July 2015

Producing the Dead Sea Scrolls: (Trans)national Heritage and the Politics of Popular Representation

Evan P. Taylor
University of Massachusetts Amherst

Producing the Dead Sea Scrolls: (Trans)national Heritage and the Politics of Popular Representation

A Thesis Presented

by

EVAN P. TAYLOR

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts Amherst in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

May 2015

Department of Anthropology

Producing the Dead Sea Scrolls: (Trans)national Heritage and the Politics of Popular Representation

A Thesis Presented

by

EVAN P. TAYLOR

Approved as to style and content by:

_____

Elizabeth S. Chilton, Chair

_____

Jane E. Anderson, Member

_____

Michael O. Sugerman, Member

_____

Thomas L. Leatherman, Chair
Department of Anthropology

DEDICATION

To Mom, Dad, and Lauren, for your incredible support, always.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

ABSTRACT

PRODUCING THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS: (TRANS)NATIONAL HERITAGE AND

THE POLITICS OF POPULAR REPRESENTATION

MAY 2015

EVAN P. TAYLOR, B.A., UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO

M.A., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Directed by: Elizabeth S. Chilton

This thesis explores the politics of representing the assemblage of ancient manuscripts known as the Dead Sea Scrolls to popular audiences in Israel, the occupied West Bank, and the United States. I demonstrate that these objects of national heritage are circulated along transnational routes to maintain the legitimacy of nationalist discourse abroad. Three sites—the Shrine of the Book at the Israel Museum in Jerusalem, Qumran National Park in the West Bank, and a travelling exhibit presented at the Boston Museum of Science—are examined for textual narrative, spatial arrangement, and visitor behavior. Analysis of these observations illuminates two recurring motifs common to all three sites: the restoration of an ancient ethno-national landscape (*Eretz Israel* or the "land of Israel") in the contemporary landscape of Palestine/Israel and the important legacy of ancient Jewish society in contemporary Israel and "the West." These motifs and the way they are presented through a framing of cultural heritage can be associated with a larger nationalist discourse maintained by Israeli state authorities and mainstream media that perpetuates a linking of western liberal and Zionist ideologies. I contend that the transnational circulation of this nationalist heritage narrative works to legitimize—at a

global scale—an ongoing Israeli program of occupation and settlement in Palestinian territory subsumed under the biblical/Zionist frame of the "land of Israel." While making preliminary suggestions toward critical interventions, I also suggest that the analysis of transnational encounters with nationalist heritage merits deeper ethnographic investigation towards understanding its impact on individuals' political (in)action towards the Israel/Palestine conflict.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

<u>Problem Statement</u>

In September 2014, Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu declared to the

United Nations General Assembly:

> The people of Israel are not occupiers in the Land of Israel. History, archaeology
> and common sense all make clear that we have had a singular attachment to this
> land for over 3,000 years. (Netanyahu 2014)

His statement confronts both specific opposition to Israeli settlement and occupation of

territories taken by the state in the 1967 Six-Day War, and general questions of national

legitimacy posed by states that do not maintain ties or recognize the State of Israel. It

naturalizes expansionist policies as ones of return and restoration, in lieu of nationalism,

settler-colonialism, and displacement. That communities use the past as a space to

construct their sense of identity and place is a basic tenet in studies of nationalism and

heritage. But Netanyahu's invocation at the UN of both "expert" and "common"

knowledge about the past as legitimation for territorial control suggests that national

imaginings of the past are also at work in global circuits of diplomacy and recognition,

with important and devastating consequences for all those not included as "people of

Israel." Here, and as I explore in this thesis, an image of a people, a place, and their

intertwined past known well *within* the nation-state is thrust into the world.

Heritage, a process of meaning-making about the past in the present, may instill

and reflect place attachment, but it is also a process affected by mobility. Meanings

generated by individuals and groups in their interactions with heritage-related objects,

places, images, and texts may change as those people and things move about. Mobile

1

groups such as diasporic and displaced communities do not leave their stories of the past in their homelands when they settle in a new land, and indeed these often figure centrally in their individual and collective identities (Malkki 1995; Slyomovics 1998; Habib 2004). Other mobile groups, such as tourists, do not abandon the historical narratives they encounter in their travels when they leave a heritage site far from their home (Noy 2004; Cary 2004). How these groups use the past differs drastically, as does their reason for movement. But they demonstrate that mobility involves more than simply the movement of people and objects. "Mobility," employed in this thesis as a social practice, involves the circulation of ideas that accompany mobile agents, whether human or non-human, that can inform political and social debates along their routes. In this space, I consider the intersections of heritage with nationalism, settler-colonialism, and globalization as I trace the transnational mobilities of people, objects, and ideas that accompany popular representations of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the oldest known assemblage of biblical manuscripts, in Israel, the occupied West Bank, and the United States.

<u>Objectives</u>

My primary objective in this thesis is to examine how a recognized practice of nationalistic framing of the past in the domestic sphere of Israel has come to operate in transnational contexts. Now more than ever, objects of Israeli national heritage—perhaps best represented by the Dead Sea Scrolls—travel the world, and foreign tourists flock to Israeli national heritage sites. These Scrolls, dated to the first century BCE through the first century CE and found in 1946, shortly before the State of Israel declared its independence, have become symbols of national belonging and return in the "land of

Israel"[1] (the term derived from the biblical and Zionist *Eretz Israel*, designating the territory roughly delimited as contemporary Israel and Palestine). What emerges through their transnational representation is a nationalism that invites participation by both national and non-national actors. Israeli archaeology and heritage practice are well recognized for their nationalistic dimensions in the heritage studies literature (Silberman 1989; Ben-Yehuda 1995; Glock 1999; Abu El-Haj 2001; Halotte and Joffe 2002). I trace this development of a national archaeological tradition in chapter II, but ultimately my aim is to push this exploration beyond the realm of domestic nationalism. The object of this inquiry is to explore how nationalistic narratives come to operate also among non-national audiences, what Salazar (2014:55) has identified as an anthropological interest in "post-local" nationalism. I do not intend to obscure the important work that others have done in identifying ongoing complicity of certain practices within Israeli archaeology with settler-colonialism and nationalistic fervor, but rather to illuminate this tradition's expansion to global stages. Israel as a nation is not confined to the imaginaries of Israeli citizens, but is being narrated and imagined worldwide.

This leads to a secondary objective of theoretical development. I aim to develop the notion of heritage in its mobile and transnational contexts through a methodological orientation towards the routes (rather than *roots*) of Israeli nationalist heritage discourse. Clifford (1997) is notable for encouraging anthropologists to turn their attention to trajectories and travel in addition to cultural centers and intensive fieldsites such as "the

---

[1] Throughout this thesis, the phrases "the land" and "land of Israel" are used in quotation marks to remind the reader of their highly contested usage as nationalistic geographical designations in contemporary political discourse. I use these phrases in lieu of "Israel/Palestine" or "Palestine/Israel" where I discuss Dead Sea Scrolls sites, which invoke this terminology directly and indirectly (through imagery, narrative, maps, etc.).

village". He reminds us that culture is regimented through displacement, interference, and interaction along its boundaries at least as much as in the "controlled laboratory" of a village (Clifford 1997:25). As such, I turn my attention to tracing the transnational mobilities of a nationalist heritage narrative. I examine representations of the Dead Sea Scrolls in museum exhibits and archaeological sites in Israel, the occupied West Bank, and the United States to track shifts in heritage narratives as they are represented to different audiences, domestic and foreign, accounting for the particularities of Israeli nationalism in motion while also paying attention the generalizable characteristics of the mobilities of heritage

The significance of examining Israeli nationalism in transnational contexts stems from the increasingly globalized nature of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Where Israel has traditionally relied on unconditional support from the West in terms of recognition, defense, and growth, its lack of cooperation in peace talks, repeated military offensives in Gaza, and ongoing settlement expansion in the West Bank has stimulated reprimand, if only on a rhetorical level from its most reliable ally, the United States (Indyk *et al* 2012:35-37). With the perceived collapse of direct peace talks, the Palestinian Authority has turned its quest for sovereignty and recognition toward the United Nations and its agencies[2]. But might we benefit from understanding how these politics play out beyond the more recognizable levels of international governance? What dimensions of these politics of recognition are played out on the level of mass communications, leisure, and popular culture? By focusing my analysis on archaeological sites and exhibits, I identify

---

[2] While global Palestinian heritage politics is not covered in detail in this thesis, this important topic has recently been addressed by De Cesari (2009, 2010) and Kersel and Luke (2012).

two principal themes that resonate directly with these debates: (1) the recovery of an ancient Jewish landscape in the whole of Israel/Palestine, and (2) the marking of the Dead Sea Scrolls as symbols of Israel's national legacy to "the West."

What is at stake in these themes? In the first instance, the three representations tie the Dead Sea Scrolls to "the land of Israel" (or simply "the land" as it is often abbreviated at Israeli heritage sites), loosely definable as the territory delimited by contemporary Israel/Palestine. The phrases "the land" or "land of Israel" are used at Dead Sea Scrolls sites as substitutes for other possible geographic categories such as "Israel," "Palestine," "the Holy Land," "Israel/Palestine," or "the Levant," and allows authors to escape the fraught role of naming the region on political or religious grounds while nonetheless making a territorial claim on the region as a whole. It is a phrase that legitimizes state authorities' claims to the past while delegitimizing Palestinian—and other—discourses of place and belonging that stand in contest. In the second instance, emphasizing the importance of the Dead Sea Scrolls not just for Israelis, but for all those who share in "Western" values and traditions, maintains the articulation of Zionist and Western liberal ideals. It allows Western visitors to these sites imagine themselves as part of an important historical trajectory that is intricately connected to the history of Israel.

My analysis of three Dead Sea Scrolls "sites" (two museum exhibits and one archaeological site) is guided by the following questions: how is the national past narrated in transnational contexts? How do formal heritage representations work to place limits on audience interpretations? And lastly, what might be the consequences for both national and non-national actors in representing a history of place and belonging as natural, when outside of representation it is highly contested? By exploring these

questions of mobile and transnational representations, my aim is to provide a framework for future ethnographic investigation towards audience encounters with heritage in transnational settings.

With an eye towards agency in audience and heritage studies (Lewis and Jhally 1998; Hall 2001; Rancière 2009 ; Harrison 2013), this research should also be useful for staging interventions towards participatory and emancipatory representations. Despite the authoritative weight that official representations carry, nothing binds museum and site visitors to the narratives being offered. Harrison (2013) reminds us of the dialogic dimension of heritage—heritage as a relationship, personal and collective, between people and things. Without any promising sign of change in the domain of corporate museum directorship and national culture ministries, we must recognize the agency involved in producing heritage as a museum or site visitor. Thus, while critically engaging with these representations, I end by considering possibilities for engaging visitors outside of the formal museum or site representation. The aim here is to critically confront the qualities of official Dead Sea Scrolls representations that make them so meaningful to Israeli nationalist discourse, while re-articulating them to their entanglements with settler-colonialism and cultural appropriation in Israel/Palestine. Such a practice might thus stimulate productive conversations about social justice and reparations through the vehicle of heritage.

Background

Heritage Mobility and the Semiotics of the Dead Sea Scrolls

The basic practice that I examine in this thesis is one of putting heritage into motion. "Heritage," as I speak of it here is both a discourse and a relationship. On one

hand, Smith (2006) has identified a particular set of assumptions grounded in innate

value, expert judgment, time depth, and nation building that has become attached to the

term "heritage". She identifies this set of assumptions as the "authorized heritage

discourse"—a discourse emergent from Western elite values that conditions the way

"heritage" is used. Smith (2006:6) emphasizes the notion of heritage as process, and the

importance of thinking about the consequences of heritage in people's lives as it

intersects "[…] with a range of social and cultural debates about the legitimacy of a range

of values and identities, and subsequently plays a part in their validation, negotiation, and

regulation." I ask, what happens when *many* groups in *many* places engage with the

authorized heritage discourse as it pertains to a particular set of objects and sites? I

engage with this challenge by illuminating nationalistic dimensions of representations of

the Dead Sea Scrolls, situating them within debates about Israeli and Palestinian national

legitimacies as they unfold in Israel/Palestine and the United States.

Heritage is also a relationship that emerges from people's engagements with

things, places, and ideas (Harrison 2013). This dialogical way of framing heritage

emphasizes the decision-making involved on the part of author and audience in terms of

how they make meaning of their relationship to such objects as the Dead Sea Scrolls as

well as their contextual narrative. In their current form, representations of the Dead Sea

Scrolls restrict dialogue between audience and object, employing a uni-directional

interpretive narrative from author to audience. But taking up the notion of heritage as

inherently dialogical opens the possibility of complicating those existing categories of

author and audience by allowing non-expert, competing, and alternative voices to emerge

as authorial. According to Harrison (2013:230), however, to foreground these other forms

of heritage-decision making requires the intentional production and maintenance of hybrid forums in which the authorized heritage discourse can be undermined. I point to some of these possibilities of alternative representations in my concluding remarks.

The three Dead Sea Scrolls "sites" that I examine in this thesis all operate in the context of Smith's (2006) authorized heritage discourse. In all cases, they emphasize time depth and the innate bond between the Jewish people and the "land of Israel." I contend that this narrative is politically potent in its spaces of representation (Israel/Palestine and the United States) due the prominence of Zionist ideology in both places. In Israel/Palestine, it serves to maintain Israeli control over the region's past, as it becomes increasingly difficult for the state to claim its entirety in the present. Nevertheless, it is used to cling to some control, to legitimize the settlement project, and to delegitimize competing Palestinian (and other) discourses of place and belonging. In the United States, it upholds what Said (1992:37) called "the complete hegemonic coalescence between the liberal Western view of things and the Zionist-Israeli view," the basis for unconditional support of the Israeli state, and lack of substantive pressure to halt its colonizing policies. Dead Sea Scrolls sites uphold reason and idealism, so central to both Zionism and liberalism, as values above all others. Through the authoritative voice of the historical sciences, they represent a homeland—not a contested land—pretending to speak for all of its people—in fact, silencing dissent. They speak directly to Western audiences by emphasizing ancient Israel's biblical legacy in the tangible and embodied form of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

How do the Dead Sea Scrolls come to convey such powerful meanings? I suggest that these meanings are encoded into representations of the Dead Sea Scrolls through a

process similar to that of linguistic enregisterment. Enregisterment, as defined by linguistic anthropologist Asif Agha (2005:38), is a "process whereby distinct forms of speech come to be socially recognized (or enregistered) as indexical of speaker attributes by a population of language users." In this thesis, I adapt the concept of enregisterment to include both linguistic *and* material (Shankar and Cavanaugh 2012) forms in the process of constructing indexicality of a community. The Scrolls become indexical of the Jews in the "land of Israel," as well as their ideological contributions to Western thought, through the co-signifiers of language (i.e. ancient Hebrew writing) and object (i.e. preserved and in situ ancient manuscripts and associated archaeological remains). This semiotic approach to popular representations of the Scrolls allows us to think deeply about what authors put into representations, and how it encourages a "preferred reading" (Hall 2001) on the part of site visitors. Particular forms of representing the Dead Sea Scrolls conjure up particular images of the people who created them—Jews in the "land of Israel"—and the people for whom they are said to be important in the contemporary moment—namely Israelis and people of the "West". Those who create these representations invest the text and design of the site with these meanings, and visitors decode these meanings in articulation with complementary discourses of place and belonging that exist outside of the space of representation (e.g. in mainstream media and political rhetoric).

My argument is not that the Dead Sea Scrolls themselves convey a message about ethnonational primacy in contemporary Israel/Palestine, or even of religious or cultural origins. As Peirce (1955:111) notes, "icons and indices assert nothing." Rather, the Scrolls became embodiments of pre-existing narratives employed most eminently by mid-twentieth century Zionists. Deployed as a means of legitimizing their political

project of Jewish return to an ancestral homeland, the narrative of ethnonational return to the "land of Israel" was popularized in political and cultural life, both in diasporic Jewish communities and the international political community from the late nineteenth through to the mid-twentieth century (Zerubavel 1995). The Scrolls, discovered in 1946 and subsequently acquired by the State of Israel in 1948, merely proved a convenient semiotic tool through which this narrative could be mediated in tangible forms and circulated to diverse audiences. Through their acquisition and representation, the State was able to integrate the Scrolls' history with the extant Zionist discourse. It is only in being preceded by these specific notions about place and belonging that these ancient manuscripts are able to wield significant political force.

