Sites of pilgrimage, sites of heritage: an exploratory introduction

Michael A. Di Giovine*

Department of Anthropology and Sociology,
West Chester University of Pennsylvania,
775 S. Church Street – Old Library,
West Chester, PA 19383, USA
Email: michael@michaeldigiovine.com
*Corresponding author

Josep-Maria Garcia-Fuentes

School of Architecture, Planning and Landscape,
The Quadrangle,
Newcastle University,
NE1 7RU, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK
Email: josep.garciafuentes@ncl.ac.uk

Biographical notes: Michael A. Di Giovine is Assistant Professor of Anthropology at West Chester University and Honorary Fellow at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. A former tour operator, his research in Europe and Southeast Asia focuses on tourism/pilgrimage, heritage, foodways and religion. He is a founding board member and current Convenor of the American Anthropological Association's Anthropology of Tourism Interest Group, and the AAA's Task Force on Cultural Heritage. He is the series co-editor of *Anthropology of Tourism: Heritage, Mobility and Society* (Lexington Books). The author of *The Heritage-scape: UNESCO, World Heritage, and Tourism*, he co-edited *Tourism and the Power of Otherness; Edible Identities: Food as Cultural Heritage*; and *The Seductions of Pilgrimage*.

Josep-Maria Garcia-Fuentes is Lecturer in Architecture at the Newcastle University, UK and Fellow at the Catalan Observatory at the London School of Economics, UK. His research focuses on the history of architecture, heritage, preservation and the history of ideas. He is also a registered architect and he has been previously an Assistant Professor at the Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya-BarcelonaTECH, Spain. He was awarded the First National Prize of Spain for university graduates in 2006 and research grants by the Government of Spain from 2007 to 2011, the Samuel H. Kress Foundation for the Society of Architectural Historians in 2011 and the Santander Bank in 2014.

1 Introduction

In late summer of 2015, much of the world watched in horror as the self-proclaimed Islamic State (ISIS) destroyed the well-preserved temples of Bel and Baal-Shamin in Syria's World Heritage site of Palmyra, the capital city of a once-flourishing empire in late antiquity. This was not the first instance of highly public, and highly publicised, iconoclasm: In the past few decades, Hindu militants in India – sometimes with support of the government – have destroyed centuries-old mosques; in 2006, the fundamentalist Islamic group Ansar Dine in Mali destroyed World Heritage-designated Sufi shrines in Timbuktu, and ISIS themselves destroyed Biblical pilgrimage sites in Nineveh in 2014, which were sacred to Jews, Christians, Yazidis and Shiites. To this, we could also add the 2015 firebombing of historic African-American Baptist churches by white (Christian) fundamentalists in the US South (Raymond, 2015).

The destruction of Palmyra's religious-cum-heritage sites was particularly reminiscent of the Taliban's highly public destruction of Afghanistan's giant rock-hewn Buddha statues in the Bamiyan Valley in the months prior to the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks by al Qaeda. As with the destruction of the Bamiyan Buddhas and the Sufi shrines at Timbuktu – today both UNESCO World Heritage sites – ISIS' primary stated motivation was to 'purify' sites from false idols, graven images, and the influence of alternative religious traditions (see Tharoor, 2012; Ford and Tawfeeq, 2014). However, their underlying motives – as well as the roots of the reactions by those of the West – were closely tied to geopolitics and economics. In the case of the Bamiyan Buddhas, Taliban spokespeople argued that the destruction of these important religious heritage sites were in partial protest to the West's monetary focus on their heritage value at the expense of providing aid to the Afghani people, who were suffering under international sanctions pressuring the brutal Taliban regime. "When you see your children dying in front of you, you do not care about a piece of art", the Taliban spokesman reportedly said (see Crosette, 2001). Yet, especially given the enormous effort the ill-equipped Taliban exerted to destroy the Buddhas, it likely was also an endeavour to assert their power to control the life or death of these sites – and of the people and their identities that were tied to them.[1] ISIS, of course, has taken this further: They not only razed the temples, but publically tied their dissenters to the edifices before dynamiting them. Building on their viral videos depicting beheadings of Western journalists, they decapitated 81-year-old archaeologist Khaled al-Asaad, the long time head of antiquities at Palmyra, hanging his body from a column (Shaheen and Black, 2015). Such arresting assertions of power, carefully staged for international journalists and, in the case of ISIS, deftly disseminated through social media, could alternatively attract adherents and goad enemies into protracted battles that could help make manifest simplistic notions of a 'clash of civilisations' (Huntington, 1993) that seem to be brought about by fundamental religious differences.

These attacks on what some would hold as sacred pilgrimage sites, and others would consider as sites of great importance to the secular heritage of humanity, reveal the complex and often nebulous connection between pilgrimage and heritage. In its broadest sense, pilgrimage is "a ritual journal from the quotidian realm of profane society to a sacred center, a passion-laden, hyper-meaningful voyage both inwardly and outwardly, which is often steeped in symbols and symbolic actions" [Di Giovine, (2012b), p.117]. An ancient form of mobility across the world, it is a fundamental precursor to modern tourism, and many tourist itineraries are not only constructed around visiting shrines, sanctuaries, and other pilgrimage sites, but their very trails are built upon the actual remnants of ancient pilgrimage routes (Di Giovine and Elsner, 2016). Scholars therefore have posited that pilgrimage is at the least closely related to tourism, if not – in this post-modern era – a subset of it (Morinis, 1983; Bauman, 1996; Badone and Roseman, 2004; Di Giovine, 2013). While pilgrimages are often religious journeys (see, for example, Coleman and Elsner, 1995; Di Giovine and Elsner, 2016), it is important to note that many travellers call their secular tours 'pilgrimages' when they hold special meaning and importance to the practitioner (Morinis, 1992).

Likewise, 'heritage' is also a nebulous term, and diverse disciplines and professions espouse different theoretical and operational definitions of it (see Di Giovine and Cowie, 2014). Nevertheless, they all suggest an equally hyper-meaningful quality – one that necessitates setting it apart from the everyday and attributing extra value to it. Indeed, most definitions centre on the notion of inheritance; heritage is something of value that should be preserved and passed on to future generations within a community that claims it. Although inheritance – and inheritance law – is quite ancient, the specific use of heritage (or 'patrimony' in many European languages) has its roots in the modern era, and, as Harrison (2013, pp.84–88; see also Naumov 2015) argues, has become a central feature in our post-modern, experience-driven culture of simulacra and simulations (cf. Baudrillard, 1994). If the ancient world may have been connected through the movement of people, objects, and capital across pilgrimage routes (see Elsner, 2000), then one might also say that the contemporary world is very much connected and negotiated through the movement of people, objects, capital, ideas, and imaginaries, centred on the negotiation, preservation, and commodification of cultural heritage. But as the title of this thematic issue suggests, pilgrimage and heritage are not in opposition to each other, nor are they part and parcel of different historical epochs or social realities. Rather, they mutually inform each other; they surround, and are concretised within, the same hyper-meaningful, hyper-affective sites.

Featuring ethnographic case studies from across the world, this special issue of *The International Journal of Tourism Anthropology* examines the complex interplay between pilgrimage and heritage at highly valued – and highly visited – places, paying close attention to their shared phenomenological and ontological qualities. Both pilgrimage sites and heritage sites are intensely affective; each are ideologically charged and are often drawn into, and deployed, in complex competitions of identity politics. If we were to strip away the overtly Manichean religious-secular treatment that so often colour interpretations and classifications of these hyper-meaningful sites – a treatment that tends to obscure their shared phenomenological qualities – two ideas emerge. On the one hand, we notice that both pilgrimage and heritage utilise surprisingly similar discourses and practices, espouse similar social structures, and employ the same 'mechanisms of seduction' (see Di Giovine and Picard, 2015) that serve to draw a very diverse set of visitors to these sites. On the other hand, there are nevertheless some highly significant differences that set pilgrimage sites apart from heritage sites – they stem from diverse cosmological understandings of the world and individuals' relationships to it, to differences in values and purposes of their preservation. Such differences will inevitably shape visitors' ways of making meaning, and meaningfully interacting, with them. As the papers in this special issue make clear, this is particularly an issue when the same place is alternatively viewed as both a pilgrimage site and a heritage site, and tensions emerge when different people and institutions – lacking perhaps a holistic understanding of the multiplicity of voices that might contextualise the same site – exert their control over the site, its narrative, and its prescribed methods of visitation.

2 Pilgrimage sites and heritage sites: convergences

While pilgrimage and heritage may be two distinctive phenomena, and the sites that they classify are perceived of as qualitatively different, the components that constitute a pilgrimage site often overlap with those that define a heritage site. It is for this reason that difficulties arise when we try to pinpoint their similarities and differences, as well as the blurriness of the limits between them.

