Longobards in Italy. The Places of Power (568-774 A.D.)" and the Brescia case 317

RETROSPECT

- N.I. Platonova** Problems of early medieval Slavonic Archaeology in Russia (a view from St. Petersburg) 333

PROJECT

- M. Valenti** "We invest in Public Archaeology". The Poggibonsi Archaeodrome project: an alliance between people, Municipality and University 417

REVIEWS

- G. Chouquer**, *Les parcellaires médiévaux en Émilie et en Romagne. Centuriations et trames coaxiales. Morphologie et droit agraires* - by **C. Citter** 431
- A. Vigil-Escalera Guirado**, *Los primeros paisajes altomedievales en el interior de Hispania. Registros campesinos del siglo quinto d.C.* - by **T. Lewit**
- M. Díaz-Andreu, A. Pastor Pérez, A. Ruiz Martínez** (eds), *Arqueología y comunidad. El valor social del Patrimonio Arqueológico en el Siglo XXI* - by **M. del Carmen Rojo Ariza**

EDITORIAL

The sixth issue of PCA presents the material from two conferences held in different European countries last year.

The volume opens with some of the papers presented at The British School at Rome (April 2014) at a conference on The Recycling and Reuse of Materials during the Early Middle Ages. The meeting – organised by Alessandro Sebastiani (who has collaborated as guest editor for this section), Elena Chirico and Matteo Colombini – dealt mainly with productive structures related to the transformation of glass and metal in Italy (papers by Alessandro Sebastiani, Stefano Bertoldi, François-Dominique Deltenre and Lucia Orlandi). Other international experts have agreed to add their contributions to the subject: Robin Fleming on the reuse of construction material in early medieval graves, Sarah Paynter and Caroline Jackson offering a synthesis on the reuse of glass, and the team of Carmen Fernández-Ochoa in Spain presenting the early medieval productive structures at the villa of Veranes (Gijón). Two papers by Florin Curta and Michele Asolati, dealing with exchange in the Byzantine Mediterranean, have been published in the Varia section.

After the catastrophe of World War II, many international institutions were founded: the United Nations, UNESCO, the European Community. All these organizations are today immersed in a transitional phase in the systemic crisis which affects the entire Western world, a crisis to which the nihilist and relativist positions have contributed and which has (rightly) delegitimated the imperialism on which the West had built its dominant position. In this crisis, the recovery of shared historical memories is increasingly revealed as a central element in the defence of a rational world, which, although it may have abandoned the utopias of the 1900s, at least safeguards the principles of freedom and the pluralism of values. Today, there is wide debate, even among archaeologists, over how to present cultural heritage in a globalized society while nevertheless pre-

serving its multiple identities and cultures. The discussion of these matters was the purpose of the papers dedicated to the World Heritage List. This collection, guest edited by Margarita Díaz-Andreu, results from a workshop of the EU-project JPI–JHEP Heritage Values Network (H@V) held at the University of Barcelona in February 2015. The main question, summarized in the title of the paper by Díaz-Andreu, is whether the inclusion of social values and local communities in the management of cultural heritage is an impossible dream. Is it a utopian vision, typical of the historical processes which gave birth to the international organizations and their initiatives to hold back the spectre of a World War III? In many of these contributions, the watchwords still conform to this direction: the participation and involvement of stakeholders in the hope that local communities will be led to a positive valuation of assets and their public use.

The different directions of the debate move between the two poles of economic management and cultural enrichment of local communities. Too often, it is difficult to find a balance between touristic exploitation and a useful cultural proposal for local communities, as happened in the telling example of the Daming Palace in China, developed by Qian Gao, winner of the 2016 PCA young researcher award.

Direct involvement is often difficult in a globalized and multicultural society that has lost its historical roots. Most of the contributions consider that a proper balance can be found between global strategies promoted by UNESCO, based on the decalogue of general principles under which to file an application for protected sites, and the feeling and evaluation expressed by the local community (the focus of Torgrim Sneve Guttorsen, Joel Taylor, Grete Swensen on Heritage Routes and Matthias Maluck and Gian Pietro Brogiolo on organizational proposals in the interventions).

Also related to the subject of cultural heritage and the public is the project section of this issue, a homage the Poggibonsi Archeodromo. A project developed in recent years by the team of Marco Valenti (University of Siena), this is a unique living archaeological park recreated from archaeological evidence, presenting the life of an early medieval village, an initiative that clearly demonstrates the social and economic benefits of good practices in public archaeology in Italy.

Finally, the retrospect section, which addresses the history of early medieval archaeology in different European countries, is this year devoted to the fascinating recent history of early medieval Archaeology in Russia, with an extensive study by Nadezhda Platonova (St Peterburg).

Gender exclusion and local values versus universal cultural heritage significance: the Avaton debate on the monastic community of Mount Athos

GEORGIOS ALEXOPOULOS *
KALLIOPI FOUSEKI * *

* UCL, Institute of Archaeology, 31-34 Gordon Square,
London WC1H 0PY, georgios.alexopoulos@ucl.ac.uk
* * UCL, Institute of Sustainable Heritage, 14 Upper
Woburn Place, WC1H 0NN, London, UK, kalliopi.fouseki@ucl.ac.uk

This article explores the discrepancy between 'universal values' and 'local values' in the case of world heritage sites of sacred/religious nature. It focuses on the example of the world heritage site of Mount Athos, a self-administered peninsula in Northern Greece inhabited by an Orthodox monastic community and accessible only to male visitors/pilgrims. Special emphasis will be placed on the *Avaton* rule (prohibition of access to women) which has constituted an issue of debate particularly since the inclusion of Greece in the European Union and, to some extent, since the inscription of Mt Athos to the World Heritage List. The issue of *Avaton* generates the question: "should a religious site of local, national and international significance that excludes half of the world population be designated as a heritage place of universal value?" By posing this question, a re-orientation towards the concept of human and cultural rights will be offered.

Keywords: world heritage, universal values, local values, Mt Athos, sacred sites

L'articolo tratta della discrepanza tra valori "universali" e "locali" nel caso di siti di natura sacra/religiosa inseriti nel patrimonio dell'umanità. Si focalizza sull'esempio del sito del Monte Athos, un monastero ortodosso in una penisola in Grecia settentrionale abitata e amministrata dai monaci stessi e accessibile solo agli uomini. Particolare attenzione sarà posta sulla regola di Avaton (proibizione di accesso alle donne) che è stata materia di dibattito in particolare dal momento dell'inclusione della Grecia nell'Unione Europea e, in una certa misura, dal momento dell'iscrizione del Monte Athos nella lista UNESCO. La questione porta a domandarsi se un sito religioso di importanza locale, nazionale e internazionale che esclude metà della popolazione mondiale può essere comunque identificato come sito culturale di valore universale. Con questa domanda, l'articolo offrirà un riorientamento verso il concetto di diritti umani e culturali.

