


Μουσείο Μπενάκη

Τόμ. 1, Αρ. 11-12 (2012)



Μια θεωρητική προσέγγιση για την ανάδειξη και διατήρηση αρχαιολογικών χώρων: Το παράδειγμα του ιερού του Απόλλωνα Αμυκλαίου στη Σπάρτη

Stavros Vlizos

doi: [10.12681/benaki.17809](https://doi.org/10.12681/benaki.17809)

Copyright © 2018, Stavros Vlizos



Άδεια χρήσης [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

Βιβλιογραφική αναφορά:

Vlizos, S. (2012). Μια θεωρητική προσέγγιση για την ανάδειξη και διατήρηση αρχαιολογικών χώρων: Το παράδειγμα του ιερού του Απόλλωνα Αμυκλαίου στη Σπάρτη. *Μουσείο Μπενάκη*, 1(11-12), 179-192.
<https://doi.org/10.12681/benaki.17809>

STAVROS VLIZOS

A Theoretical Approach to the Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites: The Case of the Spartan Sanctuary of Apollo Amyklaios

IT IS NOW A COMMON PLACE that archaeological site today functions as an interpretative tool for approaching the past of a wider region and turns the monumental remains into readable and educative material with ramifications into sectors such as history, ideology, politics and religion.¹ The planning process for the conservation and presentation of an archaeological site should focus on discussions about restoration and management, as well as politics and ideology. However, along with the cultural characteristics, the environmental particularities of the landscape also define its new identity. Here exactly lies the singularity of the archaeological site of the Spartan sanctuary of Apollo Amyklaios. The advantage of this site of exceptional natural beauty, overlooking the fertile vale of the Eurotas river, with the massif of Taygetos to the west and the Parnon mountain range to the east, is obvious to all. The picture of the area in antiquity, with its highly important monuments, is transferred to us today exclusively through the textual sources and not by the buildings, only scant remnants of which survive. So, *ipso facto* and occasioned by the views expressed by C. Tilley, S. Hamilton and B. Bender in 2000, namely that «Our work is our creative response to their creativity or, better, the ruins of their creativity»,² the creativity in the case of Amykles has to turn to other tools and methods.

According to the literary sources, during antiquity this site was the most important cult centre of the Lacedaemonians. The hill of Agia Kyriaki, where archaeological investigations, guided by the ancient sources, have located the site of the Apollo Amyklaios sanctuary, lies some 5 km south of Sparta, on the northeast outskirts of the

modern village of Amykles. Although Pausanias gives a detailed description of the sanctuary, it is very difficult to form a picture of the monuments.³ The central monument, the so-called *Thronos* or Throne, was a temple in the shape of an enormous chair, in the middle of which was the altar and tomb of Hyakinthos, which served as the base for the columnar effigy of Apollo. This surrounding superstructure, which should be dated in the third quarter of the sixth century BC at the latest, has stimulated intensive debate, both in ancient times and in modern research.

The twentieth century saw a growing scholarly interest in the Amyklaion. In the closing decades in particular, the site was a crucial point in research regarding issues such as diachronic development, the formation of identity and the emergence of the State, as well as the role of religion in this process.⁴ Systematic investigations on the hill, to bring to light and to document the basic monuments, were made in three periods of excavations. In 1889/90 and in 1904/07 under the auspices of the Athens Archaeological Society, directed by Christos Tsountas and by Ernst Fiechter, respectively, and in 1925 on behalf of the German Archaeological Institute by Ernst Buschor.⁵

In the framework of the Amykles Research Project, which commenced in 2005 under the direction of Professor Angelos Delivorrias and in collaboration with the 5th Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities, a new exploration of the entire surface of the Agia Kyriaki hill is being conducted, aimed not only at carrying out restoration works and publishing the results of the excavations,

but also at delivering to the public an organized visitable archaeological site.⁶

The present picture of the site is unfortunately far from commensurate with its importance; quite the contrary, it is bedevilled by a host of problems. Neglect combined with a series of ill-targeted measures have resulted in the depreciation of the archaeological site and its environs. From the moment the aims of the research project were clarified, through the progress of works, it became obvious that any interventions at the site should be based on an interdisciplinary approach and broad-based synthesis. Primary and constant aim of the interdisciplinary team is the recognition of the historical value of the site and the monuments. One further factor in shaping the modern view of management of the monument is the confirmation of the significance of historical memory and experience in shaping everyday life today.⁷

According to the 1990 International Charter for the Protection and Management of the Archaeological Heritage, the main actions that distinguish protection of monuments are conservation and consolidation, restoration-reconstruction (*anasteloses*) and enhancement.⁸ From the late 1990s onward, Archaeological Heritage Management is referred to as a subset of what is widely known as Cultural Resource Management and encompasses a broad range of issues relating to the protection, preservation and utilization of archaeological resources.⁹ Social, political, and economic concerns have generated new approaches and perspectives, and have brought Archaeological Heritage Management discourse into dialogue with academic archaeology as well as with allied disciplines. An extensive annotated bibliography relating to values in the context of cultural heritage explores these issues from diverse perspectives.¹⁰ The emphasis is on the meaning and practice of conservation, valorization and the need for a conceptual framework.