Pilgrimage sites include a range of built and natural structures, and can have religious or secular connotations. A pilgrimage site is typically understood as a locus of the sacred in the profane world – if by 'sacred' we mean a quality that is specifically set apart from, or in juxtaposition to, the everyday and the mundane; something with heightened meaning and with the potential to transform or transcend the lives of those who interact with it. Religious pilgrimage sites in particular are places to which people are drawn for bodily encounters with the divine (Di Giovine and Eade, 2016). The great historian of religion, Mircea Eliade, considered a pilgrimage site to be a society's axis mundi, a place in which cosmological perfection pierces through, or 'irrupts' into, this chaotic and imperfect world. As members of this world, yet products of something greater, Eliade contends, humans are innately drawn to these 'hierophanies' in an attempt to achieve cosmological perfection – constituting what Preston (1992) might call the site's 'spiritual magnetism'.

Pilgrimage sites, thus, are first of all temporally conceived. That is, they are conceptualised as existing within a primordial time – a time that is simultaneously before, and out of, linear historical time. They represent the time (or timelessness) of the divine within the profane time of man, which has lost that perfection. Therefore, they reference a sacred time that extraordinarily inserts itself into a present marked by loss, nostalgia and yearning – and humans constantly attempt to recreate this through the construction of their own sacred spaces, such as shrines, churches, temples, and even their homes [Eliade, (1959), pp.50–54, 58–62]. They also strive to recreate, and perform, sacred time through rituals [van Gennep, (1960), p.114; Turner, (1974a), p.59, Turner, 1974c], especially when they act out their cosmogonic myths – those narratives that discuss the time of creation or the time of the gods, and which serve to articulate a group's core worldview (Eliade, 1967). In these pilgrimage sites, time therefore is conceived of in a cyclical fashion: as the myth is re-performed, the sacrifice re-offered, and the prayers re-stated, sacred time begins again – creating a stark divergence from the ever-flowing movement of (Western) historical time, with all of its tendencies towards the decay of order and the destruction of perfection. Finally, as pilgrimage is iterative – that is, it is ritually performed again and again – pilgrims are well aware of its temporal aspects; they literally follow in the footsteps of others as they retrace the routes of devotees who have travelled before them, as Chemin's case study on Santiago de Compostela and Zara's on Varanasi, India (both in this special issue) tellingly reveal.

In addition, the intangible, temporal qualities of pilgrimage sites and heritage sites both manifest themselves in tangible spatial ways, since both are made to embody – or better, construct – the cosmological time they represent. They are both containers for the specific set of processes and rituals that take place in them. On the one hand, the rituals are often rites of passage, socially prescribed ways of transforming the individual traveller's status (van Gennep, 1960; Turner, 1969). In contemporary Islam, for example, the hajj – the journey to Mecca – is listed in the Koran as one of the five pillars of the faith [Coleman and Elsner, (1995), p.53; see Koran 2:196–198; 3:96–98], an obligation to "seek refuge in God away from Satan" that continues to be adhered to today (in theory, if not always in practice); it is a rite of passage that changes one's social status from a layperson to a hajji – one who completed the hajj – which comes with different roles and responsibilities in the community. On the other hand, rituals also join people together and mark in-group and out-group relations for those who visit them within an extraordinary time set apart from the everyday. Such rituals, argues Victor Turner, foster sensations of communitas – a recognition of togetherness and unity that transcends the societal divisions of participants in daily life. For example, the object of hajjis' pilgrimage to Mecca, the Ka'ba around which hajjis circumambulate, is designated as haram, a sacred space that provides shelter to a particular community, and therefore off limits to non-members [Frankel, (2013), pp.64–65; Serjeant, (1981), pp.41–58; see, for example, Burton, 1855]. By allowing access to some and not others, the pilgrimage bodily constructs the composition of the community.

A more 'blurry' ritual that blends both the rite of passage and the fostering of normative communitas within a heritage-cum-pilgrimage context is the Jewish 'birthright' tours to Israel, in which Jewish youths abroad are sponsored by Israeli foundations to travel to their imagined 'homeland' [Zerubavel, (1995), p.64]. A particularly hyper-meaningful travel experience involves a trip to the ancient fortress of Masada. According to the chronicles by Josephus, Masada was an ancient Roman fortress in which a group of Jewish rebels waged their last stand against Emperor Titus' troops in AD 73. Faced with their impending demise, the rebels – which included families of women and children – committed mass suicide rather than be taken by the Romans. While the site was abandoned and largely forgotten by European Jews after the diaspora – in part because suicide was looked upon as a sign of weakness – it was re-discovered by archaeologists and integrated into new national myths of the nascent Israeli state that changed its meaning from a place of weakness to one of land reclamation, defiance, and liberation [Zerubavel, (1995), pp.60–63]. Today, Jewish teens from both Israel and abroad are taken there as a type of 'national pilgrimage' [Di Giovine, (2009), p.84], a rite of passage that provides them with an important sense of yedi' at ha'aretz, or 'knowledge of one's country' [Katriel, (1997), p.29], as well as the feeling of unity with others who share their Jewish heritage – irrespective of their contemporary national origin. Solidifying its relatively newfound social importance, in 2001 Masada was designated a UNESCO World Heritage site [Di Giovine, (2009), pp.83–86].

Pilgrimage sites therefore are also spatially conceived, because only by visiting these sites can we even attempt to achieve the perfection they embody (cf. Di Giovine and Eade, 2016). Often geographically found in out-of-the-way locations – removed from the urban centres in which daily life takes its course – sacred centres were seen as peripheral to the institutional power structures of quotidian life and set apart from the social world (Turner, 1973; Orsi, 1991). In this sense, pilgrimages are places par excellence for experiencing transcendence and divine intervention; they are often considered unique places to see and be seen by the divine, particularly in traditions such as Hinduism (darshan), Shinto (kanko), and ancient Greece (derkomai). Indeed, the divine or its sacred mediators (such as saints or gurus) are often perceived as being present in these sites –

often imbued in statues, graves, images, or relics, or in natural landforms such as mountains like Mt. Meru or waterways such as the Ganges. For this reason, pilgrimage sites are typically found in very unique geographic landforms, or in significant churches or shrines built to represent these extraordinary temporal and spatial conceptions. This last aspect is especially salient in connecting pilgrimage sites to heritage sites; if humans strive to recreate cosmological perfection through these pilgrimage sites, then elements of material culture – built structures, art, and relics – that are part and parcel of these sites, serve to better structure the processes that are undergone in and through them.

Aesthetics – the appreciation for both art as well as any natural or geographic landform – act as triggers for affect in the experiences that take place in, around, and through pilgrimage sites. Indeed, aesthetics and religious experiences are inescapably entangled experiences that reinforce and complement one another. This overlapping underlies the complex links between pilgrimage and heritage sites, since pilgrimage sites are frequently constructed with conscious utilisation of artistic and architectural techniques, so as to become an aesthetic object – or collection of objects – that can structure or inspire the normative religious experiences that take place in them. To this aim, art and architecture are mobilised, since one is aesthetically interpreting the (natural or urbanised) site of pilgrimage. This is the case, for example, of shrines or temples built in unique natural settings – like in strange or arresting geological formations or sites of strong natural beauty – which are often enhanced through the construction of artistic monuments and architecture. This has occurred in pilgrimage sites across the world – from Lourdes and Montserrat (Garcia-Fuentes, 2016a, 2016b) to the Greek monasteries raised on Mount Athos and Meteora, from the 'footprints' of the Buddha throughout Southeast Asia to the Sacred Mountains in China and the maritime rock formations near Ise, Japan.

Furthermore, like pilgrimage sites, heritage sites are also defined through similar notions of temporality and spatiality. Heritage sites are foremostly containers for the production, and reproduction, of social groups, predicated on similar forms of rituals that recreate and concretise the worldviews and beliefs of the group. A heritage site is typically understood as a link to the past or as a confirmation of an enduring identity or memory in a volatile present [Cosgrove, (2003), pp.113–123]. They are not ideologically neutral, nor are their claims objective or a priori. Rather, heritage is always "a subjective political negation of identity, place and memory, and it is something that is done rather than something that we simply have or curate or protect" [Smith, (2015), p.460; see also Smith, 2006]. Heritage, as Harvey (2001, p.327) points out, is therefore a process, a set of embodied activities aimed to inculcate and express a particular worldview through physical engagement with the past. This entails an attempt to establish a set identity of a group or society through the preservation of heritage sites, their boundaries, and, lastly, their transformation into fixed and somehow sacred and revered objects, which generates a geography composed of bounded, containing spaces. We already can see the phenomenological links to pilgrimage sites: heritage sites are places, designated by humans, in which the 'sacred' nature of a group irrupts into the chaos and uncertainty of the present. They are once again places in which the 'cosmogonic myths' of a social group (be they secular or religious in nature) are concretised, referenced, and reproduced. Eliade's conceptions of the sacred and profane are again apropos here: cosmogonic myths that explain worldviews, he argues, constitutes a group's 'sacred history'; it explicates its origins, posits the group's overarching values and ethos, reveals social hierarchy, and seeks to explain "total reality and justify its contradictions". In short, it "provides the grounds for human history" [Eliade, (1967), pp.173, 178, 182]. Heritage may therefore be described as "a means of transmission of ideas and values and a knowledge that includes the material, the intangible and the virtual" [Graham, (2002), pp.1003–1017]. These are meanings and symbolic values that have been created by specific people who accept them for a specific purpose, which is almost always that of fostering the definition of group – from the local to the global – since heritage is by definition 'ours'.