Parole chiave: patrimonio dell'Umanità, valori universali, valori locali, Monte Athos, siti

1. Introduction

This article aims to offer a critical insight into the concept of 'world heritage' by looking specifically at the example of Mount Athos, a religious site located in Northern Greece. We will explore the emerging tensions after a

religious place becomes a heritage site of universal value as a result of its inscription to the World Heritage List. Mount Athos, an Orthodox monastic community and World Heritage Site (since 1988), is accessible only to male pilgrims. Its inscription to the World Heritage List was mainly based on the artistic and historic significance of its cultural heritage and the importance of its natural environment and less so on the continuity of its living traditions since the Byzantine era. The process of nomination has been instigated by the Greek state authorities resulting in the creation of a heritage place which is, however, viewed purely as a religious site by the local monastic community. As a result, the 'universal' value of Mount Athos has been developed on the basis of values assigned by heritage experts at national and international level without taking fully into consideration the views of the monks towards the material culture of Mount Athos. Interviews with members of the Athonite monastic community reveal the discrepancy between the values assigned by the experts (heritage professionals) as opposed to the non-expert custodians and owners (the monastic community). In addition, the exclusion of women from Mount Athos – a 'local value' that is highly maintained and supported by the monastic community as a unique attribute of the spirituality of the place – raises an ethical question: should a religious site that excludes half of the world population be nominated as a heritage place of universal significance? Given that Mount Athos receives funding from national and international taxpayers (including women), is it possible to lobby and negotiate for provisions for women to access Mount Athos? More importantly, is prohibiting access to women against the human and cultural right of access?

It will be argued that the nomination of a religious site (as with any site) into the World Heritage List introduces significant changes which need to be thoroughly considered and addressed before the nomination process begins. The process of nomination itself is a process of attributing a name, a label, as well as certain values and characteristics to a place leading to the formation of a new identity of place. Since the nomination process involves state authorities, the new attributes and the new place identity do not always accord with the values and attitudes of the local community – in the case of Mount Athos, the monastic community. Consequently, the 'universal value' can often contradict with the 'local value' of a place. Mount Athos was converted (at least theoretically) as a result of the world heritage nomination from a religious site to a heritage place of universal significance. The nomination raised the legitimate claim of women, who have been excluded from the area since its establishment, to access Mt Athos under their human and cultural right of access to cultural heritage.

This article draws extensively from unpublished research conducted by one of the authors for the purposes of a PhD thesis (Alexopoulos 2010). The data was collected through field research between 2002-2005 with the employment of a variety of qualitative methods including structured and semi-structured interviews, free discussions, participant and unobtrusive observation (Alexopoulos 2010: chapter 1, section 1.4.5). This data was compared with available literature and enhanced particularly through the collection of newspaper articles from the Greek and international daily press. The sensitive case study of Mt Athos will offer a new insight into the growing debate regarding the boundaries of human and cultural rights in the field of heritage.

2. Human and cultural rights in heritage places

Cultural rights are often recognized by state constitutions and legislations as part of human rights (Fouseki, Shehade 2015). The term often refers to the right of individuals and communities to access their cultural heritage (Fouseki, Shehade 2015). One of the first documents recognizing cultural rights as integral part of human rights is the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) which acknowledges in article 27 that “everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits” (United Nations 1948). However, despite the fact that cultural rights are viewed as integral part of human rights, the cultural nature of human rights remains problematic (Fouseki, Shehade 2015; see also O’Keefe 2000 and Psychogiopoulou 2013). Indeed, as Silverman and Ruggles have already pointed out human and cultural rights often overlap and are occasionally in conflict with each other (2007, p. 6).

Indeed, it could be argued that the right to ‘access’ is both a human and a cultural right. This is of particular relevance in the case of sacred sites that have been characterized as places of heritage significance or heritage places that are viewed as sacred sites. Access here does not only denote physical access but has symbolic dimensions. It closely relates to empowering excluded or indigenous communities to access a place of significance (Blain, Wallis 2004, p. 238). If the right to access is a human and cultural right, is prohibiting women from access against human and cultural rights? What if prohibiting women from access is an integral part of the spirituality of a religious sites? Is removing the prohibition against cultural and human rights?

There is clearly a tension between the right to access and the right to prohibit access, if the latter determines the cultural identity of an 'indigenous' or minority community. The Universal Declaration on the Rights of Peoples (known as the Algiers Declaration), adopted by a non-governmental meeting of experts in 1976, defines cultural right as the right to respect cultural identity and the right of a people not to have an alien culture imposed on it. On the same line, the rights of religious communities and ethnic minorities to practice their own religion and enjoy their own culture are established in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (art. 27) (United Nations 1976). The latter were reaffirmed in the 1992 UN Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National, Ethnic or Religious and Linguistic Minorities (United Nations 1992; see for relevant discussion Stavenhangen 2008, p. 28).

The tension between 'access' and 'prohibiting access' will be analysed in the example where the debate became more vivid after the inscription of the site into the World Heritage List.

3. Brief background to Mt Athos

Mount Athos (known in Greece as Holy Mountain= *Άγιον Όρος*) is an Orthodox monastic community occupying the easternmost peninsula of the prefecture of Halkidiki in the region of Macedonia, Northern Greece (Pentzikis 2003). The entire peninsula is divided into territories among twenty ruling monasteries while the area can be accessed only by sea through ferryboat services from the nearby towns of Ouranoupolis and Ierissos. In terms of administration, the Athonite territory is under the sovereignty of the Greek state since 1912 but the monastic community is self-governed (Papastathis 1993). The Great Lavra monastery, which ranks first in the Athonite hierarchy, was founded in AD 963 and throughout the centuries – from the Byzantine era to the present – the area has managed to retain its status quo and several privileges (Kadas 1986, pp. 11-13).