In Greece this approach had already been instituted by forming the first committee for the preservation of the monuments of the Acropolis of Athens, in 1975, as well as by the analogous committees for Bassae-Apollo Epikourios, Epidauros, Lindos, and so on, that followed. Culmination of this development was the setting up of the Management Fund for Archaeological Projects Execution, of the Ministry of Culture, in 1992.¹¹ The Greek bibliography on archaeological heritage includes a number

of publications¹² which, together with the study by Mas-trantonis (2008) on archaeological project management, recognize heritage management as a process that places management practice in its wider context and engages in a multidisciplinary approach.¹³

ARCHAEOLOGICAL DOCUMENTATION AND EVALUATION

In the new excavations and research activities in the Amyklaion, over the period 2005-2010, about 50% of the surface of Agia Kyriaki hill was surveyed and a corresponding percentage of architectural members processed.

According to the results of the works accomplished by 2010, the earliest human presence on the hill, most probably a settlement, is dated to the late Early Helladic period (EHII). It seems very possible that shallow round pits on the surface of the hilltop and the large quantity of EHII pottery, Middle Helladic (MH) Minyan ware, as well as fragments of obsidian should be correlated with a rural community during this period.

In the absence of architectural remains, the importance of the hill as a cult site from the end of the Late Helladic IIIB period into the Submycenaean is attested exclusively by the recently unearthed moveable finds, mainly figurines that had been dedicated as votive offerings to the still unknown deity who was worshipped in the sanctuary.¹⁴ In all probability, the settlement or synoecism at Amyklai had shifted further west and south, towards the modern village of Amykles and the Vapheio tholos tomb.

The abundance of Protogeometric and Geometric pottery from the Amyklaion indicates that cult activity of periodic character continued there into these periods. The new data show that the question of continuity in the use of the hill from the mid-eleventh to the tenth century BC is no longer open.¹⁵ From the numerous finds, especially pottery, it becomes apparent that from this period onwards the place attracted increasing numbers of devotees and was probably hosting bigger events.

The first monumental phase of the *locus sanctus* on top of Agia Kyriaki hill is dated to the late eighth and the early seventh century BC. There are two basic traits: first the construction of the Late Geometric/Early Archaic *peribolos* at the south and east, presumably because of the great-

er functional needs of the open-air sanctuary, and second the existence of a cult effigy-*xoanon* of large dimensions in the late seventh century BC.

The second and the most important monumental phase of the sanctuary dates from the sixth century BC. It was then that the Spartans invited from Magnesia in Asia Minor the architect Bathykles to design and construct the monumental and enigmatic construction of the so-called Thronos, to surround the already existing *xoanon*. Additionally, a circular stepped altar and a new monumental precinct-cum-retaining wall were constructed.¹⁶ So, in its heyday, during the period of the Peloponnesian League and mainly towards the end of the sixth century BC, the strictly planned sanctuary should be envisaged as quite 'full'. Obviously, it had to respond to growing needs both with regard to rituals and to the larger number of devotees who came there.

Archaeological information on the use of Agia Kyriaki hill as a *locus sanctus* in Classical, Hellenistic and Roman times is scant. The picture changes clearly in the late fourth/early fifth century AD, mainly because of the erection of a building of large dimensions with a cistern inside, at the north edge of the sanctuary.

The existence of a cemetery and another building at the top of the hill, from the Middle Byzantine period, was associated by Tsountas with a small chapel, which must have functioned as the cemetery church of Byzantine times.¹⁷ The incorporation of ancient architectural material (*spolia*) in Byzantine monuments in the wider area of Sparta, from Mystras to Xirokampi, with most characteristic the examples in modern Amykles, must have begun already in the fifteenth century AD and attests the use of the hill as a source of construction material.¹⁸ The hill's role as a place of pilgrimage of St Kyriaki goes back to the nineteenth century.

Unfortunately, it is clear that only traces of the documentation of the chronological phases and interventions in the space can be distinguished. Furthermore, the creation of a tangible picture is hindered by the fact that only a small proportion of the authentic material has survived. Nevertheless, from works carried out so far conclusions can be drawn that will contribute to the debate on intervention measures. Despite the paucity of remains, the site has all the elements for enhancing its historical and environmental importance, the factor of diachronic usage, the educational value and the quest for the particularities of the space.

PRESENT STATE

The present state of preservation of the landscape, taking into account the degree of preservation of the structures and the functions, the threats, as well as the possibilities of improvement and rehabilitation, can be evaluated as comparatively good. The not unexpected alteration of the landscape over time is due mainly to human activities. On the contrary, the state of preservation of the monuments, which are the most important source of information on the cultural tradition of the space, can be characterized as unsatisfactory, since their architectural form and a significant percentage of their authentic material have not survived. The loss of stones is largely due to "quarrying" of the ruins to meet the needs of the local population and for building local churches, over the centuries that have elapsed since the end of the ancient world and the abolition of paganism until the last century.

Christos Tsountas's research showed that subsequent building interventions had seriously damaged the constructions of the sanctuary and that the ancient layers had to a great extent been stripped from the top of the hill. Furthermore, on account of works in connection with the investigations by Ernst Fiechter¹⁹ and Ernst Buschor,²⁰ the stratigraphy over almost the entire area of the sanctuary was disturbed to such a degree that it is now impossible to draw information on the site from this source.

In the course of these works, but mainly after them, ill-considered interventions were made in the site, such as:

- Building the church of St Kyriaki in the 1920s, with material deriving from researches till then and belonging in its entirety to the ancient monuments.
- Placing this church within the boundaries of the archaeological site and upon the foundations of an ancient building, with direct effect also on the inadequate guarding of the ruins.
- "Valorization" measures with ill-conceived actions that resulted either in further deterioration of the remains (e.g. planting cypress trees very close to the surviving crepis of the Throne) or the aesthetic downgrading of the site.
- The lack of a single policy of management planning for the area is related to the fact that the site was never included in a Special Protection Zone. To this day no measures have been taken for its partial or total protection and no interventions aimed at presenting an organ-

ized and visitable archaeological site have been made. Its asphyxiating limits, which are identified with the course of the *peribolos*, leave no leeway for the development of a programme of even partial restoration of the specific monument. At present organized group visits are not possible, because the road network barely serves the site and because there is no information material pointing out the importance of the site.