In constructing notions of heritage through the creation of heritage sites, it is important that the place reference a specific point in time past, which is relevant in the present to the community that is attached to it. Yet, it is important to note that, just as memory is a process not a thing (Connerton, 1989), heritage too is "a process […] that uses sites, objects, and human traits and patterns of behavior as vehicles for the conduction of ideas in order to satisfy various contemporary needs" [Ashworth, (2008), p.3]. Since heritage claims inherently reference the past and its remains within the present, the temporal narratives that are created are quite often marked by loss, nostalgia and yearning (Lowenthal, 1985, 1996) that can be shared within a group. For remembering to become collective memory, the remembrance must be solidified into a shared narrative (Wertsch, 2002), and imbedded in tangible sites, personalities, events, performances, and rituals [Halbwachs, (1992), pp.200–201]. Yet, we must remember that, as a process, memory is only a selective interpretation of the past that entails continual processes of remembering and forgetting, as new narratives colour our previous imaginaries. Heritage sites, therefore, are sites of collective remembering that entail a selective interpretation of time that is equally selectively concretised into the affective aesthetic features of the material place. The act of preservation in particular is just as destructive as it is constructive; to 'restore' a site in the present to the way it was imagined to have looked in a particularly important time in the past entails destructive processes (such as removing the patina of the ages, newer structural interventions that are deemed 'inauthentic', etc.) as well as constructive processes (replacing stones, populating places with period furniture, etc.). These processes, however, are integral for the community to curate and organise their visits and ritual interactions at the site, solidifying particular collective memories and forgetting others.

The end product thus invokes a similar hierophany: rather than sacred time irrupting into the chaos of profane life (as pilgrimage sites are perceived to reference), at heritage sites it is a group's idealised time – complete with their shared memories of that period – that irrupts into the contemporary world, marked as it is with the destructive forces of time. It is, therefore, seen as a rare and sacred manifestation of the past community which has denied the otherwise inevitable and inescapable demise of human life. It also, therefore, serves to perpetuate the present community, mingling with that of the past, into the future. In the process, they are made to be hyper-meaningful; they are made to reveal, and resonate with, collective memories and ideologies that are often made more poignant given the stark contrast between its permanence and the transience of everyday life (see Freud, 1950) Visitation to heritage sites, therefore, can be (and often is) described as a 'secular pilgrimage' (Gammon, 2004; see also Graburn, 2001; Morinis, 1992; Ebron, 2000).

3 From heritage site to pilgrimage site: creating the sacred in the profane

An essential aspect in the current conceptualisation of heritage – at least in the West – is the authenticity of the work of art or heritage, which imbues the object with a 'sacred character' that Benjamin (1968[1936]) called an 'aura'. In utilising this term, Benjamin was creating moral claims on the status of an original in contrast to its copy or a fake. Benjamin's notion, however, was not new; nor was it merely a result of disillusion with the age of mechanical reproduction. Rather, it is grounded in major turns of Western thought that stem from Greek philosophy and especially from the influence of Plato. Plato argued that reality is divided into two spheres: the first is the sphere of ideas – or, germane to our argument, that of authentic objects –; the second is the sphere of shadows, the blurred obscure reflection of the sphere of the ideas – in other words, copies or fakes (Plato, 1997). For Benjamin (1968[1936]), in this age of mechanical reproduction, any work of art has its own 'sacred aura', for the only reason that it has been created in a particular time and place by a particular human hand. The sensation of an aura is relational; it is experience-based, created through ritual engagements with an object. In his words, it is an experience with "a strange tissue of space and time: the unique apparition of a distance, however near it may be" [Benjamin, (1968[1936]), p.23]. Although perhaps its form (or, in the words of Plato, its shadow) may be able to be reproduced, its aura – which arises from the object's creation and material contact with the artist, or the historical events that took place in it, which cannot be simulated or reproduced – cannot.

In this context, preservation – and all of its associated activities of protection, conservation, restoration and reconstruction – is often couched in terms of safeguarding the heritage object from danger and creating some shared responsibility for its permanence. Indeed, heritage represents an inherently political process (Harrison and Hitchcock, 2005; Di Giovine, 2009; Harrison, 2010; Joy, 2012; Shepherd, 2013); it is an idiom utilised for constructing ideological claims of identity, and is deployed through the assertion and mobilisation of performances of power. As the aforementioned cases of ISIS, the Taliban, American white supremacists and Hindu nationalists illustrated, sometimes these claims are asserted through coercive power (or force), but most often they are solidified by persuasive power – convincing group members of its importance, facilitating ritualised visitation to it, and invoking their shared responsibility to protect it from the destructive sands of time [Di Giovine, (2015a), pp.88–91]. Indeed, the preservation of valued heritage sites often factors into what Foucault (1991, pp.102–103) called 'governmentality', the structured set of institutions, processes, and tactics of an administrative state or organisation aimed at exerting power over a particular target population, often effected through 'apparatuses of security'. The shared responsibility for the protection of a group's cultural heritage rationalises systems of security [Ilcan and Phillips, (2006), pp.59, 61] that govern populations, create collectively held memories, and keep them within the ideological fold. Most importantly, it creates a sense of community by fostering strong emotional attachments that serve to ground these heritage sites into places of community-based or 'secular' pilgrimages that feel represented by, or attracted to, them. These sites are not mere places; they are hyper-meaningful, out of the ordinary, important to experience, and necessary to protect. In a word, they are sacred.

While heritage and museum professionals may often see their work as consisting of identifying or evaluating the authenticity of a heritage site for the sake of preservation [Ashworth, (1997), p.94; see, for example, UNESCO, 2008; Cameron and Rössler, 2013], the very process by which a destination is made into a heritage site veritably imbues the place with particular ideological claims of sacrality and material authenticity that align very closely with Benjamin's teachings. When nominating, for example, a structure to be designated as a UNESCO World Heritage site – which establishes the place's 'outstanding universal value' to all humans (Labadi, 2013) – great pains must be made to compile a 'nomination file' that documents the place's authenticity. A state-party must compile a complete history of the nominated site's production and subsequent use, complete maps of the area in which it is contained, and analyses of subsequent interventions at the site (including changes, restorations, etc.), and projected preservation and tourism management plans. The nominator must also include a statement of integrity, which attests to the 'wholeness and intactness' of the site, and thus, its authenticity (UNESCO, 2008; see also Di Giovine, (2014), p.7887]. This is important, as it is an attestation of the presence of the site's 'aura', which is necessary for it to be worthy of recognition, valorisation, and preservation.

If finally chosen by UNESCO's World Heritage Committee during its annual meeting, the site is then ceremonially inscribed on the List of World Heritage Sites, adding to its value in part by officially associating it with other similarly valorised places around the world. As Schuster (2002, p.4) argues, these lists are extremely important for elevating the status of a site or object and imbuing it with a hyper-meaningful narrative claim; it is a "purposeful collection and a form of argumentation…pretending indifference but calling for action". He continues, "[T]he information that is communicated by the list…[hopefully] will be sufficient to change citizens' and owners' behaviours with respect to listed properties. The message is: 'These are important; you should be respectful and careful and do your utmost to preserve them'" (p.5). This is further communicated through media, both by UNESCO and the nation-state in whose borders the site is located, to raise awareness of the place's 'universal value' particularly to tourists.

In reality, the process itself differs little from Roman Catholic canonisation procedures (the 'cause for canonisation'), which, while stated as an endeavour to verify or evaluate the sainthood of a person (United States Catholic Conference and Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1994), in reality constructs his or her sanctity [Cunningham, (2005), pp.10–11; Delooz, (1983), p.191]. Like the heritagisation process, canonisation is a bureaucratic procedure [Cunningham, (1980), pp.34–61] requiring the postulator (the person or group nominating the person for canonisation) to compile a 'Positio', similar to UNESCO's World Heritage Nomination File, which includes "a biography of any historical import… or otherwise an accurate, chronologically arranged report on the life and deeds…on his virtues or martyrdom, on his reputation of sanctity and signs" as well as all of the person's "writings, testimonials from others, and medical evaluation of any miracles" (John Paul II, 1983: point 10). Similar to the heritagisation process, the canonisation process 'scientises' history and culture [see Ilcan and Phillips, (2006), p.64] by engaging experts such as scientists, religious leaders, and politicians who can shape the discourse and structure practices through normative laws, preservation and museological endeavours [Di Giovine, (2015a), p.89]. Indeed, the process has become so technocratic and academic that one commentator quipped, "In its modern commitment to historical research, the congregation's corridors today seem more like the halls of a university history department than the series of courtrooms arguing over the merits and miracles of saints" [Sarno, (1986), p.9; qtd. in Stadick, (1999), p.124]. This act wrests control of the saint from popular religious communities and authorises the saint in line with Vatican teachings through the construction of the saint's hagiographic narrative – the official narrative of the Church concerning the virtues of the venerable deceased – just as the heritagisation process establishes a common, ideological narrative claim for a group over that of disparate individual understandings of the site. Tellingly, when accepted, the saint is formally canonised in a Papal ceremony and inscribed on the Litany of Saints – the official calendar and list of saints – in which the new saint's claims to sacredness is reinforced by his or her association with other long-standing, and long-revered, figures in the 'communion of saints'. Once the saint is inscribed, (s)he becomes worthy of veneration (dulia), which in popular religion often takes the form of pilgrimage to the actual body or relics of the saint.