Central to this project of semiotic regimentation at my three "sites" is the discursive use of time and place. I track these narrative dimensions not only for comparison and intertextual relationships, but because it is necessary to understand how time and place operate as a codified *chronotope*. As defined by Bakhtin (1981:84), the chronotope represents the "intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships." For my purposes, it is important to track in these representations what changes and what stays the same, who and what stays in place, and who and what moves—particularly in the emphasized (Jewish-Israeli) and silenced (Muslim and Christian Palestinian/Bedouin/Druze/Circassian/Baha'i) historical narratives of contemporary communities in Israel/Palestine. Central to most nationalistic narratives is a particular chronotopic relationship of one people in one place over an extended period of time, with ignorance to time's interferences of invasion and displacement, and visions of a boundless national future (Anderson 2006:11-12). Such a pattern is redeployed in

10

representations of the Dead Sea Scrolls, not as explicitly nationalistic messages, but as encoded meanings in the more "polite" realms of heritage sites. Chronotopes are key to understanding encoded political meanings in these representations, and also to understanding how they articulate with audiences' own cosmologies.

Authors and Audience

Authorship, here, is an enterprise of curators, educational programmers, academic advisors, museum and site managers, and government bureaucrats, together constituting a community of practice (Wenger 1998). In a broad sense, their enterprise is one of heritage interpretation—communicating images and ideas about the past to various publics. But within this community, hierarchies are maintained wherein particular motives may differ. Where a museum-employed exhibit preparator may be primarily concerned with layout, lighting, and ambient sound, a representative from the cultural ministry negotiating the loan conditions of a travelling exhibit may be more interested in the diplomatic dimensions of the exhibit narrative. Where an academic advisor may be preoccupied with historical accuracy, an interpretive expert will be quick to edit exhibit text in the interest of maximizing audience engagement. Where below I argue that representations of the Dead Sea Scrolls, regardless of their location, sustain a narrative of time-depth and "authentic" belonging of the Jewish people in the "land of Israel," this is a community practice within which exists negotiation, debate, and power hierarchies. The political narrative of these representations is not the direct result of a single author figure, but rather of the assembled knowledge and agency of a structured community within which an acute awareness of the political power of heritage is being deployed. I argue

11

that this careful negotiation of interpretive work makes the Dead Sea Scrolls decodable in a very particular way. In this institutional context, the textual authors—those individuals actually composing exhibit text and selecting artifacts for presentation—do not necessarily set out to narrate a nationalist history. However, the editorial work and diplomatic mandates of culture ministries and their departments constrict these representations to fit national interests.

I speak of audiences in this thesis not as the stereotyped image of passive consumers of representations, but rather as active bodies of critical minds displaying a range of political sensibilities. While it is difficult to paint a representative picture of an audience of museums or archaeological sites given their very temporary and mobile placements, I wish to emphasize that audiences are active co-constructors of heritage discourse. Though the responses to and internalizations of heritage will fall to subsequent ethnographic investigations, I do not wish to mislead the reader in thinking that the official narrative represented is being universally and uncritically consumed. Quite the opposite, one's relationship to that narrative is creatively constructed and put to use; sometimes in the way the author had intended, but undoubtedly also in dissenting fashions. However, I maintain that while difference among individual readings of these representations certainly exists, what is perhaps more fascinating is the important degree of *sameness* that characterizes readings of these representations, and the political consequences of articulating those readings with hegemonic ideology (Gramsci 1971; see also Lewis and Jhally 1998). The degree of sameness is important to recognize in readings of Dead Sea Scrolls representations because this is what sustains already dominant notions of Israeli national exclusivity in the "land of Israel."

As Bennett (2004:14) explains, we have a tendency to see curators and their spaces of representation as sources of authority and of monologic discourse. The audience, of whom our understanding may be quite slim, is assumed to be an information-absorbing mass of receptive consumers. Several notable exceptions exist, such as where exhibits are designed by collaborative and participatory means, thus necessitating a certain surrender of academic authority. However, most museum representations continue to assume the conventional relationship by relaying information from one person and place to another. Creators of Dead Sea Scrolls representations do not ask visitors how they see ancient customs informing their day-to-day lives; they tell them.

From its enlightenment origins, the museum, which I associate closely with such other representative sites as interpretive centers and travelling exhibitions, has functioned to organize expert knowledge and the materials that served to index that knowledge. Furthermore, museum workers had to endeavor to impart that knowledge and expertise in a way that museum-goers could make sense of and use. This concern with the careful and intentional deployment of expertise is succinctly described by Bennett (2004:27) as follows:

> It is through the deployment of particular forms of expertise in particular relations of government that particular ways of speaking the truth and making it practical are connected to particular ways of acting on persons – and of inducing them to act upon themselves – which, in their turn, form particular ways of acting on the social.

Here it is useful to consider *how* expert knowledge about the past becomes such a powerful tool of governance to begin with—to the extent that it is invoke by the Israeli prime minister in front of the UN General Assembly. As Smith (2007:162) illustrates,

archaeology's self-assumed responsibility of stewardship, in conjunction with its constant invocation of scientific rationality, allows for a select group of experts to make claims about the past that, knowingly or not, become part of an official political discourse on legitimate and illegitimate claims to history and place. Those who have the power to affect policy—and thus to recognize or ignore claims—adopt expert knowledge in making decisions. As a focal point for mobilizing expert knowledge, museums and other interpretive sites represent places where the official, sanctioned heritage discourse is given primacy over others and is given visibility to its local and global publics (see also Bennett 1998).

Methods

Data for this investigation was collected during multiple visits from 2012 to 2014 to three particular places where the Dead Sea Scrolls are represented to large audiences: (1) a travelling exhibit titled *Dead Sea Scrolls: Life in Ancient Times* at the Boston Museum of Science (a private non-profit museum), (2) the Shrine of the Book at the Israel Museum in Jerusalem (a public national museum), and (3) Qumran National Park, the site of the Dead Sea Scrolls' discovery near the northwestern shore of the Dead Sea in the occupied West Bank (an Israeli-controlled public archaeological site). During these visits I recorded interpretive texts on site and exhibit panels, observed visitor movements through space, and where permissible, photographed the spaces to capture layout and the distribution and arrangement of objects. I did this with the intention of observing not just the text of the sites, but the way they are structured to guide and govern visitor's actions and interpretations. I also collected accompanying literature available to visitors at these

sites, including site/floor plans, souvenir guides, and general information pamphlets. Special attention was also paid to marketing strategies and posted rules and regulations that might influence who would visit these places and how their actions were controlled once there.

On two occasions in the summer of 2014, I engaged in participant observation with guided group tours: the first at the Shrine of the Book and the second on a Judean Desert day tour that included Qumran. During these tours, I paid close attention to the relations between exhibit/site text and tour guide narration, as well as guest questions, comments, and movement through these spaces. Despite carrying out these observations during the Israel-Gaza offensive of 2014 when many tourists had left or cancelled their travel plans, the Shrine of the Book and Qumran tours were well-attended with ten and six participants, respectively.

Through an extensive process of coding manually and using qualitative data analysis software, I proceeded with an inductive analysis of my fieldnotes and visual data. It is from this inductive analysis that I identified the two major themes explored in chapters IV and V: *recovering "the land's" past* and *global legacies*. A literature review was undertaken to elaborate on these themes and to extend my analysis where appropriate. This allowed me to put the patterns and relations that emerged from my inductive analysis into conversation with an anthropological reading of contemporary geopolitics. It is from this intersection of critical content analysis and broader geopolitical debates that I generate my arguments in this thesis.

Thesis Outline

This thesis is structured according to historical context, theoretical background, analysis, and interpretation. In chapter II, I offer a brief historical overview of the discovery, research, and public presentation of the Dead Sea Scrolls. I also situate this history within a broader tradition of nationalistic Israeli heritage practice. This summary provides the social and political context for my analysis of contemporary places of representation, and a frame of reference useful for comparing the content of public presentation to that of academic consensus.

In chapter III, I turn to the overarching theory of heritage mobility. I explore how qualities of representational forms change between places and audiences, and how certain elements of the official Dead Sea Scrolls narrative (summarized in chapter II) are selectively emphasized or deemphasized. Next, I elaborate on the real social and political work of these representations enabled by the mobility of heritage.

In chapter IV, I elaborate on a critical linguistic and content analysis of the three study sites in which the recovery of "the land's" past emerges as a dominant narrative theme. I explain here how the Dead Sea Scrolls are made indexical to Jews in the "land of Israel," a process of linguistic and material enregisterment (Agha 2003, 2005; Shankar and Cavanaugh 2012) in which the site narrative is articulated to liberal-Zionist discourses already at play among visitors. All three sites invoke this theme through both explicit exploration of Jewish/Israelite antiquity and a silencing of other histories of place and belonging.

I build on this analysis in chapter V by exploring the second major narrative theme of global legacies. At varying scales and by different means, the creators of the

Scrolls and their associated ancient society are made to be of major ancestral significance

to contemporary "Western" communities. I argue that while site narratives maintain

many aspects of the nationalistic heritage discourse explored elsewhere (Silberman 1989;

Ben-Yehuda 1995; Glock 1999; Abu El-Haj 2001; Halotte and Joffe 2002), it is being re-

articulated to global discourses of "Judeo-Christian" and "Western" modernity by

framing biblical traditions and the Abrahamic faiths as the legacy of ancient Israel.

In chapter VI, I conclude by synthesizing my interpretation and pointing to further

opportunities for investigation. I propose final considerations regarding the consequences

of transnational heritage mobilities, and the possibilities of intervention towards more

participatory and emancipatory forms of representation.

CHAPTER II

THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND THEIR PLACES

<u>A Short History of Heritage in Palestine/Israel</u>

I devote this chapter to a contextual history of archaeology in Israel/Palestine and Dead Sea Scrolls scholarship. I also outline the history of the three sites of representation from which I gathered data for the core of my analysis. It is important that I digress from my introduction of primarily theoretical concerns in order to elaborate on regional heritage-politics in Israel/Palestine, why this theoretical approach is well suited to an investigation of this region, and how it may advance broader discussions of conflict and consensus that are of interest to heritage scholars (Chilton and Silberman 2010) and those who experience the complex reality of life in Palestine/Israel on a daily basis.

The work of heritage in Israel/Palestine has long been a topic of academic investigation for its entanglements with identity and place-making. Europeans had long been interested in studying the past of the lands they knew through classical and holy texts, but this intensified in the late nineteenth century with the development of modern scientific research methods. It was felt that European civilization was based largely on the ancient traditions of *Hellas* (Greece) and Palestine (Abu El-Haj 2001:25). In Greece, Europeans could find the roots of democracy, philosophy, literature, and art. In Palestine, they could find the roots of their faith and morality. So began the cartographic and antiquarian fascination with the Holy Land. In 1865, the still extant Palestine Exploration Fund (PEF) was established "to promote research into the archaeology and history, manners and customs and culture, topography, geology and natural sciences of biblical Palestine and the Levant" (Palestine Exploration Fund n.d.). In these early years, scholars

were especially interested in recovering the biblical map of Palestine by identifying sites named in the Bible. This project included linguistic investigation into the origins of Arabic place names, and progressively began to rely on archaeological inquiry (Abu El-Haj 2001:44).

These scholars were constructing a heritage for their own nations and churches, not for the local population that was regarded more as a curious object of study. Ethnographers with the PEF regarded the *fellahin* (local peasantry) not as Palestinian Arabs, but rather as cultural descendants of the ancient Israelites. They were seen as representing the way of life of the inhabitants of biblical Palestine, who currently happened to be adherents of Islam (Abu El-Haj 2001:38). While the Western fascination with the past in Palestine never truly ceased, parallel archaeological traditions have emerged over the years with lasting consequences for official understandings of place.

With the beginning of British Mandatory rule in Palestine, this surveying activity accelerated, and opened this work of recovery to new organizations, notably the Jewish Palestine Exploration Society (JPES). The JPES was established in Jerusalem in 1914 as the Society for the Reclamation of Antiquities (renamed as JPES in 1920) to conduct surveying work similar to that conducted by the PEF, but with the aim of better understanding a specifically Jewish past in the homeland of Palestine. Furthermore, the JPES sought to educate the Jewish public worldwide about this past through publications, conferences, and public lectures (Abu El-Haj 2001:46-47). While the JPES conducted far fewer archaeological excavations than the PEF, they were eminently successful at disseminating knowledge about Jewish antiquity through their focus on public engagement. Archaeology, in addition to being a scholarly pursuit, was being promoted

as a national-cultural one that would offer a tangible means for secular Zionists to grow a sense of attachment and belonging to *Eretz Israel*, the land of Israel (Abu El-Haj 2001:47-48). Throughout the Mandatory period, the JPES increasingly became an important channel for knowledge mobilization about the global Zionist cause. The JPES continues its work today as the Israel Exploration Society, a professional organization active in supporting excavations, publishing, and conference organizing.

It should be acknowledged that while western Europeans and Jews were drawing on the resources of Palestine for their own heritage, local Arab residents of Palestine did not regard themselves as the biblical people from another time as foreigners depicted them. An awareness and concern for a local Palestinian heritage is evident in the works of Palestinian scholars including Stephan Hanna Stephan (Stephan 1923; Stephan and Boulos 1947) and Dr. Tawfiq Canaan (1922; 1927; 1933). Canaan, in particular, wrote prolifically about matters of concern to Palestinians including medical research, health conditions, ethnology, folklore, and the built landscape. In his writing, he expresses a sense of anxiety about the encroachment of European modernity and the future of Palestinian traditions. His research reflects the goals of early twentieth century salvage ethnography, but is infused with traditional knowledge and political activism. In the preface to his book *Mohammedan Saints and Sanctuaries in Palestine*, Canaan (1927:V-VI) writes:

> The primitive features of Palestine are disappearing so quickly that before long most of them will be forgotten. Thus it has become the duty of every student of Palestine and the Near East, of Archaeology and of the Bible, to lose no time in collecting as fully and accurately as possible all available material concerning the folklore, customs and superstitions current in the Holy Land. […] I, as a son of the country, have felt it my special duty to help in this scientific work […]

The change in local conditions is due to the great influences which the West is exerting upon the East, owing to the introduction of European method of education, the migration of Europeans to Palestine, of Palestinians to Europe and especially to America, and, above all, to the influence of the Mandatory Power. The simple, crude, but uncontaminated patriarchal Palestinian atmosphere is fading away and European civilization, more sophisticated but more unnatural, is taking its place.

Canaan was attempting to draw biblical scholars to the study and appreciation of current Palestinian life that had previously only been done for analogy to biblical life. In his works on the Palestinian built environment (Canaan 1927;1933), he strives to represent the multiplicity of heritage meanings among various communities, challenging the essentialized image of the Palestinian *fellah*. In his introduction of *The Palestinian Arab House: Its Architecture and Folklore* (Canaan 1933), he explains the range of habitational structures known to local Muslims, Christians, Baha'i, and Bedouin. He offers not just physical descriptions, but the meaningful ideological concepts that they index. Canaan's ethnography did not transform the fields of biblical studies or archaeology, and he failed to draw many other scholars to his project. However, his accounts offer a glimpse of an alternative narrative of the meaning of "Palestine" that stands in contrast to the accounts of non-local scholars and travelers of the late Ottoman and British Mandatory periods.

Following the founding of the state of Israel in 1948, European biblical archaeology continued and Zionist interest in archaeology intensified. It is important to note for the purpose of our discussion that the contemporary region of the West Bank, where the Dead Sea Scrolls site of Qumran is located, was controlled by the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan between the Arab-Israeli war of 1948 and the Six Day War of 1967, which resulted in the Israeli occupation of the Gaza Strip and Sinai Peninsula, formerly

held by Egypt, East Jerusalem and the West Bank, formerly held by Jordan, and the

Golan Heights, formerly held by Syria. During the inter-war years European and

American research persisted in these regions, but a nascent Israeli archaeology, nationally

distinct from the Euro-American tradition, was taking shape and would eventually extend

to these territories upon their occupation after 1967.

Where religious Jews found justification for settling in *Eretz Israel* through divine

promise, the scientific practice of archaeology became a tool of legitimizing return to

"the land" for secular Israelis (Hallote and Joffe 2002:86). As might be expected, early

Israeli archaeology drew heavily on the methods of biblical archaeology as practiced by

Euro-American and JPES scholars, but with an intense focus on *reviving* ancient Jewish

places (Abu El-Haj 2001:93). Zerubavel (1995:25,32) remarks that Zionist newcomers to

the young state eagerly sought to frame Jewish antiquity as a national golden age—in

stark contrast to an exilic period of national disintegration and repression—and the

national revival as a "reawakening of a dormant 'national memory'." It is under this

frame of a nationalized archaeology that I pursue my interrogation of contemporary

representations, and track how they are mapped into non-national spaces.

Historical Background to Dead Sea Scrolls Research

While I attempt here to offer the reader a cursory history of Scroll scholarship and

their proposed origins, such historicization is fraught with divergent perspectives that

cannot possibly be explored in the space of a few contextualizing paragraphs. Due also to

the fact that many early works were based on partial publication of the Scrolls, or did not

account for both the archaeological and epigraphic research on Qumran *and* the Dead Sea

Scrolls, it is difficult to find real consensus among published research. For my purposes, I draw on a selection of recent, thorough, and well-contextualized studies of both Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls (Silberman 1994; Magness 2002; Collins 2013).