With an area covering approximately 336 square kilometers and a population of more than 2,000 monks, Mount Athos constitutes a very significant sacred site for Eastern Christianity and a popular pilgrimage destination (Speake 2002, pp. 176-182; Andriotis 2009). The universal value of Mount Athos in terms of cultural and natural heritage was demonstrated through the inclusion in 1988 of the area to UNESCO's list of World Heritage Sites. Indeed the Athonite monasteries have preserved a wide range of archaeologically and historically significant buildings and architectural complexes, important and valuable collections and



Fig. 1. Map showing the peninsula of Mount Athos and the location of its monasteries (courtesy of András Bereznay).

several movable and immovable cultural heritage elements (Papadopoulos 1992, p. 26; Karakatsanis 1997). The Advisory Body Evaluation document stated that 'the monasteries of Athos are a veritable conservatory of masterpieces ranging from wall paintings by Frangos Castellanos at the Great Lavra to portable icons, gold objects, embroideries or illuminated manuscripts which each monastery jealously preserves' (ICOMOS 1988, p. 10). It is worth stressing that the monastic peninsula was also inscribed on the basis of natural criterion III therefore constituting a mixed property. However, apart from this rich heritage in tangible terms Mount Athos is a very special place for the safekeeping of intangible cultural heritage traditions. This is, among other things, illustrated by the significant spiritual role of the Athonite monasteries the brotherhoods of which preserve a unique living Orthodox tradition and way of life (Kadas 1986, p. 10) (see Appendix for the criteria under which Mt Athos was inscribed into the World Heritage List).

Holding a unique status quo within the Greek state, each monastery has responsibility for the management of its cultural heritage within its relevant territory while collective administrative bodies take decisions about the wider peninsula (Papastathis 2004; Alexopoulos 2010: chapter 4). Nevertheless, the Hellenic Ministry of Culture and its regional



Fig. 2. View of the Xiropotamou monastery with the slopes of Mount Athos in the background (Georgios Alexopoulos, August 2005).

agency, the Ephorate of Antiquities for Halkidiki and Mount Athos¹, has an important role in collaborating with the monasteries and offering its human resources, expertise and technical support. In addition, responsibilities for heritage management and all sorts of interventions are also shared with KEDAK (*ΚΕΔΑΚ* = Centre for the Preservation of Athonite Heritage) an agency comprised of representatives from the monastic community, academia, and various heritage professionals (Alexopoulos 2013a, pp. 67-70).

Before discussing the access ban for women on Mount Athos it is important to emphasise that the area is not an easily accessible peninsula and it enjoys an island-like isolation from the Greek mainland. Although a peninsula-wide road network exists within the monastic territories, there is no vehicle access the area from its outside borders (mainland Greece). A ferry-boat connection is the only way for both monks and visitors to enter the Holy Mountain. In addition to this arrangement the Athonite community has established a very strict quota system for regulating visitors in terms of both numbers and religious affiliation. Currently only

¹ Prior to the significant changes in the structure of the Hellenic Ministry of Culture and its regional services this agency functioned under the name 10th Ephorate of Byzantine Antiquities.

110 male visitors per day – that have applied for and have been granted specific visitor permits (usually well in advance) – are allowed to enter the peninsula. Among these permits only 10 are allocated to non-Greek/non-Orthodox visitors in a process that requires documentation of religious affiliation.

4. The Avaton rule: exclusion of women as a means to preserve a traditional way of life

The monastic community of Mt Athos has been following a several centuries-old rule that prohibits women from entering its territory. The *Avaton* (Ἀβάτον = inaccessible in Greek) is related to the virtue of celibacy and has been deemed to represent an extension of the traditional monastic rule prohibiting men and women to enter a monastery housing members of the opposite sex observed with various degrees of rigour at different institutions (Talbot 1996, p. 68). Athonite monks account this exclusion to the tradition according to which the Virgin Mary paid a legendary visit to the area of Mt Athos which thereafter became her Garden – since then the Mother of God became its patron and protector and the area was dedicated to her exclusively². The exclusion includes also female animals and it has been suggested that this regulation was motivated by both the desire to safeguard the sexual purity of the monks but, most importantly, to avoid the engagement of the monastery in stockbreeding which could lead to the development of a large commercial enterprise (Ware 1996, p. 9). It has been argued that the *Avaton* was an unwritten rule as the various Byzantine imperial decrees only implied this prohibition but the principle was ‘so ingrained in Athonite custom law and tradition that it seemed unnecessary to put such a rule in writing’ (Talbot 1996, pp. 68-69). In fact historian Alice-Mary Talbot has argued that this tradition enjoyed so extensive respect that “virtually no women ever dreamed of attempting to enter the sacred peninsula; hence there was no need for a specific written prohibition” (1996, p. 69). Throughout the centuries, however, there have been occasional violations of this rule (Talbot 1996, p. 70; Speake 2002, pp. 62-63). In addition to anecdotal and historical evidence of violations of the *Avaton* rule, we would like to highlight an interesting symbolic act of resistance to the exclusion of women. This took place in January 2008 during a public protest by members of local communities from the prefecture of Halkidiki at the Mt

² SPEAKE 2002, p. 25. Mount Athos is still widely called as the “Garden of Panagia (the Mother of God)”.

Athos borders. Although the reason for the rally was focused on the perceived encroachment of certain Athonite monasteries on public and private land a group of female protesters, including a left-wing party MP, seized the opportunity to violate the *Avaton* under media coverage by crossing the border fence (Eleftherotypia 09/01/2008).

The main ethical question that the *Avaton* rule raises is how a monastic peninsula that means so much to the cultural heritage of the Greek nation and even more broadly to Orthodox Christianity (beyond the existing national borders) can enjoy such a privileged status within the Greek state with significant funding (from tax payers money) and human resources involved in heritage protection, conservation and management? On a European level one could question why such an important financial support has been allocated to projects on Mount Athos without reflection on gender restriction issues posed by the access ban to female visitors. On an even broader level, we wonder how a World Heritage Site of universal value can advocate the exclusion of half of the world population from accessing and enjoying its natural and cultural heritage, both tangible and intangible?

5. The *Avaton* rule contested

Reflecting on the preservation of such a seemingly contradictory principle (at least according to contemporary standards of gender equality) British scholar Graham Speake, who is the founder and honorary secretary of the Friends of Mount Athos has noted that the *Avaton* rule ‘... was so well established, so widely understood and so deeply respected that there was no need to spell it out. No one ever questioned it; and so it has (almost) always been’ (Speake 2002, p. 27). Nevertheless, this restriction has not been spared of criticism and several attempts in the last decades have been made to exercise political pressure for its abolition.