With the recognition (or creation) of the sanctity of a holy figure, the material remains of the saint therefore take on a special aura that requires the community surrounding it to assume responsibility for its protection (see Isnart, 2008) – from the medieval practice of creating decoy-like tombstones or encasing the remains deep below a church altar (such as those of St. Peter and St. Francis, respectively) to jealously guarding the remains against conflicting claims of authenticity (such as that of the Volto Santo, the 'holy face' of Jesus in Manoppello, Italy, whose exquisite museum makes the case for its authenticity in part by questioning the popular tradition of 'Veronica's Veil', supposedly held in the Vatican) or of claims to ownership and identity by different devotional groups [as has occurred with the body of St. Padre Pio of Pietrelcina by his shrine-town of San Giovanni Rotondo (Di Giovine, 2012a)]. Likewise, the heritagisation process creates a similar aura; the authentic heritage object becomes a rare and prized possession of a community, a sacred and sacrosanct condensation of its history, culture and values that must be preserved (Isnart, 2008). They become, in the words of Bodenstein (2011), 'secular relics'. Just as frequently Church leaders will ensure that pilgrimage to a shrine is done responsibly – that is, with veneration and moral authenticity – heritage practitioners also work to 'responsibilise' citizens to understand the heritage site's importance and to obligate them to ensure its protection.

That the sacred quality of heritage sites is produced through processes not unlike that of canonisation is not a coincidence. Recht (1999, 2003), in fact, has pointed out that our contemporary conceptualisation of heritage rests on the medieval Christian relic, which would serve as the centre of pilgrimage routes and politics. Just as the relic – the material vestige of the saint, which in its body concretises the hagiographic narrative of the saint for the community of believers – is presented as a sacred metonym, decontextualised from its original life story and reinserted into a community's dogmatic program, so too is the museum-cum-heritage object taken out of its original milieu and re-contextualised with another claim reflecting the ideologies of the community claiming it. Both are fragmentary representations of the group's core worldviews; both are given added value through their association with other similarly made objects, but their heightened values are also conveyed through elaborate framing mechanisms. As Recht (2008, pp.95–96) further points out, the reliquary – often a bejewelled container or frame holding the sacred remains – serves to materially convey the power and sanctity of the fragmentary relic, just as the museum 'exhibitionary complex' (Bennett, 1995) emphasises the ideological power of a group's past for heritage objects. Furthermore, the often highly aestheticised frames, cases and exhibit designs have often been modelled after religious reliquaries, if not repurposed from reliquaries themselves. For example, in the secular 19th century museums of French history, which aimed to create a new sense of nationalism through the exhibitionary enterprise (see Duncan, 2004), objects contextualised as part of French national heritage were 'enshrined' in often elaborate reliquary-like display cases [Bodenstein, (2011), p.6]. At the Louvre in the early 19th century, Louis XVI's last will and testament and Marie-Antoinette's last letter were said to have been placed in a display cabinet decorated with 'reliquary-like pediments' [James-Sarazin, (2004), p.227; qtd. Bodenstein, (2011), p.6]. Some objects, such as a bloody shirt worn by Napoleon, a leaf from the tree that grew over his grave, and a lock of Agnes Sorel's hair, were even placed in actual 15th-century reliquaries by Dominique-Vivant Denon, the director of the Louvre from 1802–1815 [Bresc-Bautier, 2001; Bodenstein, (2011), p.5].

Therefore, a heritage site, irrespective of its artistic or historical value, can potentially become a pilgrimage site through a process that does not erase any of the rituals associated with its heritage, but rather it overlaps some of the experiences associated with pilgrimage sites. These transformations add another layer of complexity to the debate around heritage and pilgrimage sites, and reveal the difficulties that often make it problematic to clearly differentiate one from another. This is a debate illustrated, for example, in the paper on the Sagrada Familia by Estela Mariné-Roig in this special issue, who discusses the struggle between religious and secular experiences of the visitors to the famous basilica in Barcelona. Do they visit the work by Gaudí as Catholics or as tourists? Or perhaps in many cases as both at the same time? Cristiana Zara, in her examination of heritage tourism and pilgrimage to the Hindu holy city of Varanasi (Benares), addresses this same conundrum by arguing that such blurred boundaries are in fact productive, for they activate processes of cultural negotiation and identity formation through the interaction and comingling of different religious and secular traditions in the town. The city's unifying feature, of course, is that the site is still considered 'sacred': it is sacred to Hindus in one way, Muslims in another, and it is an incomparable site of world heritage by secular tourists and preservationists. All of these combine to reveal what Zara calls the city's unique 'living heritage', and thus the synergy of such practices should be seen as part of a whole which needs to be understood, stewarded, and preserved. Varanasi may not have achieved UNESCO World Heritage status yet – in part because of dysfunctional internal politics that foster some disengagement with local stakeholders, according to Singh (2010) – but all of this 'productive messiness' serves to only emphasise, and indeed multiply, the symbolic relevance and importance of the city on the world stage.

4 From pilgrimage site to heritage site: tensions and transformations

Heritage sites are rarely created from scratch as such; rather, preexisting sites with alternate use values are made into heritage sites through a process of shifting its narrative, assigning diverse value claims, and, often, changing the way others interact with them. This so-called 'heritagisation' process – which has its roots in museological practice – entails de-contextualising the object from its original conditions of use and value, re-contextualising it into a historical object, and juxtaposing it with other similar structures through its inclusion on lists, registers, archives, and even tourist itineraries (see Appadurai and Breckenridge, 1991; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1998). Since frequently these places are living sites – sites that are used by host communities in some way – such a process changes its very value from something alive and evolving to something historical and rooted in the past; therefore, the intended objectives and primary activities surrounding these sites also are transformed.

While regions, nation-states, and intragovernmenal organisations like UNESCO have been designating all kinds of post-industrial and 'alternative' sites as heritage since the turn of the millennium, some of the earliest designated heritage sites have been pilgrimage sites. In particular, the British and French colonial endeavour frequently appropriated religious sites in their far-flung protectorates as markers of their expanded colonial heritage and their burden to civilise native peoples, dedicating often immense amounts of resources to preserve indigenous pilgrimage sites that were seen to have fallen into decay by their unfit and primitive heirs. In French Indochina, for example, the École Française d'Extrême-Orient was created to research, document, classify, restore, and manage eventual tourist flows to Angkor in Cambodia; colonists also brought back to Paris numerous religious artefacts, sculptures, and bas reliefs to be exhibited in museums and Worlds Fairs – and even created fanciful scale-model reproductions of the Khmer temples for the Paris Universal Exhibition of 1867 and the Colonial Exhibition of 1922 in Marseilles (Dagens, 1995).

More recently, as part of post-World War II reconstruction and peacemaking that endeavoured to better define what constitutes 'Europe' through shared history and culture, the Council of Europe was founded in 1949 with an explicit charge to be the 'prime instrument' for establishing conceptions of, and safeguarding, European heritage [see Council of Europe, (1949), Art. Ia; see also Grabow, (2010), p.91]; one of its first initiatives was to designate the Camino de Santiago de Compostela – a lengthy Medieval pilgrimage route winding its way through France, Spain, Italy and Portugal – as the 'flagship' European Cultural Route [Council of Europe, (1994), p.3; qtd. in Grabow, (2010), p.93]. The Santiago de Compostela pilgrimage route has now become one of Europe's most successful heritage tourism initiatives; while by the second half of the twentieth century religious pilgrimage along the medieval Camino had decreased to a trickle, it was reborn as a popular backpacking route linking discrete heritage sites upon which individuals travel for a host of personal reasons, as Ed Chemin's article in this special issue discusses. It also serves as a model for other heritage tourism development initiatives, such as the designation of the medieval Via Francigena ('Way of the Franks') that extended from Britain to Southern Italy, and the 'Longobards in Italy: Places of Power' route. In the hope for increased awareness that could generate preservation funding and touristic visitation, both the 'Longobards in Italy' route and the Camino are currently UNESCO World Heritage sites, while the via Francigena has been nominated to UNESCO as of this writing. That pilgrimage sites constituted the primary cache of heritage sites was also confirmed by UNESCO, who, in assessing its activities after the first 20 years of the 1972 World Heritage Convention, found that its list of World Heritage sites disproportionately skewed towards 'monumental…spiritual' sites (i.e., pilgrimage sites) from across the world (but especially from Europe) (UNESCO, 1994).