Ultimately, the debates persisting in academic circles are of minor importance to popular understandings of people and place in Israel/Palestine at the time the Dead Sea Scrolls were being created. Academic debates surrounding the actual community that produced the Scrolls or the exact relationship between the Scrolls and the site of Qumran are for the most part overshadowed by the singularly important fact that it was Jews in the land of Israel that produced them. Scholarly interpretations do inform the representations that are on offer to the public, but as I illustrate later in this chapter, the public narrative differs markedly from what is available in academic literature. Furthermore, those who visit these places add their own layer of interpretation based on their own interests and experiences. Michel de Certeau's (1984) notion of "poaching" is useful here for thinking about the agency of museum and site visitors who actively work at the interpretations on offer, rather than passively consuming them. The framework that follows should thus be regarded only as background so that the reader may understand some dominant ideas about the Dead Sea Scrolls, the subjects of representation in this investigation.

Simply put, the Dead Sea Scrolls are an assemblage of ancient manuscripts found in a number caves near the site of Khirbet Qumran on the northwestern shores of the Dead Sea. The first four scrolls of the known assemblage were likely discovered in the winter of 1946 by three men of the Ta'amireh Bedouin (Silberman 1994:32). The term

"discovery" is somewhat misleading, as Silberman (1994:32) notes that Bedouin had, at least since the 1930s, known of and offered to take Jewish workers to caves containing "books from the time of your kings"—somewhat misleading in that the first century BCE to first century CE Scrolls post-date the era of the Israelite monarchies in the eleventh to sixth centuries BCE. The discoverers' names, Khalil Musa, Juma'a Muhammed Khalil, and Muhammed Ahmed el-Hamed, and identities are typically left out of popular discovery narratives, despite being fairly well documented by individuals involved in the early transactions through which the Scrolls were acquired by their first collectors (Silberman 1994:32). What were initially regarded as forgeries or more recent medieval manuscripts by skeptical antiquities dealers in Bethlehem and Jerusalem were soon recognized to be the oldest known manuscripts from the Hebrew Bible.

The first four scrolls were purchased by Athanasius Yeshue Samuel, the Archbishop of the Jerusalem Syrian Orthodox community, from a Bethlehem antiquities dealer acting on behalf of the Bedouin discoverers (Silberman 1994:41). While Samuel was immensely interested in the ancient manuscripts, he struggled to find reliable partners in the Syrian Orthodox community to evaluate and publicize his scrolls. He agreed to let the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem have exclusive rights to publication in exchange for assistance in finding a suitable buyer (Silberman 1994:48). Soon after Samuel's original purchase, Juma'a and Khalil Musa returned to the caves with Jerusalem merchant George Shaya, and together they recovered four more scrolls. Juma'a and Khalil Musa sold three of these through a different antiquities dealer to Eleazar Sukenik, of the Hebrew University, who immediately recognized their antiquity and significance (Silberman 1994:45). While the American School did publish

the scrolls and helped Samuel organize a travelling display of the four scrolls when he moved to the United States in 1949, they failed to find a buyer. After the Scrolls had been displayed at the Library of Congress, the Walters Art Gallery in Baltimore, the University of Chicago, and Duke University, Samuel posted an ad in the classified section of *The Wall Street Journal* in 1954 announcing that the Scrolls were for sale (Silberman 1994:50). Though Sukenik had died in 1953, his son, the Israeli chief of staff-turned-archaeologist Yigael Yadin, purchased the four scrolls on behalf of the State of Israel for $250,000 through an American intermediary (Silberman 1994:51). These early acquisitions made for the original content of the first exhibit at the Shrine of the Book in Jerusalem.

While the identity of the Scrolls' creators continues to propel debate, early scholars, and probably a slight majority of contemporary scholars, believed that they were produced by the Essenes, a group described by ancient writers Pliny the Elder, Flavius Josephus, and Philo (Collins 2013:93). By the accounts of all three of these writers, the Essenes were a Jewish sect during the Second Temple period (530 BCE – 70 CE), and were known for their ascetic way of life. They are described as being devoted to purity and celibacy, keeping an intimate knowledge of biblical scripture, and living reclusively on the shores of the Dead Sea (Collins 2013:52). How archaeologists correlate these characteristics to the site where the Dead Sea Scrolls were discovered, Khirbet Qumran, has long been a source of debate (Allegro 1955; De Vaux 1973; Schiffman 1994; Silberman 1995; Galor *et al* 2006).

Nowhere in the Dead Sea Scrolls do the authors identify themselves by name, merely referring to themselves collectively as the *Yahad* ("the community"). Indeed,

much of their description of themselves resembles descriptions of the Essenes, including a preoccupation with purity, celibacy, and a marked separation from other groups. Other Jewish groups, including the Jerusalem priesthood, are referred to as the "Sons of Darkness," from whom they distinguish themselves through the self-referent "Sons of Light." Thus, based on text from the Scrolls, it is not difficult to attach the Essene identification to the community that produced the Scrolls. Indeed to argue for the absence of this community, named by three different ancient writers and positioned in the Dead Sea region, would seem more puzzling than to attach it cautiously to a known archaeological assemblage.

While the textual content of Scrolls suggests an Essene affiliation, the site of Qumran itself bears little indication of an ascetic sectarian habitation. While the undoubtedly habitational site rests in close proximity to the caves of the Dead Sea Scrolls, its archaeological features alone suggest little more than a fortified village on the shores of the sea—perhaps a minor stopping point for traders en route to Jericho or Jerusalem. Most archaeologists, however, accept some connection between the Dead Sea Scrolls and the site of Qumran, certainly in terms of contemporary age, and the absence of any significant evidence to contradict the sectarian lifeways described in the Scrolls (Schiffman 1994; Magness 2002). This is to say that while the archaeological remains alone would not lead an archaeologist to consider the site home to an ascetic sect, there is little that would suggest it couldn't have been.

The relationship between the Scrolls and Qumran is a major source of debate among scholars. To associate the two requires archaeologists to accept textual material as a major source of archaeological evidence. In terms of material that makes archaeologists

hesitant to accept this evidence includes a toilet in the middle of the settlement that seemingly contradicts the purity laws outlined in the Temple Scroll, the War Scroll, and the accounts of Josephus, which all suggest that the sectarians would relieve themselves far away from the settlement (Magness 2002:108). However, this problem may be circumvented when considering that the toilet was discovered in the corner of a large room, and was probably covered when it was in use. Furthermore, with this being the site's only toilet, most inhabitants probably did relieve themselves off-site (Magness 2002:113). Furthermore, one of the site's many *miqva'ot* (Jewish ritual baths) seems directly related to the toilet, allowing users to purify themselves after use. Other *miqva'ot* are placed near entrances to communal dining areas, a potter's workshop, and at the east entrance to the site near the settlement's cemetery. All of this seems to suggest a clear division between pure and impure spaces at Qumran in accordance with the sectarian practices described in textual material (Magness 2002:127).

While there is general consensus that Qumran was home to a sectarian group associated with the Dead Sea Scrolls, it is questionable as to whether the Qumran community produced all of the scrolls. Prominent Scrolls scholar John Collins (2013:29) has argued that the body of manuscripts is simply too large and diverse to have been produced by a single community. He suggests that the concentration of scrolls in the caves around Qumran is the result of many sectarian communities fleeing Roman armies with their holy texts, arriving at Qumran either because of its status as a sectarian homeland or for its remoteness.

Another arena for debate in academic circles surrounds the overall significance of the Scrolls in understanding the character of Judaism and early Christianity in the first

century BCE- first century CE. Some have felt that the identification of the Scrolls with the Essenes diminished their Jewish character, given their fringe status relative to the Pharisees from which Rabbinic Judaism emerged (Collins 2013:183). Furthermore, their messianic expectations have led some to speculate about a possible connection to the Jesus movement of the first century CE. For example, some earlier scholars suggested that John the Baptist was a sectarian (Brownlee 1955; Allegro 1956), and indeed this interpretation is maintained in the site of Qumran's interpretive center. The Scrolls also speak of a "Teacher of Righteousness" who was killed and subsequently resurrected in a struggle against the "Wicked Priest." This prophetic figure has drawn comparisons with the figure of Jesus, but aside from representing widespread messianic expectations among various groups during a time of increasing Roman oppression, their common traits are fairly limited (Collins 2013:127). That Scrolls scholars put forth such suggestions has at times caused anxiety in religious communities, whether because it distances the Scrolls from a Jewish historical trajectory or calls into question the uniqueness of Jesus. Of course, it has also stirred the public fascination with them.

This curiosity about the Scrolls peaked during the long period between the time they were found and the time they were fully published during the 1990s (Collins 2013:20). While the slow and guarded process of publication spurred allegations against the research teams that they were hiding secrets about the nature of early Christianity or Judaism, the final publication of material made it patently clear that any delay was the result of the highly fragmentary composition of the corpus, requiring not only decipherment but also reassembly with little contextual information. Indeed, Emmanuel Tov, who took over as editor-in-chief of the publication series in 1990 (Collins 2013:20),

remarked that the pace of publication was extraordinary given the circumstances (Tov 2001:98).

Such are some of the controversies and revelations surrounding the Dead Sea Scrolls that have made them subjects of both academic and popular fascination for some six decades. While much remains uncertain about the Scrolls and their origins, this has only served to deepen the gaze that is the subject of this thesis. Ultimately, what emerges in popular representations of the Scrolls is an official, standardized narrative that draws on academic research, while emphasizing particular themes regarding their mysterious origins and possible relations to Jerusalem, the insight they provide about Jewish and Christian origins during a period of great turbulence in "the land," and their miraculous discovery ahead of the founding of the State of Israel.

Places of Dead Sea Scrolls Heritage

Historical Representations

In the history of the Scrolls since their discovery in 1946, they have been represented in countless forms—permanent, travelling, and virtual exhibits, televised documentaries, popular and academic volumes, magazine and newspaper articles, and tourism narratives, among others. The Dead Sea Scrolls are surely the most circulated archaeological assemblage from Israel/Palestine. Their earliest travelling exhibit was arranged just over a year after their finding, when Athanasius Samuel, with the assistance of the American School of Oriental Research, toured the first three unraveled Scrolls throughout the United States, beginning at the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C. The Jordanian authorities that oversaw the excavation of Qumran and the majority of the

scroll corpus organized the first major international tour of the Scrolls in 1965. The exhibit included over a dozen scrolls and scroll fragments, as well as other artifacts from Qumran. The revenues and physical infrastructure of this exhibit provided the basis for a permanent exhibit at the Palestine Archaeological Museum (now the Rockefeller Museum) in East Jerusalem. The major sites of representation that exist today were established by the State of Israel, beginning with the Shrine of the Book, on the campus of the Israel Museum in Jerusalem.

The Shrine of the Book, Jerusalem

Almost as soon as Eleazar Sukenik acquired the first set of Dead Sea Scrolls, discussions were initiated to build a permanent home for their curation and display. Interest in building such a facility was only magnified when his son acquired the next four scrolls in 1954. Thus, in 1955, the government of Israel established the Shrine of the Book Foundation with the objective to "[…] establish a special hall in the National and University Library in Jerusalem, and that this hall should serve as a repository and a museum for preserving and exhibiting these writings and all other materials connected with the Bible" (Roitman 2001:51). While plans were made to construct the Shrine of the Book at the National Library, these were abruptly changed in 1959 when it was announced that a new national museum would be constructed adjacent to the Knesset, the Israeli parliament (Roitman 2001:56).

In 1959, the Jewish American architects chosen to design the Shrine succeeded in realizing their vision of having the Shrine built as a monumental icon. It would be built separate from the main museum complex, thus allowing for substantial freedom to

produce a distinct architectural unit (Roitman 2001:56). Despite the Foundation's early resistance to the idea of a monumental shrine for such a small assemblage, this design eventually won out. Israeli planners and bureaucrats thought that the Scrolls' significance was self-evident to the Israeli public, who would easily be able to identify with the ancient writers through common language, belief, and connection to "the land". However, the American architects saw them as essentially unintelligible to non-Israeli Jews who could not read Hebrew, thus requiring an architectural framing that would communicate their importance (Roitman 2001:55).

The Shrine of the Book stands today as an exhibition center for a small selection of the Dead Sea Scrolls, archaeological material from Qumran, and on a lower level, other early biblical manuscripts including the 10th century CE Aleppo Codex. It remains the main attraction of the Israel Museum, and one of the most visited sites in Israel as a whole[3]. In addition to drawing foreign and domestic visitors alike, it serves as a popular backdrop for photo-ops by visiting dignitaries.

Qumran National Park, Area C, West Bank

After the 1967 Six Day War, Israeli forces occupied the formerly Jordanian controlled West Bank. Despite passage of Resolution 242 of the United Nations condemning Israel's actions in East Jerusalem, the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, and the Golan Heights, as an inadmissible occupation through acts of war, Israel was quick to lay claim to a number of places as national parks, including sites such as Herodium, near Bethlehem, Sebastia, near Nablus, and of course, Qumran, on the northwestern shore of

---

[3] As of the most recent statistical figures (2012), the Israel Museum was the most visited paid-entry attraction in Israel (Pes *et al.* 2013; Peretz 2013).

the Dead Sea, near Jericho. The site, which lies in Area C of the West Bank, is currently managed by the Israel Nature and Parks Authority and the Civil Administration of Judea and Samaria. The Civil Administration is the Israeli regional governing body responsible for zoning, construction, and infrastructure in Area C, territories that fall under full Israeli military and civil control under the Oslo Accords between the State of Israel and the Palestinian Liberation Organization.

The archaeological site as presented today consists primarily of architectural foundations with some reconstructed walls, several *miqva'ot* (ritual baths) dug into the ground, and stone basins interpreted as latrines and washbasins. The site is navigated using a marked path with interpretive signs, some of which merely include the name of a feature (e.g. "Latrine"), while others include more elaborate descriptions, passages from the Dead Sea Scrolls, and illustrations of possible reconstructions. The text on these signs is written in Hebrew and English, in contrast to exhibit signage in, for example, the Israel Museum, which is offered in both official languages of the State of Israel, Hebrew and Arabic, as well as English.

While the site of Qumran is maintained as an Israeli national park in the West Bank, the Palestinian delegation to UNESCO has included it on its tentative list of sites to be considered for World Heritage status (Permanent Delegation of Palestine to UNESCO [PDPU] 2012). This draws the Scrolls directly into ongoing geopolitical struggles between Israeli and Palestinian authorities, and makes the site's maintenance as a distinctly Israeli place all the more sensitive.

Dead Sea Scrolls: Life in Ancient Times

In October 2011, the Israel Antiquities Authority began touring an exhibit titled *Dead Sea Scrolls: Life and Faith in Ancient Times* at cities across the United States, including New York City, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Boston, Salt Lake City, and most recently Los Angeles. For my research I made three visits to the Boston exhibit, where it was shown from May 19, 2013 – October 20, 2013 at the Boston Museum of Science with a modified title *Dead Sea Scrolls: Life in Ancient Times*. During this period, I also attended a lecture series featuring American and Israeli scholars that coincided with the exhibit's opening weekend.

While certainly not the first travelling exhibit, this exhibit was unusual in that the majority of the exhibit had little to do with the Dead Sea Scrolls. Despite the exhibit's title, well over half of the exhibit deals with general culture-history of "the land" (i.e. land of Israel) from the Bronze Age to the establishment of the State of Israel and most specifically the Iron Age Kingdoms of Judah and Israel. Only in the last of four galleries does the visitor encounter a large round table displaying ten scrolls in varying states of preservation. Adjacent to each of the scrolls is a translation and brief contextual history. Most of the other panels in this room deal with the Scrolls' relation to Jerusalem, Jewish resistance in the first century CE, and the three major Abrahamic faiths.

While not unexpected for a blockbuster exhibit—similar patterns may be noted at recent travelling exhibits pertaining to the young Egyptian pharaoh Tutankhamun or the Chinese terracotta warriors—there is a sustained attempt in this particular exhibit not only to showcase the symbolic capital of a foreign nation, but also to include the American visitor as part of its historical trajectory. There is a *we-ness* to this exhibit that

will be detailed in chapter V, where visitors are told how central the legacy of ancient Israel is to Western philosophy, governance, religion, education, and morality. There is an attempt to link Israel and the American audience together in a common history that distinguishes it from other blockbuster exhibits.