On the occasion of International Women’s Year in 1975, the Greek Parliament rejected the proposal of an MP for the lifting of the ban. This issue was actually brought to court under the initiative of a group of political activists and female MPs but the abolishment of the restriction was not accepted based on the following reasons (Papastathis 1993, p. 74; Speake 2002, p. 163): ‘the ban had always been in place’ and therefore constituted one of the traditional and internationally protected rights of the Athonite community; the Mount Athos Charter, which serves as a constitution for the area, establishes this rule and any amendments can be instigated only by the Athonite monasteries themselves. The issue of the abolishment of the *Avaton* was again raised

some decades later by a Greek female member of the European Parliament and indeed the latter issued in 2003 a resolution requesting the lifting of the ban³. The gender restriction was also deemed anachronistic and misogynist⁴. What's more, the fact that female visitors are forbidden and male potential visitors gain access only through the existing restricted quota system, has been considered as a type of political control while the community itself has been termed as a "semi-autonomous monastic theocracy" (Shackley 2001, p. 183).

These attempts have in turn raised great concerns within the Athonite monastic community and have resulted in cautiousness in the dealings of the monasteries with the 'outside' secular world. The debate has, at times, enjoyed wide media coverage in Greece but has also included the views of the people strongly opposing any attempt to change the monastic peninsula with many members of the Orthodox clergy being vocal (Eleyftherotypia 17/01/2003). Most of the voices representing the Athonite perspective have emphasised that Athonite monks "do not hate women" (Ta Nea 02/11/1998) and that the absence of the latter makes concentration to monastic duties more feasible (Thomas 2002). Others have highlighted the overall negative impact of changes imposed to the Athonite way of life from the outside world (Ta Nea 23/11/1999). Quite interestingly, certain monasteries have used the claims for the abolition of the Avaton as an additional reason for rejecting funding from the European Union the argument being that accepting such funding (derived from tax-paying citizens of both sexes) would come with strings attached that could compromise the values and traditional Athonite way of life (Alexopoulos 2010). On the occasion of the Treasures of Mount Athos exhibition, which took place in Thessaloniki between 1997-1998⁵, Father Vassilios, then the abbot of the Iviron monastery, highlighted that the exhibition itself was a medium for overcoming the exclusion of women⁶.

³ According to the resolution the prohibition "nowadays violates the universally recognised principle of gender equality, Community non-discrimination and equality legislation and the provisions relating to free movement of persons within the EU" (European Parliament 2003).

⁴ Ta Nea 21/08/2001; Sean THOMAS (2002) wrote for the Guardian: "... And yet, and yet. In a way Athos is a kind of courageous test, a brave, ridiculous, 1,000-year-old experiment to see what the world would be like without the destabilising effect of sexual desire. And so perhaps we should allow the Athonite monks just a few more centuries in their strange, unreal, pristinely beautiful laboratory".

⁵ On the occasion of the celebration of Thessaloniki as Cultural Capital of Europe the *Treasures of Mount Athos* exhibition with more than 1,500 artefacts from Mount Athos was organised at the Museum of Byzantine Culture from 19/06/1997 to 30/04/1998.

⁶ To Vima 22/06/1997. Indeed the exhibition in Thessaloniki was followed by three other major exhibitions for which artefacts were given on loan from the monasteries: the *Mount Athos – The Treasury of the Protaton* held in Thessaloniki in 2006, the *Athos - Monastic Life on the Holy Mountain* held in the Finnish capital of Helsinki in 2006-2007, and the *Athos and Byzantine Empire: Treasures of the Holy Mountain* held in Paris in 2009.

The issue still raises discussions and conflicting views in relation to women's rights and international law. In a legislative analysis of the matter by professor of Ecclesiastical Law Ioannis Konidaris (2003) it has been argued that the *Avaton* is a manifestation of religious freedom, especially for the practice of worship, and comes under the principle of respect towards private ownership. This legal approach imposes certain human rights related to private ownership but obviously contradicts cultural rights related to access to heritage.

6. Gender restriction as a "local value": the values of the Athonite community

Myra Shackley has argued that "many religious sites have rigidly hierarchical, clerically dominated management structures which may have functioned in the same way for thousands of years" but "are largely unaffected by modern management trends, with the exception of their peripheral activities (often financial)" (Shackley 2003, p. 163). In a similar fashion and to a great extent, the aspirations and values of the Athonite monastic community, which clings to a set of traditions and values stemming from a millennium of continuous active presence, are usually characterised by stability. Nevertheless, one cannot argue that the attitudes and perceptions of the Athonite community, which inevitably affect decision-making, have always been immutable. What's more, the views of the individual monasteries in various issues that extend well beyond the confines of cultural heritage have also differed, sometimes even radically.

Interviews with Athonite monks undertaken between 2002-2005 have revealed the different attitudes of the monastic community towards the cultural heritage of Mt Athos. For the abbot of a small Athonite monastery the name 'treasures' – a term that is often used to connote the moveable cultural and sacred objects – is a term that refers not only to the artistic significance of those objects but also the spiritual treasures (Interview 1, 2004):

"The word "treasures" has a general meaning, it includes artistic but also spiritual treasures. Of course the key element of the treasures found on Mount Athos is the spiritual life: for example, the hagiographies (depictions of saints), the context that exists behind the service. All these elements that constitute the treasure of Mount Athos are not kept by the monks secretly and faithfully in a miserable way for themselves but are open to the world and this is why visitors have existed and continue to exist".

The emphasis is strongly on the intangible elements of heritage rather than its artistic or historic significance. The traditional Athonite way of life that has been followed up to the present is viewed as the most important value by monks themselves.

For certain monks, the *Avaton* is what distinguishes Mt Athos from other monasteries and a vivid example of the living tradition and continuity (Interview 1, 2004):

“The Avaton is naturally difficult for some people to understand because it is a result of deep spiritual struggle that the monastic life requires from the monks. This struggle has some credos and some conditions which one needs to know in order to understand the Avaton. It's about the struggle of the human against the temptation, the devil, who tries to prevent him from his high spiritual destination. In this struggle the monk leaves the world, the secular life that attaches humans to everyday human habits and concerns”.

“The Avaton does not contain any element of devaluation towards women. There has never been anything like this and certainly there exists nothing now. It is worth noting that after God, the person that is honored more on Mount Athos is the Panagia (All Holy mother of God), which is a female person and this is how she is honored here”.