Pilgrimage sites often – if not always – hold strategic, ideological importance to some groups, which turns them into heritage and constitutes a shift from religion and religious experience to the experience of some sort of community mediated by the site. Yet, we should remember, as Olsen (2006, p.105) points out, that "even though all religious sites are part of a heritage environment, not all heritage sites are religious". This is an important point, as it reveals the fluidity with which pilgrimage sites can be transformed into heritage sites, but not necessarily the other way around. Indeed, tensions often arise through these shifts (see Garcia-Fuentes, 2013; Garcia-Fuentes, 2016a), and it becomes clear that different groups espouse different understandings of the site, as the contributions by Gita Pai and Shadia Taha in this issue make clear. In both of these passionately argued papers, a central issue that emerges is the site's preservation, which must be understood not just as an act or discussion about preserving material objects or the materiality of a site, but as a moral debate. Once a site is attributed a precise narrative that expresses its heritage value, it is intended to foster – and indeed to codify – idealised experiences intended to educate the viewer on the particular history of a group, rather than to necessarily elevate the viewer or transcend the chaos of the profane world.

Tensions arise from the temporality referenced in these transformed heritage sites. Pilgrimage sites are not only timeless, but they are living places, consistently filled with the prayers, devotional practices, and ex votos of devotees.[2] While heritage sites, of course, are also living sites – they continue to persist in the present, and reflect historical and contextual changes – the act of preservation commonly is seen as keeping them frozen in a particular point in time, causing what some scholars call 'museumification' [Ashworth, (1998), pp.267–268].

This is not only a problem from the theoretical standpoint, but it takes on a moral character. On the one hand, the very decision of what to include or neglect in heritage registers will serve to topographically map out the social experience of one group over that of another, as is the case with the Catholic minority on Rhodes who have embraced the heritagisation process as a way to assert and valorise their presence within a predominantly Greek Orthodox population (Isnart, 2014). Furthermore, a site can be claimed by multiple groups, and tensions may flare when one group authorises a particular heritage discourse (Smith, 2006) that does not align with, or that neglects, other groups' alternative ideologies or understandings of the history of the site and their place in it. This became a particular issue when Preah Vihear, an ancient Khmer monastery straddling a disputed section of the Thai-Cambodia border, was designated by UNESCO as Cambodia's second World Heritage site. Thailand closed the only access point to the temple and temporarily pulled out of the World Heritage Convention; riots broke out in Cambodia and Thailand; both amassed armies on the border, and several soldiers were killed in protracted skirmishes around the site [Di Giovine, (2009), pp.405–408].

On the other hand, it is the responsibility of stewards to ensure a heritage site's material preservation, and therefore to ensure that only architectural or aesthetic interventions that are in line with its authenticity are permitted. Processes of preservation inherently conceptualise some interventions as 'right' and some as 'wrong' or inappropriate – and sometimes go against the practical or spiritual needs of pilgrim-devotees (not to mention the understandings of heritage by non-Western communities; see Kreps, 2003). Joy (2012), for example, points out the tension that has arisen at the Grand Mosque in Djenné, Mali – a World Heritage site – wherein government officials privilege the authenticity and integrity of the structure, while religious leaders cater to the needs of those who use the mosque for religious reasons, even if it means introducing modern materials and amenities such as tiles and electric fans that are anachronous to the historical period for which the Mosque was originally designated. Whose needs take precedence?

Pai's piece in this issue goes further, focusing on the attempts by site managers at the Mīnākṣī-Sundareśvara temple complex in Madurai, India to 'sanitise' the site from living activity. Her word choice is telling. Sanitation was a prime concern for 19th-century colonial administrators in India. Victorian notions of cleanliness – the removal of filth – were aimed at reducing the diseases that would endanger European lives, as well as to clean away evidence of social divides and structural inequality. She links this colonial endeavour to 'sanitise' Madurai with the equally neo-colonial touristic endeavour (see Nash, 1977) to create a positive aesthetic for consumption by today's heritage tourist. Yet this impacts more than aesthetics, she shows: part of what is deemed unappealing is the longstanding and bustling forms of commerce inside the temple complex, which, to the Western sensibility [perhaps literate in the Biblical story of Jesus casting out the merchants from the temple (Matthew 21:12; John 2:15)], is inappropriate and anachronistic with respect to popular 'tourist imaginaries' of the place (see Salazar and Graburn, 2014). This, then, takes on a socio-economic and political bent, especially when considering that the purpose of casting out these private Indian merchants is to increase the destination's touristic allure – and hence its economic profitability for the government.

Politics also plays a role in Taha's examination of Sudanese pilgrimage-cum-heritage sites in Suakin, but from the opposite perspective. Shrine visitation, she argues, is an integral component in popular Sudanese religiosity, and thousands flock to the maritime city's shrines during festival periods. However, such manifestations of popular religion has become increasingly at odds with modern-day (Wahhabi-influenced) orthodox Islamic thought, although Taha contends that these forms of Islam were quite complementary for most of Suakin's history. Shrine visitation in Suakin occurs at modern, living pilgrimage sites – conceived of here as both the tangible cultural heritage of the sites themselves, as well as the intangible cultural heritage of the elaborate ritual performances enacted within them. However, Taha argues that the management authorities in the Sudan embrace outdated ideas of cultural heritage exclusively as archaeological antiquities and monumental ancient structures, ignoring more contemporary structures and intangible heritage processes. Thus, she laments, legislation and preservation processes are limited to only those very museologically conceived sites, and ignoring the living shrines. This, therefore, opens these vibrant pilgrimage sites to threats from development and modernisation projects, and, it could be suspected, by more orthodox religious sympathisers who have advocated for the abolition of such pilgrimages. In this case study, therefore, heritage could function as a formal safeguard, stripping away (and perhaps 'sanitising') the overt religious connotations of the site in a milieu in which such religiosity is deemed taboo – much like the Turkish site managers at the UNESCO-designated early Christian cave churches in Cappadocia's Göreme Open Air Museum have done. Faced with a history of iconoclasm and increasing security threats (Tucker and Carnegie, 2014), the regimented visitation to this site focuses on the Christian community's history and culture, rather than religion, and forbids talk (especially by Christian tour guides) inside the churches [see Di Giovine and Picard, (2015), pp.29–30].

In all of these cases, the question of authority emerges. Just as the Church co-opts a charismatic figure by authorising him or her as a saint, so too is the designation of a heritage site a political endeavour to co-opt and 'routinise the charisma' (Weber, 1958) of popular or problematic historic sites. For example, in the early years of the World Heritage Convention, Italy balked at UNESCO's request to designate Venice as a World Heritage site largely because it was seen as unnecessarily ceding the city's autonomy in controlling its touristic enterprise to UNESCO. Likewise, the town of Cambridge turned town UNESCO's similar invitation because officials deemed they were already adequately protected by their university [van der Aa et al., 2005; Joy, (2012), p.87]. Yet, pilgrimage adds an additional twist, in that it is often considered to be at odds with the profane world. Pilgrimage is inherently destabilising to the secular order. It often fosters – and indeed normatively and ideologically aims to create – a sense of communitas, which Turner (1969; 1974a, pp.60–62; 1974b) calls 'anti-structure', the abandonment of the quotidian trappings and divisions that structure everyday social life. Indeed, even though Eade and Sallnow (1991) famously questioned the universal applicability of Turner's concept, the case studies presented in their volume, which demonstrated that strong contestation occurs both within pilgrim factions and between pilgrims, site managers, and locals, reveal no more adherence to societal norms and ideologies that Turner's cases of communitas. Rather, they all reveal the destabilising and, often, dangerously affective responses to sacrality that still exist outside of the realm of the profane (cf. Di Giovine, 2011a).

Heritagisation changes a religious relic into an artefact. While both are valorised with hyper-meaningfulness and even a sense of sacrality, the meaning and value of this sacredness has changed, as well as the socially prescribed way one is directed to tap into it. While, for example, the goal of a pilgrim may be to bodily access the divine, the goal of the heritage tourist is to understand and commune with a particular social world, in a discrete time period. These divergent objectives necessitate different types of interactions; while pilgrims may strive to touch, kiss, pray and sing at, burn incense at, and leave offerings to a relic, an artefact is subject to what Alpers (1991, p.26) calls the 'museum effect', in which it is "always put under the pressure of seeing". Predicated on the optic sense, this gaze (see Urry, 2002) is a very specific way of interacting with objects and places that is qualitatively different from the religious mode that call on the so-called 'proximate' senses such as touching, hearing, and smelling. People are not allowed to touch an artefact; one cannot touch the frescoes of Giotto in the Basilica of St. Francis in Assisi; one cannot touch (or cover in gold leaf, as is sometimes the practice) the statues of Vishnu or the Buddha in a museum of Khmer antiquities. This is, of course, in part for conservation purposes: the first moral obligation towards heritage is not to facilitate bodily encounters with the Sacred, but to preserve the artefact for posterity through responsible viewing. Yet, this also is indicative of a deeper shift in Western hegemonic thought since the Enlightenment. The Enlightenment shifted the locus at which Western society obtained Truth about itself and individuals' existence from God to the material world, ushering in a paradigmatic shift in Western society's understanding of where, and through what means, reality could be effectively perceived. Rather than privileging the haptic – or the sense of touch as in popular religion – Enlightenment-era thinking privileged the optic sense – the visual – and relegated the 'proximate' senses such as touching, hearing, and smelling to lower levels [Synnott, (1991), p.70; Ong, 1991]. The religious relic was replaced by the artefact as the locus of knowledge, which could be unlocked through expert viewing – or what Conn (2000) calls 'object-based epistemology' [see, especially, Classen and Howes, (2006), p.199].