The hazards to which the site is exposed relate mainly to its security, the inclement weather in winter, the difficulty of dealing with vegetation and roots, and also with fire in the summer months. Other problems include seismicity, as well as the danger of landslides due to the unstable ground, the difficulty of removing excavation debris and of recruiting experienced technicians for works on site.

In the course of works conducted between 2005 and 2010, in the framework of the Amykles Research Project, direct interventions were made at the site, such as felling trees injurious to the monuments and installing a light fencing around those parts that are easily accessible. Moreover, all the dispersed architectural members were gathered together in one place inside the fence *darea*, to facilitate monitoring, inventorying and studying the material. Last, in 2010 works were completed on consolidating the visible remains of the Geometric *peribolos* along the south side of the hill.

It becomes clear from the aforesaid that visitors to the Amyklaion can wander freely within a natural landscape of outstanding natural beauty. They can see the remains of the monumental construction of the horseshoe-shaped Archaic *peribolos* around the foot of the hill, as well as a very small part of the crepis of the temple, together with the church of St Kyriaki that was built on its upper level in recent times. However, there is no way they can understand what they see. Moreover, a sense of neglect and abandonment overshadows the picture the site presents.

Among the advantages of the archaeological site is its direct relation and connection with the present town of Sparta. Through the archaeological museum there and the finds from Amyklai exhibited in it, a channel of communication and correlation between these two poles is created. Both the moveable finds and the architectural members collected in the museum after the earlier excavations prepare visitors for the particularities of the sanctuary and

encourage them to visit the actual site. Nonetheless, the image the archaeological museum presents and the old-fashioned displays in the permanent exhibition regrettably give the impression, here too, that the management of the cultural wealth in Sparta falls short of expectations.

PROPOSALS

In an age of rapid spatial changes, the necessity of a more profound understanding of the multidimensional character of today's landscape and a more systematic action for the preservation and enhancement of its identity, inform our demand for an integrated approach to its management. Today people are increasingly aware of the necessity of the safeguarding and survival of natural resources and the natural environment.²¹ As noted already, the Amyklaion is a site that combines natural and monumental wealth of outstanding value, an image that was described vividly in antiquity²² and was extolled by European travelers in the nineteenth century.²³ All the manifestations of divine presence, the monuments linked with the cult of the mythical heroes, were constructed in their natural setting as continuation of nature and in absolute harmony with its canons.

The use of the hill over the millennia, as attested by the interventions in the terrain in all chronological periods, reveals the continuous interaction between man and nature. The coexistence of monuments and nature resulted in an aesthetic in which these elements are identified and implied as a unity. In antiquity, the location of the sanctuary was not fortuitous as it was determined not only by factors of sanctity, memory or landscape, but also by socio-political dynamics that reinforced ties between various regions of interest and their inhabitants.²⁴

Thus, the examination of this two-way relationship between archaeological sites and their natural environment from antiquity to the modern age is particularly interesting. Through studying the landscape in this perspective, specific proposals for the optimum management of the area that combines monumental and natural wealth can be formulated.²⁵ Having in mind the transformation of the area into a modern archaeological site worthy of its importance in antiquity, the aims of its presentation and enhancement should focus on respect of the aspect of the site through discreet and mild interventions, and the ra-

tional management of these, and on works of conservation and partial restoration of the monuments.²⁶

In order to achieve the understanding and readability of the future archaeological site of the Amyklaion it is essential to present and enhance its monuments. Due to the particular circumstances there, this can be achieved only through a limited and piece-by-piece restoration of the monuments, and concerns the partial *anasteloses* of the three basic units of the sanctuary: 1) the temple of Apollo, the so-called Throne, 2) the altar and 3) the *peribolos* of the two phases, the Geometric and the Archaic period. Last, the restoration of the morphology of the visible constructions includes the remains of a building of Late Antiquity in the north part of the sanctuary, as well as the church of St Kyriaki.

A. RESTORATIONS

Piece-by-piece restoration of monuments with limited-scale relocations and completions of structural material in order to reinforce the durability of the remains and to achieve their readability.²⁷

Partial reconstruction of the crepis of the Throne²⁸

The partial reconstruction of the only part of the Throne preserved *in situ*, that is the crepis, is intended to give a fuller picture of the structure of this particular part of the monument. Stone blocks of one step and of the base of the stylobate, a column plinth and the lower part of a column drum can be placed in their original positions. To this ensemble will be added a number of the dispersed architectural members, which recent research has identified and shown to belong together. For reasons of statics, this piece-by-piece reconstruction must of necessity be supported also by new material.

Piece-by-piece restoration of the circular altar

The architectural members of the circular stepped altar are already assembled in a partial trial arrangement inside the archaeological site. The aim of this is their permanent exhibition in combination with new and ancient material in the original position of the monument, which was verified by Tsountas's investigations.²⁹

Piece-by-piece restoration of the *peribolos*

It emerges from preceding research that the remains of the *peribolos* are identified as a strong stone retaining wall north, east and south of the ruins of the Throne. The *peribolos* is adapted absolutely to the configuration

of the ground and does not follow an arbitrary course. As its remains attest, it was built only where the ground slopes steeply, forming an open zigzag line describing a horseshoe shape. In order to understand the monumental unity of the *peribolos*, its protection and enhancement, the deposition of fill in the remains of the foundation is deemed essential.