Non-Greek people with a first-hand knowledge of the Orthodox Christian faith have also demonstrated their understanding towards the Athonite perceptions. Graham Speake (2002, p. 25) has mentioned that “the exclusion of women is not a stand against women or feminism, but a purely practical matter” and has referred to the need for ensuring circumstances that allow “the highest possible degree of concentration”. Museum director Berndt Arell, who was involved in the organisation of an exhibition about Mount Athos in Helsinki, Finland, has very eloquently stated that: “Many people may find this annoying and difficult to explain in our day and age, but if we remember that the men occupying the twenty monasteries have chosen this way of life and brotherhood in order to serve their Creator in the best possible manner, free of all worldly temptations, it may be a little easier for us to accept. Monasteries exist for men and convents for women, and Mount Athos is one huge monastery” (Arell 2006, p. 10).

Within this context one could pose the question: is the *Avaton* an aspect/element that contributes to the heritage value of Mount Athos? If so, does this contradict with the concept of ‘universal value’? If cultural heritage is both a cultural and human right, is Mt Athos, as a world her-

itage site, against human rights? It is important to stress that the exclusion of women was mentioned only once in the ICOMOS Evaluation document (ICOMOS 1988, p. 10) and in this case without any particular critical stance.

7. Heritage, human and cultural Rights

The case of Mount Athos reveals the issues generated from the moment a religious site becomes a 'cultural heritage' place of 'universal value'. This example further reveals how the human right of a monastic community to determine their rule and governance contradicts with the human and cultural right of women to access a place of universal heritage value. It is therefore a typical example of a dissonant place where the human/cultural right of a local community to determine their own rule of governance conflicts with the human and cultural right of the female population to access this site. Although it is beyond the scope of this article to discuss the ambiguous clash of human and cultural rights (e.g. Silverman, Ruggles 2007) it is worth noting that, as access to culture is a recognised human right, the exclusion of female visitors from visiting the Athonite peninsula could be regarded as a breach of well-established heritage management principles which advocate accessibility of the general public, public value, social inclusion and gender equality. Nevertheless, the flip side of this angle would be to look at the issue of the *Avaton* as a fundamental human right of a group of people (in this case the Athonite community) to religious freedom and to be in charge of their private property – particularly as both of these rights seem to be supported by local, national and international law. In fact, another commonly highlighted heritage management principle (according to which the views of the Athonites should again be respected) is consideration towards local communities, minorities, different cultures and religions and the avoidance of top-down decision-making all of which have been among the most important achievements of the field (e.g. de la Torre 2002; Stovel 2004).

Ethnographic research on heritage management issues conducted on Mount Athos revealed the sensitivity of the *Avaton* issue, as a result of the increasing national and international pressure, criticism and media coverage exercised by certain activists and politicians⁷. The views of the Athonite community in this particular issue have been well published in a

⁷ ALEXOPOULOS 2010. This was further demonstrated by the refusal of a certain brotherhood to answer a questionnaire that covered a wide range of heritage management issues – the reluctance was justified partly by the inclusion of a question that addressed the *Avaton* rule.

variety of media and are to a great extent homogenous, whether belonging to open-minded or conservative brotherhoods and individuals. The comments received from interviews confirmed this and additionally underlined the *Avaton* as another fundamental expression of the resistance of Mt Athos to change.

All of the interviewed Athonite fathers highlighted in their responses the significance of the *Avaton* for securing the preservation of the peaceful traditional Athonite life, the ascetic aspect of which demands celibacy and abstinence from the temptations and the worries of personal relationships of the secular world. The access ban is considered to be one of the great virtues of the Athonite community and one of its most cherished and unique characteristics (Interview 1, 2004). It has been rightly pointed in terms of the reluctance of religious communities to change when faced with heritage management issues that 'Situations can change. Governments fall, national religious affiliations change and society becomes more tolerant, with the result that site access codes are altered' (Shackley 2001, p. 154). The fact that Athonite approaches need to change from within and cannot be forced upon the monastic community has been underlined in the following interesting statement by a monk with a long experience in the Athonite administrative bodies:

"I believe that the *Avaton* will be preserved as long as Mount Athos will be populated by Orthodox monks dedicated to the worship of God. No power, secular or ecclesiastical, can change what monasticism established throughout the centuries and what is substantial for the conditions of development of Orthodox monasticism. The castles usually fall from within, as our wise people say" (Interview 4, 2004).

The exclusion of women is by no means peculiar to Mt Athos as two other Orthodox monastic establishments, currently World Heritage Sites, the monastery of St John on Patmos and the Meteora in Thessaly also have had similar rules in the past (Speake 2002, p. 25). In fact, gender restrictions to cultural heritage places of religious/spiritual value can be encountered in many countries, cultures and religious groups – Australian Aboriginal places such as Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park (Kaus 2008). The existence of similar sites worldwide renders the question of this article even more critical. Should exclusive, religious sites be nominated as world heritage sites? If they are nominated as world heritage sites, what are the implications from a funding and access point of view?

8. Resistance to change

As mentioned above, the world heritage nomination endeavours to prevent rapid development and change that threatens the 'universal value' of the place (UNESCO-WHC 1988). The paradox here is that the act of inscribing a place to the World Heritage List can inevitably impose significant changes. In the case of Mount Athos, a religious community with an extensive living religious heritage seems to have gained the accolade of a heritage place of universal value. However, as demonstrated earlier in this paper, very few members of the relevant monastic community have seen this as an opportunity (e.g. for funding or heritage protection) while others may even identify a threat to the spirituality of the place.

Resistance to change in the cultural heritage context is very common. Timothy Darvill (1995, p. 48) has attributed this to the 'existence value' that people place on something from the past and to the phenomenon whereby 'every generation believes that the world is changing uncontrollably and at a more rapid pace than ever before'. The encounter of living heritage with modernity, in all world religions, is believed to be facing conflicts due to the pace of change, the quick and wide communication of new ideas and secularisation which is associated with modernisation and globalisation (Inaba 2005, p. 46; Alexopoulos 2013c). David Lowenthal (1985, p. 40) has claimed that often 'historical precedent legitimates what exists today' and we 'justify current practice by referring to 'immutable' tradition' and the notion that 'what has been should continue to be or be again'. This is particularly relevant at sites of sacred worship and pilgrimage, where monuments are deemed to play as much a symbolic as an actual role by constituting landscapes of memory, myth and tradition (Coleman, Elsner 1995, p. 48). According to Myra Shackley (2001, p. xviii) "visiting a sacred site should be an essentially spiritual experience, uncontaminated (as far as possible) by technical and commercial realities" as such as a site serves predominantly to "offer the attendee a window on infinity".