Tensions may therefore spring up from the confusion and uneasiness with dissonant directives concerning how the once-religious object ought to be consumed as heritage. This occurred, for example, during the extraordinary veneration and translation[3] of Catholic stigmatic and saint, Padre Pio of Pietrelcina (1887–1968), in San Giovanni Rotondo between 2008–2010. Known as a 'living saint' during his lifetime, Pio was buried beneath a church he constructed to accommodate the crush of pilgrims, where he remained interred for 50 years. Yet, his shrine became the epicentre of a legal battle and much disgruntled talk when managers decided to exhume his body, place him on display for an 18-month long veneration, and move his body to a new basilica designed by leading museum architect Renzo Piano and adorned with cutting-edge art from leading contemporary artists – a move, Di Giovine (2015b) argues – that is intended to change the shrine from a site of religious devotion to a heritage site that could remain viable in the event Pio's popularity wanes.

The change in value and prescribed modes of interaction with the site is palpable. Whereas before pilgrims would visit Pio's tomb, kneeling and praying at it, touching it, placing flowers on it, and leaving notes of supplication to the saint, during the exhibition of his body, Pio was placed in a glass case, elevated at eye level, blocked off by those typical velvet ropes that often surround an important artefact in a museum, and pilgrims could only walk around it to look at it, much like a museum object on display. Visitors were even hurried along by guards periodically barking, 'keep moving, please!' as if they were tourists in the Sistine Chapel looking at Michelangelo's ceiling frescoes. Thus, the site managers transformed pilgrims' haptic devotional practices shaped by popular religion to secular, museological tourism practices that privileges the optic.

Pio's eventual placement in the new basilica blended these two diverse styles in equally confusing ways. He was first transferred to a new silver, bejewelled sarcophagus designed by a jeweller-artisan named Goudji, in which his body was no longer visible. It was then entombed within a mosaic-covered pilaster at the centre of the new crypt, just behind a small altar. This pilaster had a large gash through which devotees could partially look at – and touch – the bejewelled reliquary. Pilgrims were free to approach it, and waited in long lines that extended outside of the crypt and down the hallway for a chance to file past Pio's entombed sarcophagus, taking photographs through the gash, dropping letters of supplication inside it, and sticking their hands inside to caress the silver casket and to touch their souvenirs to it. It was an awkward affair, shaped by conflicting cues on how Pio should be epistemologically and ritually approached (Di Giovine, 2015b). Somewhat fortunately, in the years following Pio's re-entombment, the gash was enlarged and Pio's body was placed in his see-through glass case again, allowing for greater haptic and optic access to the relic. But the architectural structure – that was informed less by spiritual needs and more by museological ones, and conditioned competing modes of viewership – nevertheless remains, continuing to create tensions amongst pilgrims and visitors to the basilica.

5 Conclusions

This special issue examines the interrelationship between pilgrimage sites and heritage sites: how religious sites are considered to be indicative of a community's broader cultural heritage, and, conversely (and often simultaneously), how heritage sites become places of pilgrimage to certain groups of visitors who ascribe deep meaning to them. Tourist destinations in general often espouse different, and frequently conflicting, meanings, necessitating for site managers both an understanding of, as well as a sensitivity to, the different communities who stake claims to them. Such sensitivity is perhaps most necessary at sites with heightened ideological value – 'hyper-meaningful' places that play a significant and often central role in a group's cosmology, social identity, or ability to maintain well-being; both pilgrimage sites and heritage sites (local, national, regional, and 'universal') are examples par excellence of this phenomenon. The overlap between pilgrimage sites and heritage sites is great, particularly in the post-modern 21st century tourism milieu, wherein visitors often call their secular travels 'pilgrimages' (scholars have discussed 'pilgrimages' to Elvis' Graceland and Michael Jackson's Neverland, to the Baseball Hall of Fame, to important restaurants, and, most prominently, to imagined 'homelands', ancestral motherlands, or sites of cultural heritage). This interface is most evident – and indeed, enshrined – in UNESCO's World Heritage List, which, particularly in its first 20 years, ascribed 'universal cultural value' primarily to religious places that have historically been pilgrimage sites: cathedrals, temples, shrines, sacred landscapes, and pilgrimage routes.

Whether religious or secular in orientation (or both), pilgrimage sites are hyper-meaningful and hyper-valued; most are, and have been, prime actors in the history, politics and economics of a people. It is understandable that communities see the need to designate them as their heritage [Isnart, (2008), p.80], to claim strategic ownership over them, to preserve them, or celebrate them for their social import. Yet, we have argued that tensions often arise in their heritagisation. While both forms of places can (and often are) considered sacred, the meanings and values attributed to this sacrality is divergent: For pilgrimage sites, we argued, sacred refers to the divine, supernatural, or extramundane; especially when they are religious in nature, visitors therefore interact with the site in bodily ways in an attempt to commune directly with the divine. When these active religious sites are converted to heritage sites, this meaning is re-directed. At its essence, therefore, the heritagisation process is one of de-sacralisation and re-sacralisation. That is, in the 'scientising' process of researching, documenting, analysing, management planning, and preservation of the place, the site is decoupled from its religious context and re-inserted into another that is focused on the history and value of the community. Through its preservation, designation, and insertion onto highly visible lists, the place is given a new form of heightened importance, a new sacredness. As the papers in this issue show, this conversion is not without its tensions; the process is inherently political, it privileges certain aspects of the place's life history at the expense of others, and it entails on the part of visitors certain prescribed forms of interaction and sensory perception that is significantly divergent from pilgrimage. Site managers therefore must be cognisant of this difference; they must understand that different visitors espouse different significances to the same site, and therefore necessitate different forms of encounters with them. Yet, as the cases in this issue also reveal, and as Zara's paper makes particularly clear, one should not shy away from attributing multiple meanings to these sites. Rather than 'sanitise' or purify them of alternative meanings, site managers should embrace them, looking for novel was of accommodating – and even facilitating – alternative forms of interaction with the object of (religious or secular) veneration. In this way, the 'messiness' of seemingly dissonant meanings can itself be repurposed into a productive dialogue between pilgrimage and heritage, the sacred and the profane, and the religious and secular, that can lead to new and innovative practices associated with the site. It is through such negotiation at these hyper-meaningful and ultra-affective sites that, hopefully, a more peaceful means of coexistence within and between social groups can be fostered.

References

Alpers, S. (1991) 'The museum as a way of seeing', in Karp, I. and Lavine, S.D. (Eds.): *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, pp.25–32, Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

Appadurai, A. and Breckenridge, C. (1991) 'Museums are good to think: heritage on view in India', in Karp, I., Kreamer, C. and Levine, S. (Eds.): *Museums and their Communities: The Politics of Public Culture*, pp.34–55, Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

Ashworth, G.J. (1997) 'Conservation as preservation or as heritage: two paradigms and two answers', *Built Environment*, Vol. 23, No. 2, pp.92–102.

Ashworth, G.J. (1998) 'The conserved European city as culture symbol: the meaning of the text', in Graham, B.P. (Ed.): *Modern Europe: Place, Culture and Identity*, pp.261–286, Arnold Press, London.

Ashworth, G.J. (2008) 'Heritage: definitions, delusions and dissonances', in Almoêda, R. et al. (Eds.): *Heritage 2008. World Heritage and Sustainable Development*, pp.3–9, Green Lines Institute for Sustainable Development, Lisbon.

Badone, E. and Roseman, S.R. (2004) *Intersecting Journeys: The Anthropology of Pilgrimage and Tourism*, pp.1–23, University of Illinois, Champaign.

Baudrillard, J. (1994) Translated by Sheila Faria Glaser, *Simulacra and Simulation*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.

Bauman, Z. (1996) 'From pilgrim to tourist', in Hall, S. and Du Gay, P. (Eds.): *Questions of Cultural Identification*, pp.18–36, Sage, London.

Benjamin, W. (1968[1936]) 'The work of art in the age of mechanical reproduction', in Zohn, H. (Trans.): *Illuminations*, pp.217–251, Schocken Books, New York.

Bennett, T. (1995) *The Birth of the Museum*, Routledge, London.

Bodenstein, F. (2011) 'The emotional museum: thoughts on the secular relics of nineteenth century history museums in Paris and their posterity', *Conserveries Mémorielles*, Vol. 9 [online] https://cm.revues.org/834 (accessed 22 February 2016).