Conservation of the remains of a Late Antique building
In parallel with the above works, a conservation programme must be drafted in order to deal with issues of the composition of the mortar and plaster of floor and walls of other constructions, such as the remains of a building of the fourth and fifth centuries AD at the north entrance to the sanctuary, a large space with a water cistern and a floor of stucco and terracotta tiles. In this way both the diachronic use of the sanctuary and its monumentality will be enhanced, and the modern archaeological site will acquire one more three-dimensional architectural ensemble.

Aesthetic restoration of the church of St Kyriaki

The church, a one-aisle basilica, was built in the 1920s close to the site of an earlier chapel that was pulled down in the early twentieth century to facilitate archaeological research.³⁰ The demolition of this earlier chapel yielded a host of architectural members of the Throne of Apollo and also freed the part of the crepis visible today. Unfortunately, the present church was also built with fragments of ancient marble blocks.

Interventions in keeping with the traditional architecture of the area will be made in both the masonry of the walls and the roof, aimed mainly at the aesthetic upgrading of the church, so as to fit in with the picture of a properly presented archaeological site. Such interventions are considered essential because the church is today the only complete monument in the archaeological site and its co-existence with the ancient remains documents historical continuity.

Enlarging the archaeological site, expropriations/
acquisitions of land

The Amykles Research Project has already purchased on behalf of the Greek State adjacent areas of land, tracts that have been annexed to the ownership of the archaeological site, along its east side, thus initiating the process that



Fig. 1. Proposed routes and vantage points (photo: K. Xenikakis).

must be continued. Concurrently, a cadastral table has been prepared, with the neighbouring properties and the parts of properties to south and west of the site, which will be purchased at the expenses of the Project on behalf of the Archaeological Service. Presently, the archaeological site occupies an area of 0.60 ha., whereas after completion of the proposed expropriations its area will be increased five-fold. The proposed enlargement of the site will enable implementation of the project for the restoration of the *peribolos* and its enhancement by constructing a walkway for visitors around the perimeter of the site.

B. INFRASTRUCTURE INSTALLATIONS

Due to the lack of even rudimentary infrastructure installations and the phenomena of vandalism in the past, both on the outside walls of the church and on ancient architectural members, visiting the archaeological site is difficult at present. Along with the new fencing, the construction of a guardhouse, a storeroom, a cistern and sanitary fa-

cilities is considered essential, of course in places where it is confirmed that there are no ancient remains. For the functioning of these infrastructure installations, as well as of the lighting and fire-safety systems which must be installed at the site, the creation of underground electricity, water-supply and telecommunications networks is essential. The fencing of the site should be unobtrusive, in keeping with the natural landscape.

The scattered architectural members should be presented impartial restorations of the character of a museum exhibit. Already for the needs of research many members have been correlated with one another, now constituting small ensembles. The materials will be classified appropriately and will be presented on a platform at the edge of the archaeological site, so as not to confuse the picture of the main part. Information panels will explain to visitors the original position and aspect of the monument to which the architectural members belonged.

C. ROUTES (fig. 1)

As noted above, the international conventions prescribe the linking of monumental ensembles with the natural environment.³¹ The master plan for the Amyklaion foresees two main routes for visitors, which will be concurrently of thematic and naturalist-rambler interest. The first route will be developed on the upper level of the hill with reference points to the space of the Throne with church of St Kyraki, the partially restored circular altar and the platform with the trial placements of stones from the Throne. The second route, as continuation of the first, will bring the visitor to the level of the *peribolos* around the perimeter of the hill, ending at the remains of the Late Antique building. A route of interest for naturalists-ramblers is opted for because the natural environment of the area is still virtually unspoiled and if enhanced will attract such visitors.

D. VANTAGE POINTS (see Ⓟ in fig. 1)

Basic parameter of the intervention is to enhance alongside the antiquarian content also the qualities offered by the location of the archaeological site in the natural environment. The vista of the surrounding mountains and the River Eurotas is unique. Vantage points offering a panoramic prospect of the area are proposed, which will also serve as halting points where visitors can rest awhile and enjoy the view of the landscape from a distance.

E. ACCESS (fig. 2)

The experience of the archaeological site begins with a guided course of access to it, a route that reveals progressively to the visitor an unfolding vision. The course, simple and specific, is turned into an ascent that ends at the summit of the hill and the sanctuary. Even today, the access must inspire the sense of entering a sacred space. For this reason the upward path is understood as model of the spiritual ascent, evoking sentiments of uplifting and exaltation, expectancy and anticipation of the unknown. The visitor is immersed gradually into a numinous space, introvert and closed, as at every step he/she cuts off contact with the modern town.

In this framework, apart from conserving and restoring the existing access route from the west, and arranging a parking lot there, the possibility of charting a new route from the east, through the village of AgiaKyriaki and the olive groves, is being investigated. Furthermore, the

linking with the settlement and the local road between Sparta and Vapheio will strengthen the local population's relationship with the archaeological site and will offer in the long term diverse opportunities for mild economic development.³²

F. PLANTING OF GREENERY

The plantings are intended to create an entity friendly to and in harmony with the monuments and the visitors. The programme will include those plants already growing in the archaeological site, while a large surface it will be covered with new plants appropriate to the local conditions. Trees with spreading branches offering shade will be planted at the vantage points and in the parking lot, where, moreover, they will reduce the marring effect of the stationary vehicles. A row of cypress trees will be planted to the north, at a point where a visual screen is essential in order to "hide" the archaeological site from visitors approaching it along the path starting from the village of Agia Kyriaki and ending at the guardhouse.