Experience in Greece has shown that a certain moral flexibility is required by the clergy-custodians in cases where Orthodox sites are used to host events irrelevant to religious activity, as has been demonstrated by the conflicts caused by the use of the Rotonda monument in Thessaloniki for the organisation of a concert in the late 1990s (Stewart 2001) and the initial refusal of the brotherhood of the Holy Trinity monastery on Meteora to allow the filming of certain scenes of a James Bond action movie ("For Your Eyes Only", 1981) to take place in their monastery (Moore 2012, p. 176). These examples have proved that in cases where the local religious community or the custodians have not been consulted properly, unfortunate consequences may follow. These conflicts can of course be rooted

both in unreasonable conservative claims as well as legitimate attempts to obstruct incompatible and desecrating uses. In many ways the examples of Orthodox tradition and the living tradition of Mt Athos reflect the natural human tendencies of traditional societies analysed by David Lowenthal. What these societies pursue, according to the scholar, is validation of the present through the past by invoking the 'continuance of practices that supposedly date from time immemorial' and by asserting that things are (and should be) the way they always have been' (Lowenthal 1985, pp. 40-41). In a similar fashion, Athonite monasteries pursue to preserve timeless values that link them with the early forms of Christian monasticism and the era of the establishment of the Orthodox dogma and ideals. This attitude explains, to a great extent, the reluctance to accept changes in the traditional Athonite way of life and the way the monastic community has dealt with both its own affairs and the influence from the 'outside world' (Petherbridge 1993, pp. 128-129; Chatzigogas 2005, p. 72).

The traditional Athonite way of life seems to be a strong element of the sense of place praised by the majority of pilgrims and an aspect that most visitors would not wish to be altered. This has been evidenced in thorough accounts about life on Mt Athos (Gothóni 1993) but it has also been confirmed through ethnographic data (Alexopoulos 2010). Visitors of all possible backgrounds highly esteem the serenity and the peaceful atmosphere of the peninsula that keeps far away the haste, worries and stress of everyday life in the outside world. Therefore keeping the Athonite community protected from elements that spoil the above atmosphere seems to be important not only for the brotherhoods living on Mt Athos but also for the people seeking refuge and wanting to experience, even for a few days, the 'true' Holy Mountain. Road expansions, the constant rise in the number of various vehicles, the increase in the number of shops and commodities at the capital of Karyes, are often criticised by the visitor himself, whether a conservationist or a romantic. Similarly, the Athonite monasteries dislike any association with the term museum and are reluctant to open access to their collections, although there have been some museum exhibitions and small displays in some of the monasteries (Alexopoulos 2013b).

At this point, it is worth emphasising that fieldwork conducted in the Athonite monasteries demonstrated that very few members of the community were aware of any kind of involvement or contribution by UNESCO to the management of the cultural heritage (Alexopoulos 2010). Both heritage professionals and high-ranking Athonite representatives have confirmed that the inclusion of Mount Athos to the World Heritage List did not have any impact in the overall funding and management of the local cultural heritage. Be that as it may, no negativity from the part of the Athonite

fathers was observed or expressed towards the recognition of the universal value of Mt Athos (Alexopoulos 2010). Although it has been maintained that the World Heritage status eventually made the monasteries eligible to apply for substantial EU grants (Speake 2002, p. 183) it is fair to say that the area came under UNESCO's spotlight for the first time after the fire that considerably damaged the Hilandar monastery in 2004⁸.

The *Avaton* has been maintained as a result of resistance to change. The characterization of Mount Athos as world heritage has linked the area to the rhetoric of universal value despite the fact that a significant part of the local monastic community seems to be unaware of this status or its implications. This remarkable change in the status and the values of the place – a change at least in the eyes of the international community – has led however to legitimate claims for access by women.

9. Conclusion

The analysis undertaken in this article has revealed a large gap between the values assigned by official authorities (national and international) and the monastic community itself on Mount Athos. Official authorities defined the universal value of Mount Athos on the basis of its artistic, architectural and historic significance while local monks highlight the uniqueness of the living tradition stressing the importance of *Avaton*. The inscription of Mount Athos into the World Heritage List has attributed a heritage dimension to the site with which several monks do not necessarily agree. There is no evidence to suggest that any of the monasteries resisted the nomination back in the 1980s nor that they currently dislike the World Heritage status *per se*. Nevertheless, the afore-mentioned disagreement – with the monastic community not accepting the peninsula to be treated or characterised as a cultural heritage site or attraction – has often generated conflicts on heritage management issues between the Athonites and the heritage professionals (Alexopoulos 2013a, pp. 68-70; Alexopoulos 2013b, pp. 8-9). The 'cultural treasures' of Mount Athos are in most cases viewed by the monastic community as spiritual and/or everyday objects and this has been an attitude that follows a long tradition (Alexopoulos 2007). Furthermore, the monks understand the ban of access to women (*Avaton*) as a unique signifier of the spirituality of the place. However, this has also brought the issue of whether a sacred site which excludes women should be inscribed into the World Heritage List in the first

⁸ This prompted the first international monitoring mission to Mount Athos in 2006 with members of UNESCO, ICOMOS and the IUCN (Joint Mission Report 2006).

place. More importantly, it revealed an underlying tension between the cultural/human right to access and the cultural/human right to prevent access as a means to retain the cultural and spiritual identity of a place.

We argued that the inscription of a place into the World Heritage List introduces radical and unpredictable changes. The process of inscription assigns a new form of identity and new values to that place. Although, nomination aims to protect heritage sites from rapid change, the nomination process introduces changes. The case of Mount Athos is a typical example. The conversion of the site into a 'world heritage site' immediately legitimises women's claim for access. However, it is uncertain if a heritage/sacred place, which excludes half of the world population, should be considered to hold universal value. Without undermining the role of world heritage list in the preservation and management of heritage sites that are at risk, we would advocate for alternative ways of preservation in the case of religious sites that are by tradition excluding certain groups of people.

This article opens up a reconsideration of the debate and apparent chasm between cultural and human rights, on the one hand, and the different and conflicting dimensions of cultural rights on the other. While access to culture is defined as one of the main cultural rights in instrumental and legislative documents, prohibiting access can also be viewed as a cultural and/or human right in certain cases. The role of governmental and non-governmental heritage organisations (such as that of UNESCO) is critical in how cultural and human rights are defined, understood and debated. The act of inscription into the World Heritage affects inevitably the cultural identity of a place. Cultural and human rights are not fixed terms; they are subject to change. If the process of World Heritage nomination can impose changes, should female access to Mount Athos be allowed as one of them? If the *Avaton* is to be retained, why should a religious place become a 'world heritage site' in the end?