Bresc-Bautier, G. (2001) 'Denon et Lenoir, éternels rivaux, vieux complices', in Gallo, D. (Ed.): *Les Vies de Dominique-Vivant Denon. Actes du colloque organisé au Musée du Louvre par le service culturel du 8 au 11 décembre 1999*, t. 2, pp.367–380, La Documentation française, Paris.

Burton, S.R. (1855) *Personal Narrative of a Pilgrimage to El-Medinah and Mecca*, Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans, London.

Cameron, C. and Rössler, M. (2013) *Many Voices, One Vision: The Early Years of the World Heritage Convention*, Ashgate, Surrey.

Classen, C. and Howes, D. (2006) 'The museum as sensescape: western sensibilities and indigenous artifacts', in Edwards, E. et al. (Eds.): *Sensible Objects: Colonialism, Museums and Material Culture*, pp.199–222, Berg Publishers, Oxford.

Coleman, S. and Elsner, J. (1995) *Pilgrimage Past and Present in the World Religions*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Conn, S. (2000) *Museums and American Intellectual Life*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Connerton, P. (1989) *How Societies Remember*, Cambridge University Press, NY.

Cosgrove, D. (2003) 'Heritage and history: a venetian geography lesson', in Peckham, R.S. (Ed.): *Rethinking Heritage: Culture and Politics in Europe*, pp.113–123, I.B. Tauris, London.

Council of Europe (1949) *Statute of the Council of Europe*, 5 May 1949, London.

Council of Europe (1994) *Practical Guide to Cultural Routes of the Council of Europe (Advisory Committee for Cultural Routes of the Council of Europe 3rd meeting) (CULT-CR), ICCE*, 8 rev, 17 March, Vol. 94.

Crosette, B. (2001) 'Taliban explains Buddha demolition', *New York Times*, 19 March [online] http://www.nytimes.com/2001/03/19/world/19TALI.html (accessed 22 February 2016).

Cunningham, L. (1980) *The Meaning of Saints*, Harper and Row, NY.

Cunningham, L. (2005) *A Brief History of Saints*, Blackwell Publishing, Maldan, MA.

Dagens, B. (1995) *Angkor: Heart of an Asian Empire*, Harry N. Abrams, Inc., NY.

Delooz, P. (1983) 'Towards a sociological study of canonized sainthood', in Wilson, S. (Ed.): *Saints and their Cults: Studies in Religious Sociology, Folklore and History*, pp.189–215, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Di Giovine, M.A. (2009) *The Heritage-Scape: UNESCO, World Heritage, and Tourism*, Lexington Books, Lanham.

Di Giovine, M.A. (2011a) 'Pilgrimage: communitas and contestation, unity and difference – an introduction', *Tourism: An International, Interdisciplinary Journal*, Vol. 59, No. 3, pp.247–270.

Di Giovine, M.A. (2011b) 'Re-presenting a contemporary saint: Padre Pio of Pietrelcina', in Meltzer, F. and Elsner, J. (Eds.): *Saints: Faith without Borders*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Di Giovine, M.A. (2012a) 'A tale of two cities: Padre Pio and the reimagining of Pietrelcina and San Giovanni Rotondo', *Textus: English Studies in Italy*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp.155–167.

Di Giovine, M.A. (2012b) 'Passionate movements: emotional and social dynamics of Padre Pio Pilgrims', in Picard, D. and Robinson, M. (Eds.): *Emotion in Motion: Tourism, Affect and Transformation*, Ashgate, Surrey.

Di Giovine, M.A. (2013) 'Apologia Pro Turismo: breaking inter- and intra-disciplinary boundaries in the study of tourism and pilgrimage', *The Journal of Tourism Challenges and Trends*, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp.63–94.

Di Giovine, M.A. (2014) 'World heritage list: criteria, inscription, representation', in Smith, C. (Ed.): *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*, pp.7885–7894, Springer Publications, New York.

Di Giovine, M.A. (2015a) 'UNESCO's world heritage program: the challenges and ethics of community participation', in Adell, N., Bendix, R., Bortolotto, C. and Tauschek, M. (Eds.): *Between Imagined Communities and Communities of Practice: Participation, Territory, and the Making of Heritage*, Universitätsverlag Göttingen, Göttingen.

Di Giovine, M.A. (2015b) 'When popular religion becomes authorized heritage: the case of Padre Pio and his Shrine of San Giovanni Rotondo', in Silverman, H. and Robinson, M. (Eds.): *Encounters with Popular Pasts: Cultural Heritage and Popular Culture*, pp.31–47, Springer Publications, NY.

Di Giovine, M.A. and Cowie, S. (2014) 'The definitional problem of patrimony and the futures of cultural heritage', *Anthropology News*, March, pp.33–34.

Di Giovine, M.A. and Eade, J. (2016) 'Pilgrimage', in Hayes, P. (Ed.): *Encyclopedia of Miracles*, ABC-CLIO, Santa Barbara.

Di Giovine, M.A. and Elsner, J. (2016) 'Pilgrimage tourism', in Jafari, J. and Xiao, H. (Eds.): *Encyclopedia of Tourism*, Springer, NY.

Di Giovine, M.A. and Picard, D. (2015) *The Seductions of Pilgrimage: Sacred Journeys Afar and Astray in the Western Religious Tradition*, Ashgate, Surrey.

Duncan, C. (2004) *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums*, Routledge, NY.

Eade, J. and Sallnow, M. (1991) *Contesting the Sacred: The Anthropology of Christian Pilgrimage*, University of Illinois Press, Urbana and Chicago.

Ebron, P. (2000) 'Tourists as pilgrims: commercial refashioning of transatlantic relations', *American Ethnologist*, Vol. 26, No. 4, pp.910–932.

Eliade, M. (1959) Translated by Willard R. Trask, *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion*, Harcourt, Brace, New York.

Eliade, M. (1967) 'Cosmogonic myth and sacred histories', *Religious Studies*, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp.171–183.

Elsner, J. (2000) 'The Itinerarium Burdigalense: politics and salvation in the geography of Constantine's empire', *Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 90, pp.181–195.

Ford, D. and Tawfeeq, M. (2014) 'Extremists destroy Jonah's Tomb, officials say', *CNN*, 25 July [online] http://www.cnn.com/2014/07/24/world/iraq-violence/index.html (accessed 22 February 2016).

Foucault, M. (1991) *Technologies of the Self*, University of Massachusetts Press, Amherst.

Frankel, Y. (2013) 'Pilgrimages: spaces of peace and conflict', in Pazos, A. (Ed.): *Pilgrims and Pilgrimages as Peacemakers in Christianity, Judaism and Islam*, pp.63–83, Ashgate, Surrey.

Frei, C. (2006) *The Giant Buddhas*, Documentary film, 95'11'.

Freud, S. (Ed.) (1950) 'On transience', in Strachey, J. (Trans.): *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, Vol. 14, pp.305–307, The Hogarth Press, London.

Gammon, S. (2004) 'Secular pilgrimage and sport tourism', in Ritchie, B.W. and Adair, D. (Eds.): *Sport Tourism: Interrelationships, Impacts and Issues*, pp.30–45, Channel View, Clevedon.

Garcia-Fuentes, J-M. (2013) 'A nation of monasteries: the legacy of Víctor Balaguer in the Spanish conception of national monuments', *Future Anterior*, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp.40–51.

Garcia-Fuentes, J-M. (2016a) 'Guidebooks, postcards, and panoramas: the building of montserrat through modern mass media', *Memory Studies*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp.63–74.

Garcia-Fuentes, J-M. (2016b) 'Architecture, politics and ideology in the construction of modern montserrat', in Lepine, A. and Jordan, K. (Eds.): *Building the Kingdom: Architecture for Religious Communities*, Pickering & Chatto, London.

Grabow, S. (2010) 'The Santiago de Compostela Pilgrim routes: the development of European cultural heritage policy and practice from a critical perspective', *European Journal of Archaeology*, Vol. 13, No. 1, pp.89–116.

Graburn, N. (2001) 'Secular ritual: a general theory of tourism', in Smith, V. and Brent, M. (Eds.): *Hosts and Guests Revisited: Tourism Issues of the 21st Century*, Cognizant Communications, NY.

Graham, B.J. (2002) 'Heritage as knowledge, capital or culture', *Urban Studies*, Vol. 39, Nos. 5–6, pp.1003–1017.

Halbwachs, M. (1992) Translated by Lewis A. Coser, *On Collective Memory*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Harrison, D. and Hitchcock, M. (Eds.) (2005) *The Politics of World Heritage: Negotiating Tourism and Conservation*, Channel View Publications, Clevedon.

Harrison, R. (2013) *Heritage: Critical Approaches*, Routledge, London.

Harrison, R. (Ed.) (2010) *Understanding the Politics of Heritage*, Manchester University Press, Manchester.

Harvey, D. (2001) 'Heritage pasts and heritage presents: temporality, meaning, and the scope of heritage studies', *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, Vol. 7, No. 4, pp.319–338.