G. INFORMATION PANELS

Decisive for achieving the enhancement of the site is the provision of correct information to visitors as well as to locals, and through this securing the connection of the Amyklaion with Sparta. Information panels along the routes and a map of the area inside the archaeological site, as well as material available at the entrance to it, will ensure the fullest possible visit to the site. The placement of these panels and the thematic information they give will correspond to the basic locations of the remains of the monuments and their particular characteristics: 1) entrance with a general introduction to the use of the hill over time and the topography of the area, as well as information on the enhancement project, 2) on the top of the hill, the church of St Kyriaki with information on the general arrangement of a sanctuary and the cult, as well as 3) the altar and the Throne of Apollo, while 4) on the lower level to the south, the *peribolos* of the sanctuary, and last, 5) the later phases of the sanctuary in its north part.

New technologies will be utilized in the sheltered area of the entrance to the archaeological site, with an info place and an integrated system of virtual interactive reconstruction, revival and projection of the Amyklaion. These applications are intended to offer the visitor a multifaceted cultural and educational experience through use of appro-



Fig. 2. Proposed access routes (photo: K. Xenikakis).

priately adapted innovative interactive experiential services, a temporal and spatial tour using 3D virtual reconstructions. The parallel projection of the material in the Sparta Archaeological Museum on the Internet is expected to attract a broader spectrum of visitors than today.

When we behold the site today, it is difficult to visu-

alize the sanctuary as it was. People want to experience more, and new technology is a tool that serves their needs. Sites will utilize new technology to enhance the visitor experience of having a personal guide. Such applications will help visitors to visualize the Amyklaion in its heyday, bringing to virtual life for them an ancient sanctuary, as

they walk among its monuments and see the reconstruction. It is an important instrument to help bridge the “imagination gap”, between what we can see and what lies behind the plain view.

Basic concern of all these interventions and of the enhancement of the archaeological site is the servicing of Individuals with Special Needs, which is possible also because of the nature of the terrain. Furthermore, all the restoration works comply with the principle of reversibility and the clear distinction between old and new material.

With regard to the sector of research and documentation, it is necessary to excavate further trenches in order to improve our picture of the Amyklaion, not only to expose the material remains but also to update the existing bibliography with new studies and data. Last, essential too is the ongoing updating of the digitized archive and the creation of the Geographical Information System (GIS).

Given the proximity of the village of Agia Kyriaki and of agricultural activities to the archaeological site, immediate measures for the protection of the site and the landscape are imperative. In the Zone of Absolute Protection, which will encompass the whole of Agia Kyriaki hill and inside which all building activity is prohibited, only uses compatible with the needs of protection of the area will be permitted, as well as those related to the enhancement of the protected area.

The integrated presentation and enhancement of the features that compose the historical and cultural identity of the Amyklaion demands the linking of it with a single network of environmental and cultural interest relating to Sparta generally. Central idea of the network should be the holistic interpretation of the cultural development of Sparta, which was dictated by its very identity, as this is an infrangible historical, ecological and aesthetic unity. The public will be encouraged to start their tour from the Archaeological Museum, at the heart of the historical centre of Sparta, which offers a comprehensive presentation of the antiquities of the region from prehistoric times into Late Antiquity. This broad-based management of the cultural heritage will include also tours of the sites of the acropolis, the sanctuary of Artemis Ortheia and the Menealaion. Within this network the pole of the Amyklaion will be demarcated both by the proposed archaeological park and by the other sites at modern Amykles, such as the Vapheio tholos tomb, the sanctuary of Alexandra Kassandra and

the Byzantine churches. In conspicuous positions in the areas of the network there will be a map of the area, depicting the proposed network of cultural and environmental routes. The map will be accompanied by information on the possibilities of visiting the sites of Sparta, while the proposed thematic routes will be annotated.

A Centre of Environmental and Cultural Activity in Sparta could make an essential contribution to the systematic briefing, educating and heightening of the awareness of the local society and visitors with regard to the protection and rational management of the region's ecosystem and cultural heritage. Basic aim is the integrated approach to a complex of cultural, ecological and socio-economic factors, with guideline the presentation and enhancement of its inherent values and the formulation of a synthetic proposal for the management of the landscape and its rational development.

MANAGING THE SITE

With basic axes the monuments, the natural environment, the town of Sparta and the local community, a mode of management that concentrates on the social responsibility of all the agents can be elaborated.³³ For the organized and combined management of special natural-cultural sites, the creation of a local management team, the association “The Friends of the Amyklaion” was considered essential, which will co-ordinate all the agencies already active in these areas: environmental groups, representatives of the Ephorate of Antiquities, local people, representatives of the municipality, cultural associations. Its competence extends to submitting proposals and solutions to superior authorities. However, its role in site-protection matters must be immediate and direct.

The only way to ensure appropriate protection of the archaeological heritage in Greece is to acknowledge that this is a responsibility of a State-run public service.³⁴ Unfortunately, a gap exists between the Archaeological Service and the citizens,³⁵ because of the authoritarian methodology underlying the management of the archaeological heritage.³⁶ The over-centralization of the administrative system in the Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sports is a disincentive for the involvement of local communities and non-governmental organizations in heritage management.³⁷ In some cases, this is seen as hindering innovation

at local and regional level, whereas, to the contrary, one of the broader trends of cultural heritage management at a global level is the emphasis on participatory and collaborative practice grounded in community involvement that is reciprocal, interactive and multi-vocal.³⁸

The model proposed for the Amyklaion focuses on alternative approaches, encompassing participatory, inclusive and innovative initiatives which can potentially render archaeological site management socially and economically sustainable. It is now accepted that the local administration, the local communities and the organizations are well aware of their role in a new system, of their potential contribution and of the connections and responsibilities they can assume.³⁹

This concept has been inherent in the Amykles Research Project from the outset, as evinced by the creation of a large team of scholars of all disciplines, a sponsorship policy for funding the project and, especially, the founding of the association “The Friends of the Amyklaion”, which will be directly involved in the implementation of a management and development plan for the site.