The exhibit design suggests an attempt to capture interest among an audience that has little background, or even interest, in biblical textual analysis. There is very little interpretive material that deals with the textual content of the Dead Sea Scrolls. The dominant narrative is one of long-term culture-history, and the Dead Sea Scrolls are used to illustrate a moment in that history during which Jews in the land of Israel were codifying sacred texts that would have a lasting impact on the Abrahamic faiths and, in the exhibit narrative's terminology, "Western civilization." The curators choose to focus on the above-mentioned themes to hold the gaze of the North American viewer. While these may draw more visitors and capital to the exhibits, they also carry potent political messages about the contemporary moment. Such seemingly unrelated features as a block from the Western Wall, a selection of artifacts from Masada, and a scroll that includes the Ten Commandments of the Hebrew Bible surround the table that displays the aesthetically unimpressive scraps of parchment. As the visitor exits the Scroll gallery, they pass a live feed of the Western Wall Plaza in Jerusalem, underlining the continuing centrality of Jerusalem and "the land" from past through to the present. The exhibit was not only well attended by a local audience on all three of my visits; it also drew high-profile visitors on some of its tour stops, including United States President Barack Obama. This visitorship is not necessarily driven by a desire to engage specifically with nationalist heritage narratives, but may be attributable to the exhibit's marketing within

the authorized heritage discourse that dominates western heritage practice—notable in the exhibit title's emphasis on "ancient times" and the supposedly inherent material value of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

While the Dead Sea Scrolls have been the subject of intense academic interest over the past 65 years, we must recognize that they are made meaningful on a mass scale through the act of public representation—for instance, international travelling exhibitions, tourism, televised documentaries, and popular publications. This process of authorship for popular audiences subjects them to meanings that may be in tension with expert knowledge, but nonetheless serves to regiment popular understandings. In the next chapter, I examine how these representations are organized in relation to the place of their representation. I develop a theory of heritage mobilities that allows us to think through the cultural consequences of transplanting and adapting place-based heritage narratives to captive audiences in foreign locales.

CHAPTER III

HERITAGE MOBILITY

Heritage mobility operates through the discursive and dialogical nature of heritage, the movement of agents that maintain the authorized heritage discourse, and the enregisterment (Agha 2005) of social and political ideologies of place and belonging within material objects and places. In the case of representations of the Dead Sea Scrolls, as is illustrated in chapters IV and V, notions of Jewish/Israeli belonging in "the land" and of the Scrolls' legacy in the development of "Western" culture shift between the people and places associated with the representation while remaining within the parameters of a single authorized heritage discourse.

Laurajane Smith (2006:11) proposed the notion of the authorized heritage discourse (AHD) as one that "privileges monumentality and grand scale, innate artifact/site significance tied to time depth, scientific/aesthetic expert judgment, social consensus and nation building." The AHD is a tool of governance and has the capacity to silence dissonant expressions of heritage. Perhaps most importantly, Smith's (2006:12) characterization of the AHD prompts the theorization of heritage as something that is constructed in the contemporary moment as a reflection of and response to social and cultural values: it is a process in which the tensions and contradictions of the present are mapped onto geographies of the past. This definition offers a productive unbinding of heritage from concrete objects and sites and conceptualizes place as a fluid social construction. I draw on Smith's analysis to extend my case beyond methodological nationalism, a tendency within social sciences to rely on case studies "bounded and bundled" within the nation-state despite awareness of its fragility as a geo-political

category (Wimmer and Glock Schiller 2002). The turn towards mobilities in the social sciences (Urry 2007; Salazar 2014) begs for further research into ways that "place" is regimented in heritage through transnational mobilities. What happens when *many* groups in *many* places engage with the AHD as it pertains to a particular set of objects or sites? How do readings of related heritage representations differ based on the unique spaces in which they are mobilized? If indeed we are to take up Smith's proposal of heritage as process and practice of regimenting place and community, we might ask ourselves: how does heritage work when it is done from afar?

The mobilities through which the Dead Sea Scrolls and their associated images and ideas are implicated include corporeal travel of tourists to Dead Sea Scrolls sites, the physical movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls and other related objects to interested parties, the imaginative travel made possible through the circulation of images of the Scrolls and their associated people and places, and virtual travel in which individuals are brought into spaces meant to mimic those associated with the Dead Sea Scrolls (Urry 2007:47). Indeed, many people who engage with the Dead Sea Scrolls do not visit Qumran, the place where they were found, but rather view them some 50 km away at the Shrine of the Book in Jerusalem, or even further away at international museums hosting travelling exhibits. Still more are acquainted with the Scrolls through televised documentaries, books, magazines, or newspaper articles.

In discussing the mobilities of heritage, the intent is to explore the possibilities and consequences of representing and engaging with heritage narratives along traveled transnational routes. "Heritage" is not the assemblage of Scrolls themselves, but the process and practice through which people render them meaningful. Given that in this

37

case this necessarily involves mobility—whether the recontextualization of the Scrolls in a facility in Jerusalem, the movement of tourists to Jerusalem and Qumran, or the movement of the Scrolls to various museums in the United States—it is an ideal opportunity to extend Smith's (2006) elaboration of the "uses of heritage" to transnational politics of recognition. My analysis of Dead Sea Scrolls representations in the next two chapters demonstrates how the dominant Dead Sea Scrolls heritage narrative, entwined with Israeli nationalist heritage discourse, converges and moves into socio-political discourses of Zionism and Western liberalism.

Between Jerusalem and Qumran

In the instance of engaging with representations in Palestine/Israel, the movement of both people and objects drive the efficacy of the official Dead Sea Scrolls discourse. The movement of people between Qumran and Jerusalem link people to both the historical and contemporary moment of nationhood. As a preserved and developed archaeological site, Qumran is a tangible embodiment of the "land of Israel's" past, representing the historical depth of the Israeli/Jewish nation, while the Shrine of the Book, in the modern capital, represents the persistence of that nation in "the land". The movement of the Scrolls from Qumran to Jerusalem re-centers this historical trajectory on the national capital, emphasizing the significance of the narrative for the Israeli sense of place and belonging.

In my observations travelling to Qumran as an independent observer in 2012 and 2013, and then a participant observer with an organized tour in 2014, I found that most people who make the effort of arranging a tour that includes a stop at Qumran are also

likely to have visited the Shrine of the Book in Jerusalem. Indeed one inevitably hears on visits to both places tourists or their guides asking, "Have you been to the Shrine of the Book?" at Qumran and "Have you been to Qumran?" at the Shrine of the Book. This prompt given to visitors at either site is an impetus for travel that structurally resembles "pilgrimage" in its quest for authenticity (MacCannell 1973). Most visitors won't necessarily hear or read anything new in the short times that they generally spend at either location. Guides generally offer the same narrative of the Scrolls' miraculous discovery, the mysterious lives of the Essenes who created them, and the general character of the Dead Sea Scrolls assemblage. However, by travelling between the display of the Scrolls at the Shrine of the Book and the site of their "discovery" at Qumran, the Scrolls narrative gains a powerful sense of authenticity, augmented through the familiarity with the scrolls and their place – the familiarity gained through *being there* at the site of their discovery. Qumran and the Shrine of the Book each offer only partial tangibility to the official narrative of the Dead Sea Scrolls, and it is through visiting both the Scrolls, at the Shrine of the Book, and their place, at Qumran, that people can fully engage with the narrative.

The ability to do this, of course, is only possible by creating the illusion that Qumran is fully part of the Israeli institutional framework of the Scrolls. This is accomplished by maintaining it as an Israeli National Park marked by Israeli and Parks Authority flags, Hebrew and English (and minimal Arabic) signage, and seamless accessibility despite its position deep in the West Bank. Any tourist in Israel can get to Qumran from Jerusalem in 45 minutes with a rented car, with an organized tour, or on the efficient hourly buses that make runs along the Dead Sea throughout the day.

The significance of this pattern of accessibility to heritage places in the West Bank like Qumran is significant to both foreign tourists and Israelis. Their encounter with the artifacts and places of these easily accessible sites allows both Israelis and foreign tourists to complete their engagement with the official heritage discourse. In fact, the separation of artifact and site is key to the political project of their representation. As Hall (2005:25) reminds us, the nation's "meaning is constructed *within*, not above or outside representation." By showcasing the Scrolls in Jerusalem adjacent to the Knesset, and not at Qumran or the Rockefeller Museum in East Jerusalem, the state centers and secures the Scrolls in an unquestionably Israeli national context. Qumran does not carry the assurance of security and national belonging of West Jerusalem, despite the intense symbolic marking of it as such with the abovementioned ease of access, flags, and linguistic regimentation.

From Israel to North America

During the last five years, the Dead Sea Scrolls have been exhibited in major Canadian and American cities, including Toronto, New York City, Philadelphia, and Boston. With the exception of a recent showing at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Fort Worth, Texas in 2012-2013, the Scrolls are usually presented in large generalist museum venues that attract broad segments of the general population; not specifically archaeological or Near Eastern history museums. These are spaces distant from Israel/Palestine, geographically and in terms of narrative. Their attraction generally lies in sizeable so-called "world" and "natural" history collections and an ongoing rotation of travelling exhibits. While scholars write about the historical specificity of the Scrolls, focusing on such issues as the identity of their authors and their relations to other

texts, their narrative framing in travelling exhibits is broad so that it can attract an equally broad audience. The travelling exhibit that I analyze below focuses on the historical trajectory of "ancient Israel," drawing heavily on biblical passages and recognizable objects of everyday life, as well as the Dead Sea Scrolls and their significance to understanding the roots of Abrahamic religions. Emphasis on the importance of "ancient Israel" and the Scrolls to the West encourages visitors to see themselves as part of the historical trajectory presented in this representation. The transplantation of the Scrolls narrative in new transnational contexts generates heritage connections with individuals who have never been to the region nor previously identified with it.

Here we see the movement of objects and images *to* a group of people—rather than the opposite—to make this connection possible. This is where, more than at the Shrine of the Book or Qumran, we see the weakness of site-bound conceptions of heritage also noted by Smith (2006:75). In this instance, the breadth of the narrative is thrust toward a largely uninformed audience who can easily articulate elements of the narrative with their own experience. It is important not to read too much into a content analysis of the travelling exhibit, or other representations for that matter, for while it is rife with notions of exclusive belonging, national authenticity, and the production of legacy, we cannot assume without complementary ethnographic research what these ideas mean to visitors. We can, however, comment on the constraints imposed on interpretive possibilities—what is silenced in these narratives and what implications this selective repertoire has on broad understandings of the distant landscape of Israel/Palestine. As stated earlier, the significance of mobility is not in the process of moving people or objects, but in the possibilities it opens for new non-local audiences.

Mobility and Heritage Politics

Heritage, as a process of meaning-making, cannot be fully explained by focusing only on localized cases. Such a framework does not account for transnational relationships that people maintain with places, memories, and objects that transcend local issues. The analysis that follows of Dead Sea Scrolls representations at the Shrine of the Book, Qumran, and the Boston Museum of Science aims to illustrate how notions of Israeli national heritage accompany moving people and objects. Theorizing heritage relations as being developed through mobility allows us to consider the ways they are maintained through an interconnected and authorized discourse of heritage—related to innate value, expert judgment, nation building, etc.—that transcends national boundaries.

Representation, be it in Israel, the West Bank, or the United States, serves to constitute what the place (Palestine/Israel) *is* by articulating historical narration with the existing categories of place established in the media, state politics, and educational curricula (Knopf-Newman 2011; Roy 2012). Not only this, it adds immensely to this discourse through its authoritative narration of time depth, thus imposing a historical legitimacy on "the land" where abovementioned actors (media, government, and schools) might focus on its contemporary existence. These intricately connected narratives can only operate cohesively through processes of mobility, whether it be the movement of people, images, or objects. These are controlled mobilities orchestrated from central positions of narrative construction and deployed among agencies of related, if not always the same, ambition.

By ambition I mean not a conspiratorial nation-building project, but a carefully crafted program of authorship with diplomatic dimensions, e.g., in clearly identifying the exhibit's national provenience: "All the objects in this exhibition are displayed courtesy of the Israel Antiquities Authority and are from the collections of the Israel National Treasures" (Dead Sea Scrolls: Life in Ancient Times [DSSLAT] 2013). We also must not neglect the economic interests at the base of all these institutions. The Dead Sea Scrolls draw massive numbers of visitors when on tour, and remain a top attraction for visitors in Israel. The Israel Museum was, in 2012, the most visited paid-entry attraction in Israel (Pes *et al* 2013; Peretz 2013), and is the third highest rated attraction in Jerusalem on TripAdvisor, only after the Old City and Yad Vashem Holocaust Memorial (TripAdvisor, accessed October 30, 2014). Also in 2012, Qumran drew 377,000 visitors, making it the third most visited archaeological site in Israel after Masada, also in the Judean Desert, and the coastal resort development and archaeological park at Caesarea (Peretz 2013). The extensive local and national media coverage that the Scrolls received when touring the United States illustrates that these are also meaningful events to non-Israelis. The institutions that represent the Dead Sea Scrolls do gain financially from the popularity of this narrative about national roots and global significance (although a museum hosting a travelling exhibit does pay significant fees). I do not wish to downplay the important role of capital in motivating the circulation of these objects and the attraction of tourists to them. However, I maintain that there is immense social capital that also must be attended to. Together these representations constitute a narrative of place and belonging that stretches itself throughout the social formation, from the economic to abstract ideological

notions of identity and nationhood. The political and ideological consequences of this

mobilized narrative are the subjects of the next two chapters.

CHAPTER IV

MAKING "THE LAND'S" PAST PRESENT

In the three sites that comprise the focus of this research, "the land" emerges as a central component of the official narrative of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Through carefully crafted interpretive strategies and the deployment of linguistic ideologies, site narratives draw on a repertoire of pre-existing categories that integrate the Dead Sea Scrolls with larger notions of Israeli national place and belonging. Their strategies render "the land's" past present, I argue, by constructing a chronotope that positions the people and place of ancient Israelite society as the ancestral precursors to the contemporary State of Israel. This chapter follows two lines of enquiry: the first being the mobilization of linguistic ideologies that map notions of ancient languages and peoples onto the present landscape, and the second being the cultural ideologies articulated in these representations that position the historical context of the Dead Sea Scrolls as central to the contemporary cultural geography of the region.

"The land," or "the land of Israel," emerges as a motif in all three sites in lieu of using the name of a contemporary nation-state for the geographic region in question. A biblical name for the homeland of the Jewish people, the term "land of Israel" (*Eretz Israel* in Hebrew) from which the phrase "the land" is derived, comes to these representations already semiotically loaded. While having long been used in Judaism and early Zionist thought for referring to much of what we now think of as Israel and Palestine, it held little political clout in post-1948 Zionism until the 1967 Six-Day War. Del Sorto (2003:37) and Fish (2014:23) remind us that from the founding of the State of Israel until that point, the dominant ideology of spatial nationhood was that of *Medinat*

Israel—the Democratic Jewish state as it existed in its pre-1967 incarnation—

recognizing the significance of its establishment in *Eretz Israel*, but without basing its

territorial reach on it. *Eretz Israel*, as the basis of a political entity, became a real

possibility in right-wing Zionist thought following the 1967 occupation of the West

Bank, East Jerusalem, Gaza Strip, Sinai Peninsula, and Golan Heights, all considered—

fully or partly—components of this traditional geography (Benvenisti 2000; Pappe 2014).

Thus, it is not uncommon to hear statespeople from the governing right-wing coalition

speak in prominent venues of the "land of Israel" (*Eretz Israel*) as a basis for territorial

negotiation going forward, something quite unusual in pre-1967 politics. One need not

look further than Benjamin Netanyahu's speech to the United Nations General Assembly

referenced in the opening of this thesis. Using the Dead Sea Scrolls as a means of

maintaining this discourse, in and outside of Israel, renders alternative and competing

notions of land in Palestine/Israel invisible to museum and site audiences.

Linguistic Ideologies and Historical Continuity

In the case of the Dead Sea Scrolls, it is important to recognize not just the

archaeological context in which they are represented, but also the linguistic. Linguistic

ideologies and practices surrounding the State of Israel, ancient Israel, and the Hebrew

language can be rich sites of heritage production that allow us to better understand how

the past is made significant for social, political, and economic purposes in the

contemporary moment.

One particular event that occurred at the Shrine of the Book demonstrates the

power of linguistic ideologies in the maintenance of the authorized discourse surrounding

the Dead Sea Scrolls. When Barack Obama visited the Shrine of the Book in March

2013, he participated in the regimentation of a discourse on the place of Hebrew and the

Jewish past in the Israeli and international political establishment. Like many of the

foreign visitors I observed during my time at the Shrine of the Book, he did this

unprompted by his Israeli counterparts.