Acknowledgments

Georgios Alexopoulos would like to thank the Greek State Scholarship Foundation (IKY) for funding the research that has underpinned the development of this article and the various people who have contributed to the relevant research, particularly the Athonite fathers who eagerly offered their views. Kalliopi Fouseki would like to acknowledge the JPI-JPHE Cultural Heritage and Global Challenges funding scheme for funding the European Research Network on Heritage Values of which this article is part. Many thanks are due to Margarita Díaz-Andreu for offering constructive comments on a previous version of this paper that have significantly contributed its structure and approach.

Appendix: UNESCO's World Heritage criteria in 1988 (UNESCO 1988, pp. 5-8) and their applicability to Mount Athos as expressed in the ICOMOS Advisory Body Evaluation document (ICOMOS 1988)

UNESCO's World Heritage criteria (1988)	Mount Athos World Heritage criteria (1989)
natural (iii): contains superlative natural phenomena, formations or features, for instance, outstanding examples of the most important ecosystems, areas of exceptional natural beauty or exceptional combinations of natural and cultural elements	'The natural features of all these sites provide the setting which attracted settlement and the building of religious structures in historic times. All, thus, have natural features which form an important backdrop for a cultural landscape which now represents the dominant values' (UNESCO-WHC 1988).
cultural (i): represents a unique artistic achievement, a masterpiece of human creative genius	The transformation of a mountain into a sacred place made Mount Athos a unique artistic creation combining the natural beauty of the site with the expanded forms of architectural creation (ICOMOS 1988, p. 10)
cultural (iii): has exerted great influence, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture, monumental arts or town-planning and landscaping	Mount Athos exerted lasting influence in the orthodox world, of which it is the spiritual centre, on the development of religious architecture and monumental painting. The typical layout of Athonite monasteries... was used as far away as Russia. Iconographic themes, condified by the school of painting at Mount Athos and laid down in minute detail in the Guide to Painting (discovered and published by Didron in 1845), were used and elaborated on from Crete to the Balkans beginning in the 16 th century (ICOMOS 1988, p. 10)
cultural (iv): is an outstanding example of a type of building or architectural ensemble which illustrates a significant stage in history	The monasteries of Athos present the typical layout of orthodox monastic establishment: is a square, rectangular or trapezoidal wall flanked by towers, which constitute the peribolus of a consecrated place, in the centre of which the community's church, or the catholicon, stands alone. Strictly organized according to principles dating from the 10 th century are the areas reserved for communal activities (refectory, cells, hospital, library), those reserved solely for liturgical purposes (chapels, fountains), and the defense structures (arsenal, fortified tower). The organization of agricultural lands in the idorrythmic skites, the <i>kellia</i> and <i>kathismata</i> (farms operated by monks) is also very characteristic of the medieval period (ICOMOS 1988, pp. 10-11).
cultural (v): is an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement which is representative of a culture and which has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change	The monastic ideal has, at Mount Athos, preserved traditional human habitations, which are representative of the agrarian cultures of the Mediterranean world and have become vulnerable through the impact of change within contemporary society. Mount Athos is also a conservatory of vernacular architecture and agricultural and craft tradition (ICOMOS 1988, p. 11).
cultural (vi) is directly or tangibly associated with events or with ideas or beliefs of outstanding universal significance	In 1504, the sacred mountain of Athos, a holy place in the Christian world, became the principal spiritual home of the Orthodox church. It retained this prominent role even after the fall of Constantinople in 1453 and the establishment of the autocephalous patriarchy of Moscow in 1589 (ICOMOS 1988, p. 11).

References

- G. ALEXOPOULOS 2007, *Development of the concept of cultural heritage on Mount Athos: past and present*, in S. GRABOW, D. HULL, E. WATERTON (eds), *Which Past, Whose Future? Treatments of the Past at the Start of the 21st Century: An International Perspective*, Proceedings of the Conference (York, May 2005), Oxford, pp. 75-84.
- G. ALEXOPOULOS 2010, *Reconciling living religious heritage with value-based management: the case of Mount Athos, Greece*, Unpublished PhD thesis, UCL.
- G. ALEXOPOULOS 2013a, *Management of living religious heritage: who sets the agenda? The case of the monastic community of Mount Athos*, "Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites", 15(1), pp. 59-75.
- G. ALEXOPOULOS 2013b, *Living religious heritage and challenges to museum ethics: reflections from the monastic community of Mount Athos*, "Journal of Conservation and Museum Studies", 11(1), pp. 1-13.
- G. ALEXOPOULOS 2013c, *Sacred site conservation and preservation*, in C. SMITH (ed), *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*, New York, pp. 6409-6414.
- K. ANDRIOTIS 2009, *Sacred site experience: a phenomenological study*, "Annals of Tourism Research", 36(1), pp. 64-84.
- B. ARELL 2006, *An unfathomable miracle*, in M. ORANEN (ed), *Athos: Monastic Life on the Holy Mountain*, Helsinki, pp. 10-12.
- J. BLAIN, R.J. WALLIS 2014, *Sacred sites, contested rites/rights contemporary pagan engagements with the past*, "Journal of Material Culture", 9(3), pp. 237-261.
- A. BRYER, M. CUNNINGHAM (eds) 1996, *Mount Athos and Byzantine Monasticism*, Papers from the 28th Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies (Birmingham, March 1994), Aldershot.
- J. CHATZIGOGAS 2005, *The challenges in reconciling the requirements of faith and conservation in Mount Athos*, in STOVEL, STANLEY-PRICE, KILICK 2005, pp. 67-73.
- S. COLEMAN, J. ELSNER 1995, *Pilgrimage: Past and Present. Sacred Travel and Sacred Space in the World Religions*, London.
- T. DARVILL 1995, *Value systems in archaeology*, in M.A. COOPER, A. FIRTH, J. CARMAN, D. WHEATLEY (eds), *Managing Archaeology*, London-New York, pp. 40-50.
- M. DE LA TORRE (ed) 2002, *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage: Research Report*, Los Angeles.
- ELEFTHERTOTYPIA, *Greek daily newspaper*.
- EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT 2003, *European Parliament Resolution on the Situation Concerning Basic Rights in the European Union (2001) (2001/2014(INI))*, Online in: www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+P5-TA-2003-0012+0+DOC+XML+VO//EN (accessed 7 July 2015)
- K. FOUSEKI, M. SHEHADE (in press), *Heritage activism and cultural rights: the case of the New Acropolis Museum*, in H. SILVERMAN, E. WATERTON, S. WATSON (eds), *Heritage in Action: Making the Past in Present*, New York.
- R. GOTHÓNI 1993, *Paradise within Reach: Monasticism and Pilgrimage on Mt Athos*, Helsinki.
- ICOMOS 1988, *Advisory Body Evaluation for the World Heritage List: Mount Athos*, Online in: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list> (accessed 2 August 2015).
- JOINT MISSION REPORT 2006, *Joint UNESCO/WHC-ICOMOS-IUCN Expert Mission Report, Mount Athos (Greece) (454), 30 January – 3 February 2006*, Paris, 10 April 2006, Online in: <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2006/mis454-2006.pdf> (23 August 2015)
- N. INABA 2005, *The Ise Shrine and the Gion Festival: case studies on the values and authenticity of Japanese intangible living religious heritage*, in STOVEL, STANLEY-PRICE, KILICK 2005, pp. 44-57.
- S. KADAS 1986, *Mount Athos: An Illustrated Guide to the Monasteries and Their History* (5th ed.), Athens.
- A.A. KARAKATSANIS (ed) 1997, *Treasures of Mount Athos* (2nd ed.), Thessaloniki.
- D. KAUS 2008, *The management of restricted Aboriginal objects by the National Museum of Australia*, "reCollections", 3(1), 2008. Online in: http://recollections.nma.gov.au/issues/vol_3_no_1/notes_and_comments/the_management_of_restricted_aboriginal_objects#11 (accessed 12 September 2015).
- I.M. KONIDARIS 2003, *To ábaton tou Agiou Órous* (in greek), Athens.