On the other hand, the lack of adequate funding and of long-term strategies impact on the quality and sustainability of certain interventions.⁴⁰ It is a fact that the turn towards the conservation and enhancement of monuments in recent decades has benefitted from the possibilities of funding through the various European operational programmes. The future economic viability of the operation of the archaeological site of the Amyklaion, through European programmes but also through funding from other agencies and individuals, can be secured first of all through the sponsorship policy of the research project and the association. In this way and on the basis of an established collaboration between these agencies, the efforts of the basic management agency of the site, namely the local Ephorate of Antiquities and the Ministry of Culture, is assisted.

POLITICS AND IDEOLOGY

Greek and Roman antiquity hold pride of place in the imaginative world of every ideology, in the endeavour to forge a national identity.⁴¹ And this is result of a documented construct for which all the data of scholarship and propaganda from the nineteenth century onward have been utilized. The placing of antiquity in the service of

ideology is nuanced and is perceived correspondingly by archaeologists both of the Hellenic world and of mythicized Byzantium.⁴² In the case of the Amyklaion, memory and identity are considered in the context of multi-temporality and not of linear progression.⁴³

The mention of Amyklaion in the Homeric catalogue of ships (*Iliad* 2.584) reflects the settlement's distinct political status already during the Bronze Age. It is accepted that from the eighth century BC the *polis* put religion at its centre, and through religion forged its identity. Ancient literary sources and inscriptions bear witness to the great importance of the Amyklaian sanctuary of Apollo and the related Hyakinthia festival to the people of Laconia during Greek and Roman antiquity. It was the celebration of the cult of Apollo Amyklaios together with the other Spartan cults, those of Athena Chalkioikos and Artemis Ortheia, which provided Sparta with a Dorian identity and worldview. Although Laconia was a hub of culture and commerce during Hellenistic, Roman and Byzantine times, it is to the Archaic and Classical Doric period that modern Laconians point today, when they wish to emphasize their homeland's particular contribution to the ancient past. The Dorians are thus both emblematic of local pride and yet ultimately seen as forerunners of the greatest flowering of Greek civilization.⁴⁴

The site of ancient Sparta may have claimed greater prestige than nearby Mystras in Greek and Western imagination, but it was poor in monuments. Disappointed by this lack, travellers would climb up to Mystras for some visual stimulation. Although physically towering over Sparta, Mystras was under the shadow of its ancient predecessor. For even those that correctly distinguished the two, the glory of Mystras was built on the downfall of Sparta and the demise of the ancient world.

In modern Laconia and Sparta, pride in the achievements of antiquity is merged with pride in the high level of cultural sophistication enjoyed in the Byzantine Age. Thanks to the importance of Mystras and Monemvasia, the region was home to artistic creativity and was involved in developments in politics, ethnicity and religion. Nevertheless, the great influence of the Byzantine Age led to the subordination of independent local pride to an empire-orientated nationalism. Mystras became Greece's idealized archaeological site for the consumption and representation of the Middle Ages. It was a unique source for constructing an ideological topos and a national discourse based on the

notion that the renaissance of the fifteenth century contained the early seeds of a Greek national consciousness.⁴⁵

Collapsing historical time in experiential space has been a component central to the enterprise of Modern Greece.⁴⁶ National narratives produced by State authorities were grounded in social processes and political ambitions: the nation's genealogical foundations, traced in the conflation of Greek antiquity and Byzantine Christianity that took place in the nineteenth century, were rewritten with reference to the new historical realities and the geopolitics of archaeology of the twentieth.⁴⁷

Through archaeology the Amykles Research Project can make a contribution to the broader discussions on ideology and memory, since engagement with the material world is the key to understanding how memory works. In our work we seek to define the relationship between past and present, calling for a political critique of nationalism promoted by a historiography that is as accurate, balanced and objective as possible. This approach is greatly advanced by the project's interdisciplinary perspective, which juxtaposes historical, anthropological and archaeological methods.⁴⁸

CONCLUSION

The emergence of new disciplines and changes in the cultural environment of Greece has had a profound impact on site-management strategies, with archaeological heritage being considered a significant part of the country's

heritage industry.⁴⁹ New archaeology demands archaeological sites open to the public and focusing on knowledge, education, landscape experience and activities.⁵⁰ Archaeological projects have to explore the threats and propose a values-based approach to management planning for the site.

Research in the sanctuary of Apollo has resulted in one more cultural collectivity that is characteristic of Sparta and at the same time complements those of Artemis Ortheia and Athena Chalkioikos. The strategic goals for making the Amyklaion a modern, functional archaeological site accessible to all, are protection, documentation and research, and last, its enhancement. The long-term management of the site demands its inclusion in the wider cultural landscape of Sparta, through a network with cultural and environmental nodes, and the development of practices of experiential approach and appropriation by the local people and by visitors to the region. This also points out the need to promote an integrated treatment of the landscape as a social good by enhancing its multi-planar value.

The achievement of these goals and the prospects for development of the archaeological park demand fertile collaboration between local agencies and social partners, with prime movers the Amykles Research Project and the association "The Friends of the Amyklaion".