The following discussion occurred at the beginning of the presidential visit while

observing the Great Isaiah Scroll in the middle of the Shrine, and included comments by

U.S. President Barack Obama, Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, Israel

Museum Director James Snyder, and Senior Advisor to Netanyahu, Yitzhak Molcho

(transcribed from Arutz Sheva 2013):

Snyder:	This scroll is 24 feet long… [inaudible]
Netanyahu:	[searching for a passage of text] Oh, oh. That's pretty good. It says, it says, "A nation should not lift sword onto nation and they shall know war no more." Two thousand years ago, and that's, that's it.
Obama:	So, so the Hebrew script never changed that much.
Snyder:	If you… [interrupted by Netanyahu]
Netanyahu:	My son, Avner…
Obama:	You can still read it?
Netanyahu:	He was here when he was six years old. I held him up like this [gesturing as one would hold a child up to the display case]. He, he read it. No, no change whatsoever. Exactly.
Snyder:	[inaudible] This is the same traditional Hebrew text that is used, in this instant, the precise biblical text that you read in the Hebrew Bible today. So if you can read Hebrew today, you can read this.
Obama:	Cause, I'm, I'm trying to think about the Roman alphabet, and, and I'm assuming that there have been some variations on it over, since the biblical…
Snyder:	It morphed, and actually, the Roman alphabet came more from the Greek. And while, this is another story, the Scrolls were written until into the first century AD, and by the time the scrolls were no longer being copied in Hebrew, they were beginning to be copied in Greek. So we have overlap, not in the Shrine but in the museum itself, the second century of accurate Hebrew biblical text and accurate Greek text.
Netanyahu:	This is about, this is exactly the language that we use today. The same alphabet, the same words, the same [pause] the same style. A

Molcho: kid goes into an elementary school, that's what he's reading, he's reading this.

Molcho: Possibly, those kids, they use a little bit different grammar, but this, this manuscript is exactly the way they pronounced it, so when they wrote letters for instance, then the letters would have been written in basically the Qumran, the name of the caves, the Qumran grammar.

In sum, each of the speakers in this exchange brings a different perspective of Hebrew to the conversation. Snyder attempts to offer an objective description of the Isaiah scroll and the Hebrew in which its text is written, also acknowledging that Hebrew was not the only language used in writing the Scrolls. Netanyahu frequently interrupts Snyder or follows his explanations with his own interpretations of the text that signals the diplomatic wisdom of Jewish tradition and of the scroll's authors, and also the persistence of Hebrew as a pure language of the Jewish nation. Obama acts as the curious observer, eliciting interpretations of the historic and contemporary nature of Hebrew. Finally, Molcho mediates between Snyder and Netanyahu's descriptions of ancient and contemporary Hebrew by explaining the difference as one of grammatical variation.

One must recognize the significance of these statements given the speakers' positions of power, particularly Benjamin Netanyahu and Barack Obama. Netanyahu first identifies a passage about diplomacy and peace making: "A nation should not lift sword onto nation, and they shall know war no more." Following up with "that's it," he implies that this piece of biblical tradition, written more than two millennia prior, is relevant to the contemporary conflicts and tensions in which Israel is embroiled. Netanyahu's statement is significant because he considers this piece of wisdom valuable to both contemporary Israelis and ancient Jewish society in the "land of Israel". Obama's interest, however, is directed at Netanyahu's ability to select, read, and translate this

passage with such ease. Though Snyder attempts a response, Netanyahu interrupts with a story of his six-year old son being capable of reading from the Scrolls. He insists that the Hebrew of the Scrolls is consistent with contemporary Hebrew, but it is not yet clear whether he is only referring to the Hebrew alphabet or to the language as a whole. Nonetheless, his interruption suggests an imagining of Hebrew as pure and consistent over an extended temporal range. Obama remains focused on changes to alphabets and scripts, and pushes for further explanation. Snyder explains the relationship between Greek and Roman alphabets, and notes that some of the Dead Sea Scrolls are written in Greek, though not exhibited in the Shrine. Netanyahu shifts back to a focus on Hebrew, assertively remarking directly to Obama that writers of the Dead Sea Scrolls not only used the same alphabet, but that it is "exactly the language that we use today," with the same words and style. Such a statement requires adherence to a language ideology in which denotational variability has a negligible impact, thus allowing the Hebrew of the Isaiah Scroll to be "exactly the language that we use today," especially considering that Molcho says immediately after that there is a grammatical difference between "Qumran grammar" and the Hebrew taught to contemporary schoolchildren.

Netanyahu's understanding of Hebrew transcends denotation, given that both Snyder and Molcho are both talking about alphabetic and grammatical change, and yet he can still insist that Hebrew is unchanged. The semiotic process of iconization (Irvine and Gal 2000) allows Netanyahu to associate Hebrew across temporal periods with Jewish people. His impression of consistency relies on the "we" who use the language today. "We" in this case does not include citizens of Israel who identify as Palestinian, Druze, and Bedouin, or naturalized foreign workers, although most of these people can and do

speak Hebrew (Lefkowitz 2004). Netanyahu's "we" references Jewish Israelis for whom, in his perspective, Hebrew is emblematic. That it was also Jews in the "land of Israel" who wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls allows for this iconization to be extended across chronotopes. Hebrew, for Netanyahu, unites Jews across time, a force that minimizes the significance of denotational variations to the point of non-recognition. Speaking Hebrew emerges as a means of asserting one's belonging. Hebrew, unlike other languages spoken by Jews over the last two thousand years, ties Jews to "the land." That Obama was party to this expression of linguistic ideology was critical for Netanyahu as he struggles to maintain the historically unconditional support of his political counterparts in the United States. Seen as a mobilizing practice, this event takes the official narrative of the Dead Sea Scrolls to international settings of power negotiation. We cannot assume that Obama himself accepts Netanyahu's interpretation at face value, but we also must not forget that this performance was reported by both Israeli and American media outlets (see for example Tarnopolsky 2013). The broadcasted visit carries the subtext that Obama accepts the Dead Sea Scrolls as legitimately Israeli things in a legitimately Israeli space.

I also observed exchanges such as these at the opening events at the Boston Museum of Science exhibit. For instance, at a lecture marking the opening of the exhibit, one guest scholar displayed a scroll excerpt in his PowerPoint presentation, and asked if anyone in the audience could read it. At this point, in near unison, at least a dozen people in the audience began reciting the familiar biblical passage aloud, making a powerful statement about cultural continuity and change through the collective performance of linguistic ideology.

The deployment of linguistic ideologies in the maintenance of the heritage discourse surrounding the Scrolls is also found at Qumran. As previously mentioned, all interpretive signage at the site is provided in Hebrew and English only. Why, given Qumran's status as a state-run national park, its discovery by Bedouin, and its location in the West Bank, is interpretive text not offered in Arabic, the state's second official language? While this does not preclude Palestinians—many of whom are certainly capable of reading Hebrew and English—from visiting the site, the absence of Arabic and presence of Hebrew and English is an index for *who* heritage authorities believe the site is important.

Given the precarious nature of Qumran's geopolitical situation, it is useful to consider language racialization as a contributing factor to the deployment of certain languages over others. According to Urciuoli (1996), language is marked as racialized when it is regarded as threatening to the state. Qumran sits in the contested landscape of the West Bank, and yet indexes Jewish belonging in the "land of Israel." Though it is currently an Israeli national park in Area C of the West Bank—under full Israeli military and civil control in accordance with the Oslo Accords of 1993—Palestine, recognized as a member state of UNESCO since October 2011, has included Qumran on its tentative World Heritage Site list (PDPU 2012). At such a site, the inclusion of Arabic, the racialized language of the oppositional Other, would compromise the semiotic process that Israeli authorities are trying to maintain. The Israel Museum, located in West Jerusalem, recognized Israeli territory, does not face such political contestation, and does include Arabic in its interpretive material where in such a context it can shift from a

51

position of racialization to what Urciuoli (1996) refers to as unthreatening "ethnicization."

The exclusive use of Hebrew, the code of national continuity in "the land," and English, the code of Israel's main international allies, positions Qumran as a place of national belonging and global legacy. Articulating language ideologies of dominance with the heritage narrative of the Dead Sea Scrolls elevates the time and place of the Scrolls above all narratives of time and place that fall between the creation of the contemporary State of Israel and the period of the Jewish Revolts. The national heritage discourse that these representations uphold is the subject of the rest of this chapter.

Representing "the land" and "ancient Israel"

Authorship of official representations of the Dead Sea Scrolls employs carefully crafted strategies to draw connections between the past and present. These strategies generally bundle people with place and time into national designations such as "ancient Israel," "Israel," or "the land" (all of these terms are used in the travelling exhibit). These designations refer not merely to geographical units, but through an elaborate project of semiotic regimentation become indexical to people, place, and time.

Naming places and regions associated with the Dead Sea Scrolls and ancient Israel is not a straightforward task given the fluidity and contested nature of both ancient and contemporary borders. Site managers at Qumran, located deep in the occupied West Bank, have the benefit of dealing with just one named place—Qumran—without having to explicitly name its location in relation to Israel, Palestine, or the West Bank. However, it positions the site in a uniquely Israeli/Jewish context through its almost exclusive use

of Hebrew and narrative focus on Jewish life at the site in antiquity. At Qumran, "the land" is experienced through the visit itself. The interpretive center and site draw on the surrounding rugged landscape to emphasize the mysterious qualities of the sectarians and the scrolls they produced. The Shrine of the Book shies from situating the Dead Sea Scrolls in a context larger than Jerusalem, where they are displayed, and Qumran, where they were discovered. However, the positioning of the building next to major government institutions and the arrangement of materials within it move the image of Qumran and the Scrolls to the heart of the contemporary State—Jerusalem. It narrates "the land" as a space at once ancient and modern, in which the ancient site and the contemporary space of representation are profoundly connected. The travelling exhibit takes on the task of narrating the history of all ancient Israel, even tracing the region's history between the emergence of Israelite society in the early Iron Age to the founding of the contemporary State of Israel. The exhibit narrative frequently references "the land" and the "land of Israel" as its central axis of narration, around which it weaves the story of ancient Israel and the Dead Sea Scrolls. In all cases, whether named or not, "the land" persists as one of the main images associated with the Scrolls—one that encompasses the entire territory of contemporary Israel/Palestine.

The expression "ancient Israel" is one of the more repeated phrases in the traveling exhibit. In contrast, this term is never used in either the Shrine of the Book or at Qumran. Widely used in academic parlance to refer to the society of the ancient Israelites in their various political manifestations throughout the Iron Age, some scholars remain skeptical of the term for its potentially nationalistic connotations—referring to an ancient precedent for the contemporary State of Israel (Whitelam 1996), or to a presupposed

entity based on theological convictions (Davies 1995; 2008). Nonetheless, most mainstream scholars accept the designation as useful and appropriate for referring to a particular historically and archaeologically recognizable cultural horizon (Dever 1998). Whether the Dead Sea Scrolls fit within this context is debatable, as many scholars limit their use of the term "ancient Israel" to the time of the autonomous united and then divided kingdoms of Israel and Judah (Finkelstein and Silberman 2001; Mazar 2009), whereas the Dead Sea Scrolls were mostly written during the much later period of Roman domination.

The Shrine of the Book

At the Shrine of the Book, one needn't read any site text to read the site as a re-centering of the Dead Sea Scrolls in the contemporary nation-state. Situated in full view of the *Knesset* (the Israeli parliament), and designed to resemble one of the jars in which the Scrolls were found in the Qumran caves, the Shrine positions the Scrolls as central documents of the nation. During Obama's 2013 state visit, one journalist described the Scrolls in contemporary Israeli society as "virtually a deed to the land" (Tarnopolsky 2013), speaking to their relationship to the founding national principle of return. The location of the building and its designation as "shrine" put the Scrolls on the level of a constitution, an assemblage of founding principles.

Among the sites examined here, the text of the Shrine of the Book exhibit most closely resembles an academic reading of the Scrolls. Both in its entry corridor—which focuses on the archaeology of Qumran—and the main display rotunda—where a selection of scrolls are displayed along its perimeters—the text focuses on interpretations of the textual content of the Scrolls, the unusual organization of the Qumran sectarians, and the

remarkable state of preservation of the Scrolls. All scroll text is interpreted in terms of the

Qumran sectarian worldview, not a generalized view emergent from the broad category

of ancient Israel. Indeed, only two displays are of biblical scrolls, which may or may not

be familiar to the general visitor. The other cases around the room display scrolls specific

to Qumran—including fragments of the famous Community Rule, the War Scroll, and the

Temple Scroll. The text of these scrolls details the sectarians' marginal positioning vis-à-

vis Jerusalem and other Jews. Take for example the interpretive treatment of the War

Scroll, which illuminates the Qumran sectarians' antagonism towards the Jerusalem

priesthood and other outsiders:

> The sectarians divided humanity into two camps: The "Sons of Light," who were
> good and blessed by God – referring to the sectarians themselves; and the "Sons
> of Darkness," who were evil and accursed – referring to everyone else (Jews and
> gentiles alike). They believed that in the End of Days these two camps would
> battle each other, as described in detail in the scroll now known as "The War of
> the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness." This work, which provides a
> detailed account of the mobilization of troops, their numbers and division into
> units, weaponry, and so forth, states that at the end of the seventh round of battles,
> the forces of the "Sons of Light," aided by God Himself and His angels, would
> vanquish the "Forces of Belial" (as Satan is called in the sect's writings). Only
> then would the members of the Community be able to return to Jerusalem and
> engage in the proper worship of God in the future Temple, which would meet
> with the stringent requirements set out, for example, in the scroll known as "The
> New Jerusalem." (Shrine of the Book n.d.)

The center of the room, however, draws the most visitor attention. Here, wrapped

around a central column in the form of a Torah rod, is a facsimile of the Great Isaiah

Scroll—a 734 cm long impeccably preserved manuscript of the book of Isaiah, written in

a fairly easily decipherable Hebrew script—and it was here that the above-noted

exchange between Benjamin Netanyahu and Barack Obama occurred. In my

observations, this display drew the most prolonged gaze among visitors. This would

generally occur after spending a few minutes attempting to read the detailed descriptions

in the other dimly lit displays around the circumference of the room. From the periphery,

visitors would then proceed to the center, usually as soon as they encountered one of two

sets of stairs leading up, and with no long descriptions to read (the scroll is

unaccompanied by interpretive panels), they would slowly make their way around the

column. As a facsimile, it is also the most well lit portion of the exhibit, with no concern

about damage from harsh lighting. As visitors, both foreign and Israeli, make their way

around, most can be observed deciphering some small part of the text, or in cases where

clearly the individual does not read Hebrew, commenting on the remarkable condition of

the scroll and the apparent legibility of the text.

The Shrine of the Book constitutes and maintains an official narrative through its

centering of the most known scrolls—and indeed, the most indexical to ethnolinguistic

identity—in a national shrine. The interpretation in the Shrine need not elaborate on

themes of national continuity and belonging; the mere presence of ancient writing in this

sacralized space serves this function. It is a space for safely articulating distinctive—

perhaps obscure—elements of an envisioned past with common national concerns over

place and identity.

Qumran National Park

The narrative centering of the presentness of the past is also observable at

Qumran National Park. The tenth most visited attraction in Israel by foreign tourists as of

latest records and third most visited archaeological site (Peretz 2013), Qumran has a

highly simplified site narrative that plainly illustrates to general visitors the daily routines

of sectarians at the very place where they lived, while also highlighting the global

significance of the Scrolls. The interpretation at Qumran is not directed to a local audience. As mentioned earlier, none of its main interpretive signage is offered in Arabic, and despite the widespread use of Hebrew in its signage, I did not encounter any Israelis in either of my two visits to the site. All other visitors were foreign tourists on guided tours or in one case travelling independently. Depending on the schedule of the group or the traveller, a visit either begins with a multimedia presentation in the site's interpretive center, or if time does not permit, at an observation point in view of Cave 1, where seven scrolls, including the most complete version of the Community Rule (Vermes 1995:69), were found.

The multimedia presentation (also critiqued by Killebrew 2010) offers a fictional account of life at Qumran through the experience of one of its members. It includes a storyline that suggests John the Baptist, a figure familiar to Qumran's many Christian visitors, was an Essene and, for a time, a resident of Qumran. The film also includes sweeping views of the Judean Desert landscape juxtaposed with the reconstructed sets used for the fictional account, emphasizing the reclusive circumstances in which this group lived. At the end of the film, the screen rises to the ceiling, and visitors proceed through the opening to a series of small displays of mostly replica features and artifacts from the site, including a set of scroll jars, a *miqva* (ritual bath), and a scribal writing table. Visitors then exit the center near the observation point, where they may otherwise have started, and face the very place where this narrated history unfolds. Killebrew (2010) characterizes the interpretation as essentially a commercial attraction with little basis in archaeological consensus. She argues that repeated reference to the "secret" of

Qumran as the imagined association with "John" (assumed to be John the Baptist) is an

attempt to construct Qumran as a major Christian pilgrimage site.

The site itself includes a short interpretive trail that winds though the buildings,

with various features and rooms marked by signs bearing short text explanations and, in

some cases, illustrations. Often, the sign includes only the name of the feature (in Hebrew

and English), for example: "Cistern" or "Aqueduct." Others include a paragraph

explaining the significance of the feature:

> The Scribes' Room
> In this room, plastered mud brick benches and tables were discovered along with
> three ceramic and metal inkwells attesting to the fact that the scribes who copied
> the scrolls sat here. When the Roman army approached Qumran in 68 CE, the
> scribes placed the scrolls in clay jars and hid them in the caves in the cliffs of
> Qumran (Nature and Parks Authority [NPA] n.d.)