Huntington, S. (1993) 'The clash of civilizations?', *Foreign Affairs*, Summer, Vol. 72, No. 3, pp.22–49.

Ilcan, S. and Phillips, L. (2006) 'Governing peace: global rationalities of security and UNESCO's Culture of Peace Campaign', *Anthropologica*, Vol. 48, No. 1, pp.59–71.

Isnart, C. (2008) 'Making saints and performing locality as heritagization? An ethnography of local holiness and village identity in the French and Italian Alps', *Journal of Mediterranean Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp.79–91.

Isnart, C. (2014) 'Changing the face of Catholicism in a tourist context: heritage care, ritual dynamics, and the rhetoric of transformation of a religious minority in Greece', *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp.133–149.

James-Sarazin, A. (2004) 'Aux Grands Hommes, la Patrie reconnaissante', *Archives et nations dans l'Europe du XIXe siècle. Actes du colloque organisé par l'École des Chartes en 2001*, pp.215–233, Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes, Paris.

Jasud, L. (2011) 'St. Elvis', in Meltzer, F. and Elsner, J. (Eds.): *Saints: Faith without Borders*, pp.35–44, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

John Paul II (1983) 'Divinus Perfectionis Magister', in *New Laws for the Causes of Saints*, Congregation for the Causes of Saints, Rome [online] http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/csaints/documents/rc_con_csaints_doc_07021983_norme_en.html (accessed 22 February 2016).

Joy, C. (2012) *The Politics of Heritage Management in Mali: From UNESCO to Djenné*, Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek.

Katriel, T. (1997) *Performing the Past: A Study of Israeli Settlement Museums*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. (1998) *Destination Culture: Tourism, Museums and Heritage*, University of California Press, Berkeley.

Kreps, C. (2003) *Liberating Culture: Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Museums, Curation and Heritage Preservation*, Routledge, London.

Labadi, S. (2013) *UNESCO, Cultural Heritage, and Outstanding Universal Value*, Altamira, Lanham.

Lowenthal, D. (1985) *The Past is a Foreign Country*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Lowenthal, D. (1996) *Possessed by the Past: The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*, The Free Press, New York.

Morinis, E.A. (1983) 'Pilgrimage and tourism', *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp.569–570.

Morinis, E.A. (1992) *Sacred Journeys: The Anthropology of Pilgrimage*, Greenwood Press, Westport, CT.

Nash, D. (1977) 'Tourism as a form of imperialism', in Smith, V. (Ed.): *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*, pp.37–52, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

Naumov, N. (2015) 'Heritage and tourism: reconceptulisation of the past as an experience', *Journal of Tourism and Services*, Vol. 6, No. 11, pp.60–65.

Olsen, D. (2006) 'Management issues for religious heritage attractions', in Timothy, D. and Olsen, D. (Eds.): *Tourism, Religion, and Spiritual Journeys*, pp.104–118, Routledge, London.

Ong, W.J. (1991) 'The shifting sensorium', in Howes, D. (Ed.): *The Varieties of Sensory Experience: A Sourcebook in the Anthropology of the Senses*, pp.25–30, University of Toronto Press, Toronto.

Orsi, R. (1991) 'The center out there, in here, and everywhere else: the nature of pilgrimage to the Shrine of Saint Jude, 1929–1965', *Journal of Social History*, Vol. 25, No. 2, pp.213–232.

Plato (1997) Edited by John M. Cooper and D.S. Hutchinson, *Complete Works*, Hackett Publishing, Cambridge.

Preston, J. (1992) 'Spiritual magnetism: an organizing principle for the study of pilgrimage', in Morinis, A. (Ed.): *Sacred Journeys: the Anthropology of Pilgrimage*, pp.31–46, Greenwood Press, Westport.

Raymond, A. (2015) 'Here's a list of attacks against black churches in the past 25 years', *New York Magazine*, 18 June [online] http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2015/06/25-years-of-attacks-on-black-churches.html (accessed 24 February 2016).

Recht, R. (1999) *Penser le patrimoine. Mise en scène et mise en ordre de l'art*, Hazan, Paris.

Recht, R. (2003) *Victor Hugo et le débat patrimonial*, Somogy, Paris.

Recht, R. (2008) Translated by Mary Whittall, *Believing and Seeing: The Art of Gothic Cathedrals*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Salazar, N. and Graburn, N. (Eds.) (2014) *Tourism Imaginaries: Anthropological Approaches*, Berghahn, Oxford.

Sarno, R. (1986) Interview by Robert Moynihan, *The Men Who Make Saints*, National Catholic Register, 7 December.

Schuster, J.M. (2002) *Making a List and Checking it Twice: The List as a Tool of Historic Preservation*, Working Paper 14, The Cultural Policy Center at the University of Chicago, Chicago.

Serjeant, R.B. (1981) 'Haram and Hawtah: the sacred enclave in Arabia', in Serjeant, R.B. (Ed.): *Studies in Arabian History and Civilisation*, Variorum Reprints, London.

Shaheen, K. and Black, I. (2015) 'Beheaded Syrian scholar refused to lead ISIS to hidden Palmyra antiquities', *The Guardian*,. 19 August [online] http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/aug/18/isis-beheads-archaeologist-syria (accessed 23 February 2015).

Shepherd, R. (2013) *Faith in Heritage: Displacement, Development and Religious Tourism in Contemporary China*, Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek.

Singh, R.P.B. (Ed.) (2010) 'Varanasi, India's cultural heritage city: contestation, conservation and planning', in *Heritagescapes and Cultural Landscapes*, pp.205–254, Shubhi Publications, New Delhi.

Smith, L. (2006) *Uses of Heritage*, Routledge, London.

Smith, L. (2015) 'Theorizing museum and heritage visiting', in Witcomb, A. and Message, K. (Eds.): *The International Handbooks of Museum Studies: Museum Theory*, pp.459–484, John Wiley and Sons, Ltd., NY.

Stadick, A. (1999) 'Saint Patrons: the role of archives in the Roman Catholic process of canonization', *Archival Issues*, Vol. 24, No. 2, pp.123–143.

Synnott, A. (1991) 'Puzzling over the senses: from Plato to Marx', in Howes, D. (Ed.): *The Varieties of Sensory Experience: A Sourcebook in the Anthropology of the Senses*, pp.61–76, University of Toronto Press, Toronto.

Tharoor, I. (2012) 'Mali: why Islamists are wrecking Mali's cultural heritage', *Time* [online] http://world.time.com/2012/07/02/timbuktus-destruction-why-islamists-are-wrecking-malis-cultural-heritage/ (accessed 22 February 2016).

Tucker, H. and Carnegie, E. (2014) 'World heritage and the contradictions of universal value', *Annals of Tourism Research*, July, Vol. 47, pp.63–76.

Turner, V. (1969) *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*, Lewis Henry Morgan Lectures, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

Turner, V. (1973) 'The center out there: pilgrim's goal', *History of Religions*, 1 February, Vol. 12, No. 3, pp.191–230.

Turner, V. (1974a) 'Liminal to liminoid in play, flow and ritual: an essay on comparative symbology', *Rice University Studies*, Vol. 60, No. 3, pp.63–92.

Turner, V. (1974b) 'Pilgrimage and communitas', *Studia Missionalia*, Vol. 23, No. 1, pp.305–307.

Turner, V. (1974c) 'Pilgrimages as social processes', in *Dramas, Fields and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society*, pp.166–229, Cornell University Press, Ithaca.

UNESCO (1994) *Expert Meeting on the 'Global Strategy' and Thematic Studies for a Representative World Heritage List*, (WHC-94/CONF.003/INF.6), 20–22 June, Paris.

UNESCO (2008) *World Heritage Information Kit*, World Heritage Centre, Paris.

United States Catholic Conference and Libreria Editrice Vaticana (1994) *Catechism of the Catholic Church/English*, Liguori Publications, Ligouri, MO.

Urry, J. (2002) *The Tourist Gaze*, 2nd ed., SAGE, London.

van der Aa, B., Groote, P.D. and Huigen, P. (2005) 'World heritage as NIMBY? The case of the Dutch part of the Wadden Sea', in Harrison, D. and Hitchcock, M. (Eds.): *The Politics of World Heritage: Negotiating Tourism and Conservation*, pp.11–22, Channel View Publications, Clevedon.

van Gennep, A. (1960) *The Rites of Passage*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Weber, M. (1958) Edited and translated by H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, Oxford University Press, New York.

Wertsch, J. (2002) *Voices of Collective Remembering*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Zerubavel, Y. (1995) *Recovered Roots*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Notes

1 For an excellent examination of both the Taliban's motivations for the destruction of the Bamiyan Buddhas, as well as the impact on the locals who live in the caves at the site, see Frei (2006).

2 For photographic illustrations of these from both a secular and religious perspectives, see Jasud (2011) and Di Giovine (2011b), respectively.

3 'Translation' (traslatio) is the official term for the ritual transfer of a relic from one space to another.