Dr Stavros Vlizon
vlizost@ionio.gr

NOTES

1. Hamilakis 2008, 274.
2. Tilley *et al.* 2000, 43-45 (35-62).
3. Pettersson 1992, 11.
4. Burkert 1985, 19; Sourvinou-Inwood 1993, 7-10; Marinatos 1993, 228-30; De Polignac 1995; Morgan 2009, 11-30.
5. Tsountas 1892; Fiechter 1918; Buschor – von Massow 1927.
6. Delivorrias 2009; Vlizos 2009.
7. Lambrinouidakis 2010.
8. Mallouchou-Tufano 2004, 7, 120-21. UNESCO, World Heritage Centre, Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention 08/01, Jan. 2008.
9. De la Torre 1997; Randall 1998; Avrami *et al.* 2000.
10. For the latest bibliography see Cleere 2010, 4-12.
11. Dimakopoulos 2000; Lambrinouidakis 2010.
12. See generally Kokkou 1977 and Petrakos 1982; Étienne 2000; Dimakopoulos 2000; Pantos 2001; Mallouchou-Tufano 1998; Voudouri 2003; Doukellis – Mendoni 2004; Lambrinouidakis 2006, 49-58; Stroulia – Sutton 2010.
13. Lambrinouidakis 2000, 363-70; Mastrantonis 2008; Mastrantonis 2009.
14. See Demakopoulou in this volume.
15. See Vlachou in this volume.
16. See Bilis – Magnisali in this volume for a detailed presentation of these monuments.
17. Tsountas 1892, 1, 9-10.
18. Bilis – Magnisali 2009, 9-10.
19. Fiechter 1918.
20. Buschor – von Massow 1927.
21. In antiquity man officially protected nature, when, on account of the sacred temene, the destructive action of man was comprehended, see McClure 1934, 109-24; Dillon 1997, 115; Anschuetz *et al.* 2001, 157-211.
22. In antiquity the wider area was densely vegetated, as stated by Polybius (*Hist.* 5.19,2: *Amyclae: a place in Laconia about twenty stades from Lacedaemon, exceedingly rich in forest and corn*).
23. George Hamilton Gordon Lord Aberdeen, Remarks on the Amyclean Marbles. Letter from Lord Aberdeen to the Editor, in: R. Walpole, *Memoirs Relating to European and Asiatic Turkey* (London 1817) 446-52; Leake 1830, 134-47; Omont 1902, 616-33.
24. Pedley 2005, 39-40, 52-56.
25. As was observed early by Greeves 1989, 59-66.
26. Of interest is the view of Tilley *et al.* 2001, 156: “We have to keep in mind that our installations and images are valuable intellectual resources in that course of interpretation, which is always a contemporary act”.
27. For the technical details and the form of the monuments see analytically in the present volume Bilis – Magnisali.
28. For the ethical dimension of the proposal for the restoration of the Throne and the altar see analytically Bilis – Magnisali 2009.
29. Tsountas 1892; see also Fiechter 1918, 164 fig. 36.
30. Fiechter 1918, 110-22.
31. The ICOMOS CHARTER for the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites (2007) article 3,4.
32. Lambrinouidakis 2000, 370.
33. See in general Cooper *et al.* 1995; Lambrinouidakis 2000, 366-67; McManamon – Hatton 2000; Ringbeck 2008.
34. See Archaeological Law, 2002.
35. Herzfeld 1991, 34.
36. Fouseki 2009, 49-65.
37. Herzfeld 1991, 193-96; Hamilakis 2007, 37; Loukaki 2008, 168-70.
38. Hodder 2003, 55-69; Hodder – Hutson 2003; Lekakis 2008, 308-19.
39. See e.g. Bertaux 1998; Chitty – Baker 1999; Grenville 1999; Sakellariadi 2008.
40. Lambrinouidakis 2000, 369.
41. Gazi 2008, 67-82.
42. Sakka 2002, 26-40, 74-81; Liakos 2007; Hamilakis 2007; D. Plantzos, Archaeology and Hellenic identity, 1896-2004: the frustrated vision, in: D. Damaskos - D. Plantzos (eds), *A Singular Antiquity: Archaeology and Hellenic Identity in Twentieth-Century Greece* (= *Mouseio Benaki*, 3rd Suppl, Athens 2008) 14.; Sakka 2012, 91-100.
43. R. M. Van Dyke – S. E. Alcock (eds), *Archaeologies of Memory* (Oxford 2003) and its review by Y. Hamilakis in: *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 12 (2006) 470-71.
44. Indicative is the example of Sparta and the discussion on the origin of the Dorians, from which emerges the enormous fascination Dorian Sparta held for the Nazis, in relation to Ionian Athens. The virtues of the pure race found their embodiment in Sparta, since eugenics satisfied the demands of the Nazis’ racial policy. In this period in particular, academic discourse was denuded of every ethical principle of scientific documentation and truth, and became loyal slave of an ideology that is ordered by a mythopoeic rhetoric beneath a veneer of scientific truth. See Chapoutot 2008.
45. Runciman 1980; Chatzidakis 1981; Kourelis 2011-2012, 331.
46. Kourelis 2011-2012, 298.
47. Foro – Rey 2008, 98; Hamilakis 2009; Gratziou 2012, 81-90.
48. Brown – Hamilakis 2003; Papadopoulos 2005.
49. Palumbo – Teutonico 2002.
50. Dyson 1993, 195-206; Renfrew – Bahn 2004.