This narrative framework, which focuses almost entirely on aspects of the site that

tie it to the Dead Sea Scrolls, allows interpretation to focus on features that reflect the

unique qualities of the Qumran sectarians described in other representations of the

Scrolls, but in the very place where they lived. It also allows interpretation to be carried

forward without having to expand on other aspects of life at the site, such as the quite

remarkable water system used by its former inhabitants.

As stated in chapter III, the significance of Qumran, for our purposes, is its

capacity to represent the authorized narrative of the Dead Sea Scrolls in the place where

they were found. Few people are likely to go to Qumran without also having visited the

Shrine of the Book to see the most impressive of the Dead Sea Scrolls, and have also

probably encountered the Scrolls in media representations or perhaps in a travelling

exhibit. For many tourists, to visit the site is to prioritize the narrative of the Dead Sea

Scrolls over a competing discourse of contested geopolitics. With no hybrid forum where

an alternative narrative could be represented, it becomes difficult to image this place, despite its location in the middle of the West Bank, outside of an Israeli national framework. Qumran is a land-based site, one from which all other representations of the Scrolls are derived, and that land is contested. On the one hand, it lies within the traditional geography of *Eretz Israel*, but outside the internationally recognized boundaries of the State of Israel. As a state-operated national park in the West Bank that derives revenue from domestic and foreign tourism, it is economically, politically, and narratively entwined with the occupation of the West Bank.

On the other hand, as mentioned in chapter II, the site is listed on the Palestinian tentative list of World Heritage Sites, underlining the national politics of recognition that go hand in hand with official heritage designations. Nowhere in tourism marketing or tour guide scripts will one come across a mention of entering Palestinian territories. En route to Qumran, visitors will never pass a road sign marking entry to the West Bank, nor the artificial internal boundaries between Areas A, B, and C. They are greeted by the flags of Israel and the Nature and Parks Authority, as well as the remains of what is interpreted as the generative settlement of the Dead Sea Scrolls—framed as progenitors of "Western civilization" (this theme of global legacies is explored further in chapter V).

The Travelling Exhibit

The interpretive strategy of the travelling exhibit more directly asserts the conventional Israeli nationalist heritage agenda than at the Shrine of the Book or Qumran. It works intently to build a sense of "the land" as an Israeli place through multimedia, sweeping aerial landscape photographs, concise and provocative interpretive statements,

and an exhibit design that evokes an atmosphere of mystique. Whereas the Shrine of the Book and Qumran are structured rather loosely in terms of visitor movements, the travelling exhibit has a set path and is tightly structured along a narrative of the history of ancient Israel, using its associated geographic category, "the land of Israel," as a frame of reference. Thus, I tend to this exhibit in a rather more systematic fashion, in hopes of offering the reader a sense of the exhibit's narrative flow. The travelling exhibit uses narrative in quite a different way from the Shrine of the Book and Qumran, in that it introduces the contemporary ideological elements of the Dead Sea Scrolls narrative to entirely new publics.

The travelling exhibit, "Dead Sea Scrolls: Life in Ancient Times," as it was titled during its run at the Boston Museum of Science[4], makes ample use of photos, audio-visual material, timelines, maps, and archaeological artifacts to emphasize the significance of "the land's" past in the present. Though the title of the exhibit differs slightly from its other tour stops in the United States, the exhibit design and content were consistent. The actual scrolls on display are changed every few months in order to minimize light exposure, but this only entails a change in the small interpretative panel that includes a translation of the scroll itself; never a change in the more elaborate interpretation of the Scrolls as an assemblage. As mentioned in the exhibit outline in chapter II, relatively little of the exhibit content directly pertains to individual elements within the Dead Sea Scrolls assemblage. Rather, the focus of the exhibit from the very

---

[4] From 2011-2015, the exhibit was also shown in New York, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Salt Lake City, and, at the time of writing, Los Angeles. In New York, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, and Salt Lake City, the exhibit was titled, "Dead Sea Scrolls: Life and Faith in Ancient Times," and in Los Angeles was more simply titled, "Dead Sea Scrolls: The Exhibition."

beginning is framed as the history—particularly the Iron Age and early Roman periods—

of the "land of Israel."

The Desert Orientation Gallery

While waiting for their timed entry outside of the main exhibit hall, an audio-clip

plays on repeat to visitors in line, alternating between Hebrew and English: "The Lord

said to Abraham, 'Go forth from your native land, and from your father's house, to the

land that I will show you' " (DSSLAT 2013). This passage, from Genesis 12:1,

foreshadows the framework for the exhibit before the visitor even enters. When the

previous group has moved on, a guide leads the waiting group into the "Desert

Orientation Gallery," a room delimited by three screens with projected panoramic images

of the Dead Sea landscape. Also in the room are three vessels: one from the so-called

First Temple period, another from the Second Temple period, and the last a scroll jar

from Qumran dating to the time of the Jewish Revolts against Roman administration.

When the group has entered, the guide recites a scripted introduction to the exhibit. She

uses the surrounding imagery to introduce the group to the history of "the land" and

ancient Israel:

> GUIDE: Three jars, each with their own unique story from the ancient past, and
> inside of one, our closest written connection to Abraham, Moses, and Jesus.
> Welcome to Israel, the biblical land of milk and honey, at the crossroads of
> Africa, Asia, and Europe, and paradise for an archaeologist. Thousands of years
> ago, this land was the cradle of religious traditions that would shape Western
> civilization, and artifacts bring that long lost world to life, a world we'd know
> virtually nothing about, if it weren't for objects [pause] like this. [The first of
> three jars is illuminated]

This excerpt alone captures the mood that emerges from the exhibit—one of mystique,

but also rediscovery—of returning to the very roots of "Western civilization." It also

introduces the two dominant themes of popular representations of the Scrolls: "the land" and legacy. The "land of Israel," we are told is the fount of a people and a repertoire of values important to the present day. The guide's narrative begins with a contemporary place, "[…] Israel, the biblical land of milk and honey, at the crossroads of Africa, Asia, and Europe, and paradise for an archaeologist." She then proceeds to tell the group about a fragment of the first of the three jars, stamped with the royal insignia, and the state of "the land" during its time:

> GUIDE: This tiny broken piece brings us back to a time when the Bible was still being written, to the days of the legendary First Temple that King David's son, Solomon, built, to house the Ark of the Covenant almost 3000 years ago. This was the golden age of ancient Israel. Within a couple of hundred years, the Babylonians would overrun the land and destroy Jerusalem and the First Temple. Jars like this one were buried under a layer of utter destruction. That might have been the end of Israel's story, but amazingly in the face of obliteration, rather than disappearing, the people, their history, and their religious thought of biblical Israel would persist and even thrive.

With this insistence on continuity, she proceeds in her explanation of the second jar to account for the return of the people of Israel to "the land," positioning them relative to a known contemporary geography:

> GUIDE: Another chapter in our history, and another ancient jar to illuminate our story. This one elaborately carved from a single chunk of limestone. Two thousand years ago, it probably held water to purify the worshippers entering the Temple Mount giving sacrifice to the God of Israel. It's a jar from the very place that the New Testament tells us Jesus overturned the tables of the moneychangers. Today, the western outer wall is nearly all that remains of the once proud shrine of the ancient Jews, after the Romans destroyed Jerusalem and the Second Temple in 70 CE. Once more, the story of the Israelites might have ended as the Second Temple was demolished, but, instead we have a tale of survival, the saga of a people striving to uphold their contract, or covenant, with their God.

Note also the use of "our" in recounting this "[…] chapter in our history […]." This is an early and explicit evocation of the inclusion of "Western" society as a legacy of "ancient Israel." The guide includes the American museum audience as having a natural stake in

this historical narrative. Finally, the third jar is juxtaposed with contemporary video footage of rippling water on the shore of the Dead Sea. She ties the discovery events of 1947 (more likely 1946 as noted by Silberman 1995) to the contemporary and ancient landscapes, while discounting the Bedouin involvement as one of ignorant treasure hunting:

> GUIDE: Now that's the Dead Sea, twenty miles from the Temple in Jerusalem, 1400 feet below sea level, the lowest elevation on earth, surrounded by desert. The same sand that the Bible tells us Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob once walked. Sacred land. And it's here that one of the greatest archaeological discoveries of all time was made. The year was 1947. It was the eve of the founding of the modern State of Israel. Now, story has it that a young Bedouin goatherd chased a stray goat to a cave near the Dead Sea. He threw a rock inside the cave and heard pottery shattering. The next day he returned, disappointed to find no treasure in the cave, just a parchment scroll – animal skin, wrapped in linen, amid pieces of pottery. And this parchment had ancient Hebrew writing on it. Little did he know, it was worth far more than any gold or gem ever found. You see, pots and coins, well that's one thing, but finding ancient writing is truly miraculous. Paper and parchment disintegrate—they burn, animals eat them, water and humidity destroy them. But not here. In these dry caves at the lowest point on earth, that scroll survived, for 2000 years. All until a shepherd, who couldn't even read it, stumbled on a broken jar. His find led to nothing less than the oldest known surviving copies of the Hebrew Bible, what Christians call the Old Testament. Bedouins and archaeologists went on to find more scrolls, and fragments of scrolls, in other nearby caves. More than 900 scrolls, hidden in this rugged terrain over 2000 years ago—all while the Romans conquered the land, and destroyed Jerusalem and the Second Temple—a vast library we know as the Dead Sea Scrolls.

The above narrative positions the contemporary interests of Jews and Christians in a land at once ancient and modern. It constructs a chronotope (Bakhtin 1981)—a relationship between time and place that is drawn on through the remainder of the exhibit—centering on Jewish and Christian identities, while repeating the trope of accidental discovery by an ignorant Bedouin herder. "The land" is a chronotope. It binds ancient Jewish life (as well as the emergence of early Christian thought) and

contemporary Jewish nationhood to the biblical/Zionist "land of Israel." "The land" is a

place, but it is constructed as inherently tied to a community of Israelites/Jews/Israelis in

antiquity (Second Temple period-Jewish revolts) and the contemporary moment (State of

Israel). The exhibit does not treat this geography as temporally inclusive of those periods

between the creation of the Scrolls and the founding of the State of Israel, despite

gesturing to these transient peoples in a timeline that connects the State of Israel to the

early Israelites. This is the focus of the next room, the "Timeline Gallery."

The Timeline Gallery

The "Timeline Gallery" adopts a culture-historical lens, stretching almost the full

length of the exhibit hall, dividing the history of the region into cultural phases, providing

for each one or two paragraphs of text, one or two images, and a small selection of

artifacts from the period. The wall opposing the timeline display is lined with floor-to-

ceiling aerial landscape photos of an unpeopled Judean Desert, constantly maintaining

"the land" as a point of reference. The timeline divides the region's history using the

following headings: "Where Past and Future Intersect" (State of Israel), "Ottoman Period

(1516-1917 CE)," "Mamluk Period (1250-1517 CE)," "Crusader Kingdom (1099-1291

CE)," "Fatimid Period (909-1171 CE)," "Early Islamic Period (638 CE-1099 CE),"

"Byzantine Empire (325-638 CE)," "Roman Empire (63 BCE-313 CE)," "Persians,

Greeks, and Hasmoneans (539-37 BCE)," "Iron Age II: Judah and Israel (1000-586

BCE)," and finally "Iron Age I: The Early Israelites (1200-1000 BCE)." Despite allotting

equal space to each of these phases, it maintains a rise, fall, and return model of the

history of *Israel*. Between the descriptions of the Roman Empire and the State of Israel,

each cultural phase is represented through its own self-contained rise and fall trajectory.

See, for one example, the paragraph on the Fatimid period:

> The Fatimids traced their lineage to the prophet Muhammad through his daughter Fatima. They claimed that they, not the Abbasid caliphs in Baghdad, were the rightful rulers of the Islamic community. At the beginning of the tenth century CE, they founded a kingdom in North Africa and in 969 CE they conquered Egypt, building a capital there at al-Qahira, or Cairo ("the victorious"). By 970 CE, they had seized the entire region. However, their control in Palestine was hampered by constant conflict with local Bedouin tribes. The Fatimid period ended with the conquest of Jerusalem by the Crusaders, who founded the kingdom of Jerusalem. (DSSLAT 2013)

Note that there is little to no explanation of the legacy of the Fatimids in Palestine other than that there were Bedouin tribes there who "hampered" their control. Most of the explanation focuses on their exploits elsewhere, and ends with their disappearance at the hands of the Crusaders. In this instance, the Fatimids are kept apart from any profound connection to "the land." Compare this with the paragraph on Iron Age II:

> The monarchic period witnessed the emergence of the first Israelite kingdom united under David and Solomon. According to the Bible, this glorious union did not last long: the country split into southern (Judah) and northern (Israel) kingdoms in 922 BCE. Archaeological excavations reveal that the northern kingdom was the dominant of the two. But at the close of the eighth century BCE, the westward advance of the Assyrian Empire ended in its violent destruction. About a hundred and thirty-five years later, the kingdom of Judah suffered a similar fate, at the hands of the Babylonians, along with the destruction of the Temple, in 586 BCE. After the devastation of much of Judah and a prolonged siege on its capital, the mighty walls of Jerusalem were breached. The city was torched and the Temple destroyed. Babylonian arrowheads found in the ruins testify to the magnitude of the catastrophe. (DSSLAT 2013)

Here we see an injection of powerful and emotional terms such as "glorious," "suffered," "devastation," and "catastrophe" to describe the experience of the Israelite kingdoms in "the land." In this case, history does not passively unfold in "the land"; there are protagonists (Israelites) and antagonists (Assyrians and Babylonians) struggling over the sanctity of it.

The Biblical Gallery

Following this gallery, visitors proceed to the "Biblical Gallery," where various aspects and episodes of the history of ancient Israel are traced. This narrow gallery is the most densely populated, with visitors and material culture, as it stretches back across the exhibit hall from the end of the timeline toward the final "Scroll Gallery." On display in the gallery are artifacts, including rows of large stamped storage vessels, architectural fragments, including monumental column capitals, and a series of smaller portable objects, such as figurines and arrowheads. Maps, provenience labels, and still more floor-to-ceiling landscape photos play an important role in constituting "the land" in this part of the exhibit.

Among the main display of artifacts stretching along the wall that separates this room from the Timeline Gallery are two projection screens, each featuring a rotation of the small objects displayed under glass cases before the visitors. For each object, a map (labeled "Israel") featuring the outer perimeters of what constitutes contemporary Israel, the West Bank, and the Golan Heights is shown with the provenience of the object marked by a red dot. The inclusion of the West Bank and the Golan Heights on the maps naturalizes the mapping of *Eretz Israel* onto a contested contemporary geography. Among the objects displayed on these screens, half are from the East Jerusalem sites of the Western Wall plaza and the City of David (see Greenberg 2009 regarding the controversial excavations at the City of David/Silwan), though their provenience is only ever labeled as "Jerusalem," never "East Jerusalem." Many of the artifacts found elsewhere in the exhibit in fact come from sites in occupied territories, including Samaria

(near Nablus, West Bank), the Western Wall plaza (East Jerusalem), and the City of David (East Jerusalem). In this narrow corridor, visitors occasionally turn to view the large aerial photos depicting Tel Hazor in northern Israel and the Old City of Jerusalem, or the reconstructed segment of an Israelite four-room house, partly reconstituted with building stones from the City of David.

In no part of the Biblical Gallery are Qumran or the Dead Sea Scrolls represented. Its chronology ranges from "Israelite Beginnings" in Iron Age I (1200-1000BCE) to the "Fall of Judah and Jerusalem" with the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem in 586 BCE. The entirety of the gallery thus far predates the Scrolls by more than four hundred years. Until the end of the Biblical Gallery, the narrative focus is the history of "the land of Israel," with particular emphasis on the Iron Age biblical kingdoms of Israel and Judah. The Biblical Gallery's foci are illustrated by panels with such captivating titles as "Birth of a Nation" (seemingly oblivious to the subject of the D.W. Griffith film of the same name) and "Jerusalem: Center of Worship, City of Kings." The selection of artifacts is based on significant historical events, such as Assyrian arrowheads from Lachish to illustrate the Assyrian invasions of the late eighth century BCE, and on biblical passages, as in the case of an ivory dove seated on a pomegranate from the City of David to accompany the Psalms 55:6 verse: "Oh that I had the wings of a dove, I would fly away and be at rest…" (DSSLAT 2013).

This narrative structure, integrated with a striking display of material culture, brings their place to the present. To read a biblical verse about Jerusalem, to see artifacts from there, and then to turn and see a massive aerial photo of the Old City as it looks today, has remarkable affective power. To have this situated in the framework established

in the Timeline Gallery, connecting past to present, adds further to its impact. It is the narration of a people and place whose past, we are told, is the essence of a profound cultural legacy and sense of national belonging.