- D. LOWENTHAL 1985, *The Past is a Foreign Country*, Cambridge.
- R. MOORE (with G. OWEN) 2012, *Bond on Bond: Reflections on 50 Years of Bond Movies*, Guilford (Conn.).
- P.J. O'KEEFE 2000, *Archaeology and human rights*, "Public Archaeology", 1(3), pp. 181-194.
- S. PAPADOPOULOS 1992, *Oi keimeliakoí thesau-roi: o plóutos tou Agíou Órous periménei akóme, en pollóis, ten axiopoiesé tou, Eptá Eméres - Agíon Óros: E Kibotós tes Orthodoxias* (in greek), "E Kahemeriné", 05 July 1992 (cultural supplement of the Sunday issue), pp. 26-27.
- C.K. PAPASTATHIS 1993, *The status of Mount Athos in Hellenic public law*, in TACHIAOS 1993, pp. 55-75.
- C. PAPASTATHIS 2004, *Prostasia politistikón agathón kai autodioikese Agíou Órous* (in greek), in E. TROVA (ed), *E Politistiké Kleronomiá kai to Líkaio*, Proceedings (Athens, 3-4 June 2003), Athens-Thessaloniki, pp. 509-517.
- G.N. PENTZIKIS 2003, *Agíon Óros: énas pléres taxidiotikós odegós*, 2 voll., Athens.
- G. PETHERBRIDGE 1993, *Vulnerable physical manifestations of a spiritual tradition: the dilemma in the preservation of Mount Athos' heritage of manuscripts, printed books and related material*, in TACHIAOS 1993, pp. 125-132.
- E. PSYCHOGIOPOULOU 2013, *The European Union and cultural rights*, in A. VRDOLJAK (ed), *The Cultural Dimension of Human Rights*, Oxford, pp. 159-185.
- M. SHACKLEY 2001, *Managing Sacred Sites: Service Provision and Visitor Experience*, London-New York.
- M. SHACKLEY 2003, *Management challenges for religious-based attractions*, in A. FYALL, B. GARROD, A. LEASK (eds), *Managing Visitor Attractions: New Directions*, Oxford, pp. 159-170.
- H. SILVERMAN, D.F. RUGGLES (eds) 2007, *Cultural Heritage and Human Rights*, New York.
- G. SPEAKE 2002, *Mount Athos. Renewal in Paradise*, New Haven-London.
- R. STAVENHAGEN 2008, *Cultural and human rights: a social science perspective*, in P. PITARCH, S. SPEED, X.L. SOLANO (eds), *Human Rights in the Maya Region: Global Politics, Cultural Connections and Moral Engagements*, Durham-London, pp. 27-50.
- C. STEWART 2001, *Immanent or eminent domain? The contest over Thessaloniki's Rotonda*, in R. LAYTON, P.G. STONE, J. THOMAS (eds), *The Destruction and Conservation of Cultural Property*, London-New York, pp. 182-198.
- H. STOVEL 2004, *Top-down and bottom-up management*, "ICCROM Newsletter", 30, pp. 16-17.
- H. STOVEL, N. STANLEY-PRICE, R. KILICK (eds) 2005, *Conservation of Living Religious Heritage, Papers from the ICCROM 2003 Forum on Living Religious Heritage: conserving the sacred*, Rome.
- A.-M. TALBOT 1996, *Women and Mt Athos*, in BRYER, CUNNINGHAM 1996, pp. 67-79.
- A.-E.N. TACHIAOS (ed) 1993, *Mount Athos and the European Community*, Thessaloniki.
- S. THOMAS 2002, *How the other half lives*, "The Guardian", 17 June 2002. Online in: <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2002/jun/17/gender.uk> (accessed 2 August 2015).
- TA NEA, *Greek daily newspaper*.
- THE GUARDIAN, *British daily newspaper*.
- TO VIMA, *Greek daily newspaper*.
- K. WARE 1996, *St Athanasios the Athonite: traditionalist or innovator?*, in BRYER, CUNNINGHAM 1996, pp. 3-16.
- UNESCO-WHC 1988, *Technical Evaluations*. Online in <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/454> (accessed 14 September 2015).
- UNITED NATIONS 1948, *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. Online in www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/index.shtml#a27 (accessed 09 November 2015).
- UNITED NATIONS 1976, *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*. Online in www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/ccpr.aspx (accessed 09 November 2015).
- UNITED NATIONS 1992, *Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities*. Online in www.un.org/documents/ga/res/47/a47r135.htm (accessed 09 November 2015).