ΣΤΑΥΡΟΣ ΒΛΙΖΟΣ

Μια θεωρητική προσέγγιση για την ανάδειξη και διατήρηση αρχαιολογικών χώρων
Το παράδειγμα του ιερού του Απόλλωνα Αμυκλαίου στη Σπάρτη

Είναι πια κοινός τόπος στην έρευνα ότι ένας αρχαιολογικός χώρος σήμερα λειτουργεί ως ερμηνευτικό εργαλείο προσέγγισης του απώτερου παρελθόντος μιας ευρύτερης περιοχής και μετατρέπει τα μνημειακά κατάλοιπα σε αναγνώσιμο και διδακτικό υλικό, με προεκτάσεις σε τομείς όπως ιστορία, ιδεολογία, πολιτική και θρησκεία. Μαζί με τα πολιτιστικά και πολιτισμικά χαρακτηριστικά είναι, όμως, και οι περιβαλλοντικές ιδιαιτερότητες του τοπίου αυτές που καθορίζουν τη νέα του ταυτότητα. Το Αμυκλαίο είναι χώρος που συνδυάζει φυσικό και μνημειακό πλούτο ιδιαίτερης αξίας, εικόνα που περιγράφεται παραστατικά κατά την αρχαιότητα και αντίκρισαν και οι Ευρωπαίοι περιηγητές του 19ου αι. Γεγονός, όμως, είναι δυστυχώς η έως τώρα έλλειψη μιας ενιαίας αντιμετώπισης της περιοχής σε επίπεδο διαχειριστικού σχεδιασμού που σχετίζεται και με το γεγονός ότι ο χώρος δεν εντάχθηκε ποτέ σε Ζώνη Ειδική Προστασίας. Δεν έχει ληφθεί έως τώρα μέριμνα για τη μερική ή ολοκληρωμένη προστασία του και δεν έχουν πραγματοποιηθεί επεμβάσεις για τη διαμόρφωση σε οργανωμένο και επισκέψιμο αρχαιολογικό χώρο. Όλα αυτά ενώ είναι γνωστό ότι η σημασία της θέσης έγκειται κυρίως στη διαχρονικότητα της χρήσης (από την ΠΕ εποχή έως σήμερα) και τη μοναδικότητα του “Θρόνου”. Επιπλέον συμπληρώνει την αρχαιολογική εικόνα της περιοχής (Σπάρτη, Μενελάιο, Βαφειό, Αγ. Βασίλειος) υπογραμμίζοντας παράλληλα την πραγματικότητα ότι ο χώρος αποτελεί αναπόσπαστο κομμάτι της κοινωνικής ζωής του χωριού.

Για την κατανόηση και την αναγνωσιμότητα του μελλοντικού αρχαιολογικού χώρου στο Αμυκλαίο είναι απαραίτητη η παρουσίαση και ανάδειξη της μνημειακής του υπόστασης (Θρόνος, βωμός, περίβολος, τα κατάλοιπα ενός οικοδομήματος της ύστερης αρχαιότητας και η εκκλησία της Αγ. Κυριακής). Στις άμεσες ενέργειες

συγκαταλέγεται και η διεύρυνση του αρχαιολογικού χώρου με απαλλοτριώσεις και οι εγκαταστάσεις υποδομής. Ο σχεδιασμός στον χώρο προβλέπει δύο κύριες διαδρομές επίσκεψης που θα είναι παράλληλα θεματικές και φυσιολατρικές-περιπατητικές. Καθοριστικός παράγοντας για την επίτευξη της ανάδειξης είναι η σωστή πληροφόρηση των επισκεπτών αλλά και της τοπικής κοινωνίας, και –μέσω αυτής– η διασφάλιση της σύνδεσης του Αμυκλαίου με τη Σπάρτη. Οι νέες τεχνολογίες μπορούν να αξιοποιηθούν με ένα σημείο πληροφοριών και την ανάδειξη ενός ολοκληρωμένου συστήματος εικονικής και διαδραστικής αναπαράστασης.

Η ολοκληρωμένη ανάδειξη και προβολή των χαρακτηριστικών που συνθέτουν την ιστορική και πολιτιστική φυσιογνωμία του Αμυκλαίου, απαιτεί τη σύνδεσή του με ένα ενιαίο δίκτυο περιβαλλοντικού και πολιτιστικού ενδιαφέροντος της Σπάρτης γενικότερα. Κεντρική ιδέα της υποδομής πρέπει να είναι η ολιστική ερμηνεία της πολιτισμικής εξέλιξης της Σπάρτης που υπαγορεύτηκε από την ίδια τη φυσιογνωμία της, καθώς αποτελεί μια αδιάσπαστη ιστορική, οικολογική και αισθητική ενότητα. Με βασικούς άξονες λοιπόν τα μνημεία, τη φύση, την πόλη, αλλά και την τοπική κοινωνία, μπορεί να διαμορφωθεί ένας τρόπος διαχείρισης που θα επικεντρώνεται στην κοινωνική ευθύνη όλων των φορέων. Για την οργανωμένη και συνδυασμένη διαχείριση των ιδιαίτερων φυσικών-πολιτισμικών χώρων, κρίνεται απαραίτητη η δημιουργία μιας τοπικής ομάδας διαχείρισης, το σωματείο «Οι Φίλοι του Αμυκλαίου», που, μαζί με το Ερευνητικό Πρόγραμμα Αμυκλών, θα λειτουργεί ως φορέας συντονισμού όλων των δυνάμεων που ήδη δρουν στις περιοχές αυτές: περιβαλλοντικοί φορείς, εκπρόσωποι της αρμόδιας Εφορείας Αρχαιοτήτων, κάτοικοι, εκπρόσωποι του Δήμου, πολιτιστικοί σύλλογοι.