The Scroll Gallery

With this base of interpretation firmly established—past and present thoroughly articulated—the visitor proceeds to the final room, the "Scroll Gallery." They are greeted with a panel titled "The World of the Dead Sea Scrolls," which explains the return of the Israelites, following their exile by the Babylonians, to the now Persian province of *Yehud*. It describes the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the Second Temple, and the Hellenization of "the land" after the arrival of Alexander the Great in 332 BCE (DSSLAT 2013). It then introduces, for the first time since the very beginning of the exhibit, the Dead Sea Scrolls:

> Two thousand years ago, in the Judean Desert, on the northern shores of the Dead Sea, a group of people placed their religious writing in eleven remote caves, never returning to retrieve them.
>
> Discovery of the texts, beginning in 1947, remains one of the great archaeological events of the twentieth century. These fragile parchment scrolls, though ravaged by insects and the elements, were preserved by their surroundings' hot, dry climate and the darkness of the caves where they were placed. Among them are the oldest existing copies of the Hebrew Bible, written when Judaism and Christianity were just taking form. (DSSLAT 2013)

The visitor enters a spacious room with a central table into which ten scrolls (or scroll fragments) are set with accompanying summary and provenience information. On the perimeter of the room are inset display cases dealing with three themes: the archaeology of Qumran, Jerusalem at the time of the Scrolls, and the relevance of the Scrolls to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. There are also two alcoves: one dealing with

the site of Masada, and the second featuring a short video about the discovery of the Scrolls.

There are no maps in this room, perhaps because of Qumran's rather obvious location in the center of West Bank, and also very little said about the status of Qumran overall. Just five short panels cover the site's interpretation, dealing largely with particular finds like a hoard of shekels, food remains, and ceramics. The marginal status of the Qumran community is mentioned only briefly at the end of a panel titled "Journey to Qumran":

> Most archaeologists and scholars who studied Qumran and the Scrolls were certain the authors of the scrolls occupied the site leading a secluded, austere life of piety. These investigators believed that they had found the Essenes, described by ancient historian Josephus, who "reject pleasures as an evil, but esteem chastity." More recent investigations have called this theory into question. (DSSLAT 2013)

This is how the Qumran community's status is described, glossing over the scholarly debates that have raged over several decades and also the general consensus that the inhabitants lived outside of mainstream society. As Prior (2006) notes, while blockbuster exhibits—in their commercial goal to attract as wide an audience as possible—may simplify scholarly debates, it is wrong to discredit this as simply the "dumbing-down" of museums. This selectivity and simplification leaves the Scrolls open to the expansive interpretation offered regarding their relation to Jerusalem and the Abrahamic faiths. This oft-repeated strategy in blockbuster travelling exhibits at once democratizes the museum by drawing a broader public while reproducing power asymmetries—in this case privileging official Israeli nationalist heritage narratives over those based in Palestinian nationalist and other alternative discourses of the past.

Despite little textual mention of the Scrolls' relationship to Jerusalem at the Shrine of the Book or Qumran, it is a centerpiece of the their interpretation in the travelling exhibit. On the panel titled "Jerusalem and the Dead Sea Scrolls," the narrative proposes a direct relationship between Qumran and Jerusalem, and points, in something of a double entendre, to a future restoration of Jerusalem:

> The authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls were intimately familiar with Jerusalem. It is likely that some of them lived in the city at one time. Many scrolls mention both the contemporary city and messianic visions of it in a perfect future age. For these writers, the city was polluted and profane. […]
>
> The Temple was the seat of an illegitimate priesthood, which would be delivered into the hands of the *Kittin*, probably the Romans. At the same time, the scrolls speak of Jerusalem's future restoration; it would again be worthy of the divine presence at the end of days, when God would build a perfect Temple there. (DSSLAT 2013)

The Jerusalem-Qumran relationship is narrated outside of textual interpretation at the Shrine of the Book and Qumran. There, it is narrated through the movement of the Scrolls to their new "home" at the Shrine of the Book, and the movement of visitors back and forth between Jerusalem and Qumran. Facing the impossibility of such immediate relations in Boston, the American and Israeli co-curators rely on the basic museological practice of moving both places to the unifying space of the exhibit, with juxtaposed photographs and artifacts from both places.

The most powerful juxtaposition lies at the far end of the Scroll room near the exhibit's exit. Here, the visitor stands between the Scroll table and a massive stone from the Western Wall in Jerusalem. Visitors are invited to touch the stone and deposit a written prayer on top with the promise of it being delivered to Jerusalem. This mimics the custom of inserting prayer notes in cracks and between the stones of the actual Western Wall in Jerusalem. Just as the visitor rounds the corner to exit, they are confronted with a

live-feed video screen of the Western Wall plaza, showing hundreds of people praying with accompanying audio to give a sense of the commotion. Above the screen, one reads the following passage, which is also recited in English and sung in Hebrew by a disembodied voice:

> Stay in this land for a while, and I will be with you and will bless you… I will make your descendants as numerous as the stars in the sky and will give them all these lands, and through your offspring all nations on earth will be blessed… Genesis 26:3-5 (DSSLAT 2013)

Without explicitly stating the politics of the process, this narrative articulation of the Scrolls and "the land" concludes with an image of the "restored Jerusalem" foreshadowed by the earlier panel. The entire narrative of "the land" in biblical times is *made* present through the practice of leaving a prayer on the ancient stone of the Western Wall, through the immersive engagement with the Scrolls, and through the image of continuity in "the land" as the visitor leaves the exhibit.

Consequences of Making "the Land's" Past Present

Where a contemporary discourse of contested land exists, can there also exist an uncontested discourse of that land's past? At the Shrine of the Book, "the land's" past is made present through the repositioning of its best-preserved ancient texts to the heart of the modern capital. At Qumran, despite existing outside of the State's recognized boundaries, "the land's" past is made present by transforming the very place of the historical narrative into a place of the modern nation-state, a pawn in contemporary geopolitics and a place that draws people from around the world. The travelling exhibit brings many of these elements—the centrality of Jerusalem, the mystique of Qumran, and the past/present juxtaposition of "the land" to whole new audiences. There is a certain

assertiveness that accompanies the travelling exhibit's narration of "the land." It lacks the passivity of simply being in "the land." It must take on the role of introducing a narrative to individuals and groups who might not travel to Jerusalem or Qumran of their own ambition. Those who do travel to these sites in Israel/Palestine already demonstrate a certain familiarity with the Scrolls—they travel to seek direct contact with them— whereas the average visitor to the travelling exhibit is not guaranteed to be acquainted with their associated narrative.

The project of mobilizing this narrative is particularly salient with the case of the United States, where Israel's previously unflagging alliances show signs of eroding (Gerges 2013). From a nation-state founded on an ideology of return—an ideology its governing right-wing seeks to expand (Pappe 2014)—regimenting this national heritage discourse on an international stage is an ongoing struggle in the face of a repeatedly failing cycle of peace processes. Subsuming all of Israel/Palestine as "the land," through an assemblage of text, imagery, artifacts, maps, language use, flags, and display techniques legitimizes ongoing expansion of settlements and resource extraction, and continued Israeli military and police monitoring of Palestinian life, as justified based on a project of restoring the imagined geography of an ancient community.

"The land," as constituted through linguistic and representational forms outlined above, must be understood for its political consequences despite the innocence all too often associated with "heritage" (Hall 2005). The process of naturalizing perceptions of "the land" through a carefully constructed and mobilized discourse of its past is one that must be navigated critically in these places of heritage. In the next chapter, I examine the second major theme that emerges from these sites: legacy.

CHAPTER V

STRUCTURING LEGACY

Nadia Abu El-Haj (2001) rightly remarked in her ethnography of Israeli archaeological practice that ethnocentric archaeology in Israel/Palestine was not an Israeli invention. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, North American and European Christian scholars intensified their study of those regions where they traced their cultural ancestry. In Greece, they found the roots of Western democracy, philosophy, and the arts. In Palestine, they found the roots of their faith and morality. While archaeology was gradually adopted by a local power with the emergence of a national Israeli tradition, the "West" has never abandoned its gaze over the region.

Recently, critiques of archaeology in Israel have focused on the shift from nationalism to tourism as the priority of state interventions in heritage. Baram (2007) traces this shift through the emergence of a post-Zionist intellectual class and the integration of Israel into the global economy. He contends that Israelis no longer rely on tangible markers of antiquity to inform their sense of identity, citing the reprioritization of economic needs over the needs of collective identity. Archaeology is thus seldom practiced for building Israeli social identity, but rather for economic development through its touristic appeal. Similarly, Killebrew (2010) surveys a selection of Israeli public archaeological representations and identifies tourist interest as the driving force behind site interpretation. No longer, she argues, do archaeological representations try to call on Israelis to root themselves in their country. The sites she examines are developed to take

advantage of the tourist economy, complete with gift stores, restaurants, and tourist-oriented interpretation.

Such critiques advance our thinking of the entanglements of archaeology with forces of globalization. While it is important to recognize heritage management as a strategy for economic development—and I repeat that capital surely is a motivating factor in the maintenance of these representations—these analyses tend to neglect the global politics of recognition that operate with the large and diverse audiences heritage sites attract under conditions of hyper-commodification. While the pursuit of economic growth among national heritage authorities in Israel, and in our case private non-profit American museums, is unquestionable, this does not supersede another cultural politics still at play; not solely the domestic nationalism that was the focus of critiques like those of Silberman (1989) and Abu El-Haj (2001), but also of global diplomacy (Scham 2009). Representations of the Dead Sea Scrolls carry immense symbolic capital that is mobilized at these sites.

In addition to the importance of "the land," Western civilization and the Abrahamic faiths as the *legacy* of ancient Israel emerges also as a dominant motif in these representations. Drawing on those core values that first brought Western scholars to Palestine, notions of extra-national significance are enregistered—that is, made socially recognizable—within these official representations of the Dead Sea Scrolls. These notions of legacy—Western thought, governance, morality, etc.—are expressed implicitly and explicitly at the three sites of this investigation. With its grand scale, the Shrine of the Book was designed specifically with the intent of communicating the concept of rebirth to those who could not read the Hebrew of the Scrolls (Roitman 2001). Qumran National

74

Park is designed especially to appeal to Christian tourists (Killebrew 2007). The narrative presented in its introductory film signals a direct connection between New Testament imagery and the sectarian community of Qumran. Together, Qumran and the Shrine of the Book emerge as quasi-pilgrimage sites for place-making and recognition. Meanwhile, the traveling exhibit articulates its narrative to the supposed "Judeo-Christian" values of its patrons, framing their worldview as a legacy of "ancient Israel." Here I open a discussion of what it means to move these messages along transnational routes, to position them in institutions of cultural regimentation, and why, as I interpret, this process is effective for maintaining national legitimacy.

A Narrative of Global Legacies

Where earlier critics of Israeli archaeology understood the field in nationalistic terms, they fell short of considering the highly mobile character of its representations. They do not account for the ways that tourists decode representations, or what happens when representations are exported to by-and-large extra-national audiences. The Dead Sea Scrolls, probably the most highly mobile assemblage from Israel/Palestine, make for a rich site to examine the intersections of nationalistic heritage discourse, tourist pilgrimage, and the networks of globalization. This thesis does not delve into the ethnographic examination of narrative decoding by audiences, but establishes a necessary starting point by disentangling the articulations that make these representations readable within a limited frame of interpretation. The three sites speak at least as much, if not more, to non-Israeli audiences as they do to Israelis. Israelis are not excluded, and indeed the sites reproduce Israeli nationalist heritage discourse. However, since the 1980s when

archaeology began to fade as the "national pastime" (Abu El-Haj 2001; Halotte and Joffe 2002; Killebrew 2007), the Shrine of the Book and Qumran have been maintained as tourist attractions for largely foreign audiences. And the travelling exhibit, which is exclusively touring the United States, is developed specifically for a foreign audience. Below, I focus on the context in which non-Israelis, namely Europeans and North Americans with means of access, encounter Israeli nationalist narratives about the past in a new context of promoting recognition of the State in transnational spaces.

Legacy for Who?

All three Dead Sea Scrolls sites construct the inheritors of this legacy in slightly different ways, and these are examined below. But the accompanying guidebook to the travelling exhibit offers a particularly illustrative response to this leading question:

> Reaching beyond religious circles, these sources have swayed philosophers, molded leaders, affected institutions of higher learning as well as courts and seats of government, and have shaped our precepts of morality and justice as they have for over two thousand years and across the world's continents. (Kohn and Ben Ami 2012:7)

Note here the use of "our" to denote a shared sense of values. This panel establishes a common legacy, stemming from ancient Israel, and shared by nations of "the West," presumably including the State of Israel (Handelman 2004:50-51). It also establishes a personal relationship between the visitors and these entities, inviting them into the narrative as equals of the narrators—a sort of imagined community base on shared values (Anderson 2006).

The representations build on an undisclosed notion of "Judeo-Christian" identity. Emergent from the United States in the 1930s and 1940s as a response to European anti-

Semitism, Protestant groups adopted this discourse of Judeo-Christian identity to envision the Hebraic roots of Christianity and the shared vision of Western modernity within Judaism and Christianity (Silk 1984). It also served as a convenient displacement for rampant anti-Semitism that had existed in the United States up until that point, focusing antagonism toward Europe and reframing American society as one of a unified future between Christians and Jews. Increasingly, it has become a way of characterizing a religious unity of "the West," despite resistance from American Jewish and Catholic groups seeking to maintain distinct identities (Silk 1984:76-78). Though it is contested, it has emerged as a hegemonic discourse operating at all levels of the American social formation, and notably reflected in the popular, yet highly problematic, political writings of Samuel Huntington (1996; for critical response see Said 2001). In the travelling exhibit especially, it is not only implicitly evoked; it is materially defined. First resuming my analysis of the travelling exhibit, the following sections trace how this relationship between ancient Israel and the West is marked in the three sites through the theme of "legacy".

The Traveling Exhibit

Within the interpretive strategy outlined in the previous chapter, the travelling exhibit employs frequent and direct references to the relationship between ancient Israel, "Western civilization," and the contemporary Abrahamic faiths. These are not fleeting mentions buried in artifact descriptions, but rather framing statements at major intervals in the visitor's trajectory. Take one of the first statements made by the guide in the Desert Orientation Gallery:

> Thousands of years ago, this land was the cradle of religious traditions that would shape Western civilization, and artifacts bring that long lost world to life, a world we'd know virtually nothing about, if it weren't for objects [pause] like this [the first of three jars is illuminated]. (DDSLAT 2013)

Thus, within seconds of entering the exhibit, the narrative framing is set and subsequently maintained by related statements. Note too the prioritization of "religious traditions that would shape Western civilization." The traditions of ancient Israelite societies, of course, informed Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, and this is acknowledged in the exhibit. But to use the category of "Western civilization" invokes the discourse of "Judeo-Christian" tradition, itself a recently imagined category.

The exhibit treats the three Abrahamic religions directly, devoting a panel each to the legacy of ancient Israel in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. The text of each is quoted below, beginning with the panel on Judaism:

> The Scrolls and the Hebrew Bible
> The Dead Sea Scrolls illustrate that scripture formed Judaism as much as Judaism shaped scripture. They provide a porthole to an era when a variety of Jewish groups attempted to live their lives in accordance with the writings of their sacred past. They did so by continually interpreting and reinterpreting these sacred texts and by reading the words of the biblical prophets as predictions and as contemporary commentaries. The scrolls help us understand a time when the biblical canon as we know it today was still taking shape—when each community had its own set of authoritative texts; when there was not one Bible, but many. (DSSLAT 2013)

The panel is accompanied by two mosaics depicting menorahs from the Byzantine period. Following this is the panel explaining the relevance of the Dead Sea Scrolls to understanding Christianity:

> The Scrolls and Christian Origins
> Much of the New Testament had not been composed when the scrolls were placed in the Qumran caves. No New Testament writings were found among them, nor is mention of Jesus, Paul, or John the Baptist. Still, the earliest Christians and the authors of some of the scrolls share religious ideas. These include anticipation of a messiah and identification of their community as the "ideal Israel". Both groups

78

have a "righteous teacher"; both highlight the importance of communal meals and prayer. Important differences between the two groups include the view that the teacher of righteousness in the scrolls, unlike Jesus, is not divine. And while the *Yahad* community was exclusionary, the earliest Jesus movement was open to all. (DSSLAT 2013)

Displayed alongside this panel is a mosaic with the symbol of the cross from the Byzantine period. Note the departure from Qumran's site narrative, mentioning that John the Baptist does not figure in the writings of the Scrolls. However, it maintains the Scrolls as central to understanding the context in which Christianity emerged. Next is a panel on the Scrolls' relevance to both Judaism and Christianity:

> The Scrolls open a Window the Distant Past
> Among the Dead Sea Scrolls are texts that reveal a turbulent and important period in Jewish history. In them we see Judaism divided into numerous religious communities and political parties. With the destruction of the Temple in 70 C.E., most of these groups disappear. The Judaism of the Pharisees—rabbinic Judaism—and the Jesus movement survive and grow. Reflected in the scrolls is a religion in transition: moving from the ritual and practice of biblical Israel to the Judaism of the rabbis and the Christianity of the church fathers. (DSSLAT 2013)

The panel emphasizes the commonalities of Judaism and Christianity, notably the common historical landscape in which they emerged, resonant with American Judeo-Christian discourse. The last panel in this series explains the relevance of the Dead Sea Scrolls to Islam:

> Reverence and Dedication
> Many are not aware of the ways in which the Koran is influenced by the Hebrew Bible and the Christian New Testament. The Koran does not borrow directly from these scriptures; however it does contain some of the same history. Those familiar with the Bible will recognize figures in the Koran, such as Abraham, Moses, Lot, and Noah. The scrolls are important to Islam because they contain the earliest known texts representing part of Islamic history, as well as that of Jews and Christians. (DSSLAT 2013)

Accompanying this panel is a glass weight from the Fatimid Period from Tiberias and a stone slab bearing an Arabic inscription from Ramla. The text of this panel gestures to a

shared history of Islam with Judaism and Christianity through recognition of prominent biblical personages. Unlike those panels dealing with Christianity and Judaism, however, there is no mention of shared values between these two traditions and Islam.

The reader will note in these texts the direct links made to the biblical canon at the time of the Qumran sectarians to the development of Christianity and Judaism. They are parallel developments that draw equally on the events of the time period. Islam is also said to draw on this tradition, and elements of it are made recognizable to the visitor. It does not, however, offer the trajectory through which these developments were made relevant, nor do the artifacts on display mark Islamic practices in Israel/Palestine as in the way that the cross and menorah symbols presented in the gallery mark early Christian and Jewish practices and origins in "the land."

The Shrine of the Book

The few Dead Sea Scrolls originally acquired by Eleazar Sukenik and his son, Yigael Yadin, were initially intended to be exhibited in the National Library at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem in a dedicated, yet modest, display facility (Roitman 2001:54). Consensus among the planning committee was that Israelis did not need an elaborate venue to connect to the heritage mediated by the Scrolls. The fact that many of the Scrolls were written in legible Hebrew would be enough to provoke an emotional response to them (or rather, as I have argued, to the time-place relationship that they index). The decision to build a separate facility—indeed, a "shrine"—was made by the two American architects hired to design the exhibit space (Roitman 2001:55). The two felt that visitors who could not read Hebrew would have trouble appreciating their

significance, and thus argued that a monumental exhibit hall must be built. Frederick

Kiesler, one of the Shrine's two American architects notes in his journal:

> There is much more involved here than the display of rare manuscripts. The timing of these two events, one near the Dead Sea of the Middle East, and the other, away on the shores of the East River of North America [referencing the United Nations' 1947 resolution to partition Mandatory Palestine into Jewish and Arab states], this extraordinary simultaneity of fusing events is a hypnotic inspiration which I feel very strongly and would like to follow up.

> I wonder if one could find a plastic expression for the idea of "rebirth"—that is, an architectural concept that would make visitors feel the necessity for each person to renew himself while yet on this earth. (Kiesler 1964:323)

Foreign visitors, namely the architects' American compatriots, would thus be able to

experience the full legacy of the Scrolls without being able to read them in the way that

Israelis could (Roitman 2001:55). For the architects, it was a way of making the

meanings indexed by the Scrolls—"rebirth" of both Israel and oneself in the presence of

these foundational texts (Kiesler 1964:323)—recognizable to audiences through

architectural monumentality and metaphor.

I have explained the significance of the Shrine's location in Jerusalem, but it is

also worth noting how the Shrine's design elements make the theme of legacy tangible to

visitors. In my observations, more visitors commented on the Shrine itself than the Dead

Sea Scrolls within. This is unsurprising, as the use of technical interpretation and dim

lighting makes their display functionally difficult to engage with. Many focus their time

inside on the central display of the facsimile of the Great Isaiah Scroll, and outside taking

photos in front of the Shrine's domed roof. The white dome, shaped as the lid of a scroll

jar, is constantly bathed in water from surrounding fountains symbolizing the purification

practices of the Qumran sectarians. Adjacent to it stands a tall black granite wall that

descends to the subterranean exhibit space. As narrated by museum guides, the striking

contrast between the "pure" white dome and the black wall is meant to signify the struggle between the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness illustrated in the famous War Scroll. Thus, the two dimensions of the site that visitors engage with are its monumentality (architecture) and its best-preserved—though replicated—biblical material (the Isaiah Scroll).

As Smith (2006) argues, it is precisely these elements, the monumental and the preserved, that articulate to Western conceptions of heritage. I would add to this another category: the textual recognition of founding documents, of biblical texts in this case. Despite being unreadable to most foreign visitors, I observed many visitors remarking on the *apparent* legibility of the Great Isaiah Scroll and general familiarity with its English translation. Visitors to the Shrine see their own cultural values embodied in grandeur, the preservationist ethic, and the valorization of text.

Qumran National Park

Site interpretation at Qumran develops a theme of legacy by drawing connections between the sectarian community and figures related to Christianity. In the introductory film, the narrator (a fictional member of the *yahad*, or community) suggests a possible connection between John the Baptist and the Qumran sect:

> This morning, while working in the date grove, a neighbor from Ein el Ghuweir, a five-hour walk from here passed by. He told us of the bitter end of one John the Baptist whose head was severed by King Herod. Suddenly I remembered, we too had one by the name of John. Years ago he came to us, eager to volunteer. Each new member undergoes a thorough examination and once accepted for a season of study he joins in the work as well. In a year's time, just before becoming a full member, he arose, broke his vow to the *yahad*, and left. (NPA n.d.)

For those who are already familiar with the Scrolls, they will also be familiar with the suggestion of ties between the messianic expectations of the Qumran sect and early Christianity. The suggestion of a direct New Testament connection makes Qumran tangible to a wider audience, namely Western Christians. The film's Hebrew and English narration mark the film as for Israeli Jews and foreign tourists, but especially evangelical Protestants with invocations of divine predetermination:

> All is predestined. There is no free will. Even before the time of creation it was inscribed that you, somewhere in the future, would hear and see these words. It is God's own plan that brought you today to this pure and secret place, and God willing, perhaps the secrets may be revealed unto you. (NPA n.d.)

Killebrew's quantitative overview of visitorship to Qumran (among other sites) positions it as a Christian site given the massive gap between domestic and foreign visits. Data from 1998-2000, immediately predating the temporary tourist slump that coincided with the Second Palestinian *Intifada*, shows that there were 57,696 domestic visitors and 880,958 foreign visitors. Compare this to nearby Masada, where the gap is proportionally smaller, with 379,123 domestic visitors and 1,498,866 foreign (Killebrew 2010:128). Thus, Qumran emerges interpretatively as a site seemingly oriented to national belonging in "the land," and yet it is not a narrative aimed at Israelis. By drawing Western Christian tourists into the narrative, it adopts both diplomatic and economic missions reliant on Western Christian recognition and capital.

The Politics of (Trans)national Heritage Practice

These are narratives that anticipate a particular kind of visitor. This is the context in which authors reach out to particular people and invite them to see themselves in the narrative—to make it their own. Yet it is only effective for certain people. The heritage

narrative of the Scrolls, authorized within the dominant ideologies of Zionism and liberalism, articulates with particular experiences shared by a presumed Judeo-Christian and Western audience. It is for these individuals that the Scrolls are enregistered as indexes of an ethnonational landscape. It is not in all cases their landscape to belong to, though they are invited to recognize it and assume their social world as its legacy. Through these strategies, a large proportion of visitors to these sites come to decode the Dead Sea Scrolls for all those values enregistered within them—all those values outlined in the last two chapters. This is not regimented through electoral politics, organized activism, or religious doctrine. It does, however, animate politics in the gentle realm of heritage.

An important dimension of mobility is access: economic, physical, organizational, and temporal (Urry 2007:194). All of these forms of access are regimented at the intersections of class, race, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, nationality, and language. How access is regimented along these lines must fall to later ethnographies of decoding and discursive articulations, but one can speculate based on observations of inflated ticket prices, the demands of long-distance travel, the planning required to orchestrate these mobilities, and the educational backgrounds to which these representations speak, that the ideal subject of the Dead Sea Scrolls discourse is the Western subject of power and privilege. Thus, mobilities of heritage, in this case, operate along routes regulated by privileged access and sustain a power dynamic that is not easily hampered by marginalized dissenters.

It should also be clear by now that little of what constitutes the core of academic inquiry into the Scrolls corresponds to the core of public representation. The "authentic"

Dead Sea Scrolls of the scholar are quite distinct from those of the site visitor. While a cumbersome analytic point of reference, it cannot be denied that a sense of authenticity contributes to driving visitors to these places. Indeed, as an index for origins, how can they not offer visitors some semblance of authenticity? And yet, this authenticity is entirely constructed—what MacCannell (1973) termed "staged authenticity." Whatever substance scholars find within the Scrolls is displaced in these representations, only to be replaced and enregistered with authentic engagement with "the land" and legacy. As Bruner explains, the reproduction of originals, as in the reframing of the Scrolls at each of these sites, produces new originals—new authenticities. Precisely as I have argued, the work of representation is to rearticulate old things with new discourses. Bruner (1994:407) contends that "each new performance or expression of cultural heritage is a copy in that it always looks back to a prior performance, but each is also an original in that it adapts to new circumstances and conditions." Particularly useful for us is to consider what is being authenticated in these representations. Is it the Scrolls—the physical scraps of parchment—that visitors are engaging with? Evidently not. It is all that they index which is authenticated. This brings me to my concluding chapter, in which I pursue questions raised by this analysis for further consideration. Taking up Bruner's (1994) challenge to the ethnographer of authenticity: if our sites are seeking to construct authenticity, then who has raised a doubt?

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

In this thesis, I have taken sites representing the Dead Sea Scrolls as a case study for examining the transnational mobilities that introduce Israeli nationalist heritage discourse to global audiences. I have tracked the ways that official representations impose constraints on interpretative possibilities, and how mobility allows representation to function in multiple distinct contexts. While the narrative subject may indeed be a singular place (e.g. "the land"), as in the case of the Dead Sea Scrolls, it is mediated in multiple centers where it becomes articulated to other discourses particular to these diverse geographies. This is an open-ended model of heritage. It does not justify ways that heritage is used polycentrically; indeed it allows us to see new distributions of power and asymmetries. It allows us to seek out previously unconsidered spaces of representation, and think about how representations are coupled with discourses particular to these centers of representation.

This particular case demonstrates how representations are structured so that audiences recognize their own histories within them, even when the apparent subject of representation is of non-local contexts. Likewise, local place-based representations invite foreign actors to see themselves as part of their narrative. This is achieved by setting the narrative's principal theme—"the land"—into a framework of global legacy. This framing is not unique. Indeed, it lies at the base of the UNESCO World Heritage paradigm, in which places and practices around the world are selected for supposedly universal value. Yet as De Cesari (2014) has demonstrated, formal World Heritage designation can in fact reaffirm national difference. While as yet no Dead Sea Scrolls site

has received official World Heritage designation, this analysis suggests that heritage authorities are adopting a similar strategy to affirm a national discourse on a world stage. This research demonstrates how national heritage is *made* global, which might help us ask new questions about the consequences of the global heritage paradigm.

This case study stands as a precedent for deeper investigation as to how people at these sites go about linking their Dead Sea Scrolls experience to other discourses. My analysis does not attempt to illustrate standard visitor readings, but rather how the narratives offered at these sites constrain interpretive possibilities toward a "preferred reading" (Hall 2001). The contextualization of the site narratives allows us to think about how the official narrative associated with the Scrolls articulates to Zionist and liberal discourses of land and legacy. But in order to proceed with contextualization, we must first understand how representations work and the common threads that run through them. For others and myself, this analysis will hopefully provide a useful framework for future ethnographic research. Knowing how to decode such representations and the motifs they repeatedly invoke prompts questions as to how, in the soft economy of commoditized heritage, audiences reconcile their heritage engagements with narratives of violence and contestation in the media, where local organizers situate their heritage practice vis-à-vis transnational activism, and how commodification stimulates (or inhibits) mobilities.

Looking Forward

The Consequences of Representation

I have identified two overarching themes that emerge from these representations: the recovery of "the land's" past and legacy. Together, these themes speak to important and pressing geopolitical concerns. They are constructed in the framework of a well-rehearsed national heritage discourse authorized by the Israeli state and, more broadly, by complementary discourses of Zionism and liberalism. Mobilized in the transnational circuits of Israeli and Western museum and site visitors, these themes serve the interests of those individuals and groups concerned with maintaining Israeli dominance over the lands and people of all Israel/Palestine, and maintaining (minimally) a non-interventionist stance among publics in the United States. The first of these themes defines ethnonational belonging in the contested territorial limits of Israel/Palestine. The notion of "the land" that emerges from these sites does not float in isolation; it articulates with Zionist discourses of "the land" mobilized by American and Israeli mainstream media and political rhetoric, and reacts against dissenting voices in and outside of Israel/Palestine. And yet, within the sites themselves, the framing is one-dimensional and uncontested in keeping with nationalist heritage narratives that have been continually reproduced since Western Zionists first turned to the expert realms of archaeology and geography to demonstrate their claims in the late nineteenth century, as I outlined in chapter II. This is not to say that visitors do not contest this framing, but there is no evidence of—nor space for—critique within the place of representation. The representations invite visitors to recognize their history within the exhibit narrative, but if the visitor rejects that narrative, the exhibit offers no outlet for expression. Thus, counter-narratives flounder in these

spaces, while complementary narratives find sustenance. Such was the case when, in 2009 while on display at the Royal Ontario Museum, daily demonstrations were organized in support of a request from the Palestinian Authority (PA) that the Government of Canada seize the Scrolls as cultural property stolen by Israel in its occupation of East Jerusalem and the West Bank (Kersel 2011). The demonstrations received some media attention, but following the immediate dismissal of the request by the Canadian government and a perceived lack of support given the much larger crowds gathering inside the museum for the Scrolls exhibit, no such demonstration has been organized at an international exhibit since.

Mobilities—the circulation and engagement of people, things, and ideas in new and different spaces—allow these narratives to reach new publics with agency of their own to either accept and reproduce extant power asymmetries through passive ignorance or active lobbying, or to counter dominant ideologies in solidarity with activists seeking a just future for Palestinians and Israelis. Further to what can be observed at these sites, the transnational mobilities associated the Dead Sea Scrolls narrative operate elsewhere, such as television specials in which individuals experience virtual travel through projected images of place. This diverse range of representational forms demands inquiry into the complex economic, cultural, and political entanglements of transnational practices. It also offers rich opportunities for ethnographic observation of how people situate themselves within the narrated legacy, and importantly, who is left out.

Imagining Just Alternatives

In light of the power asymmetries that these representations seem to re-enforce, how might we consider interventions? In the case of the Dead Sea Scrolls, we might consider points of visible friction as moments of transformative possibilities. While during the Toronto exhibit, the request for the Scrolls' return was dismissed on the grounds that the PA was not a recognized state (Kersel 2011), the moment of protest represented a competing claim to the Scrolls and the nationalist heritage discourse they index. This has more recently manifested when the Palestinian Delegation to UNESCO included Qumran on its Tentative List of sites to be nominated for World Heritage status. Its listing (see PDPU 2012) emphasizes the significance of the site for its contributions to world history—notably that the Scrolls produced there allow us to understand the context in which the world religions of Judaism and Christianity originated. The text does not bind these traditions to particular nations; rather it frames Qumran as representing the time and place in which multiple global traditions took shape. It does not tie Qumran to Jerusalem in any direct way, instead adopting the view that the Essenes were a unique and reclusive community whose cultural tradition has disappeared.

Ya'ari (2010) offers one possible model for reconciling tensions in heritage discourse under the paradigm of "shared heritage." Working collaboratively with Palestinian, Jordanian, and Israeli heritage professionals, she and her colleagues developed a plan to harmonize interpretation at sites in the West Bank and Israel in anticipation of an eventual peace agreement. She defines shared heritage as a project of identifying historical experiences common to all that also enrich cultural identity and national pride (Ya'ari 2010:10). Their working group then collectively produced

interpretive materials to distribute at select sites and trained local tour guides. While

shared heritage offers productive alternatives to nationalist interpretation—it assumes

local visitation by responding to local tensions. Such an approach may not easily resonate

in transnational encounters with this heritage discourse, and must actively work to

articulate with mobile heritage tourists otherwise engaging with one-dimensional models

of heritage, as at the Dead Sea Scrolls sites. Interventions must also recognize the global

politics of recognition, and the likelihood that many sites will not embrace revision of

their representations toward ones of shared heritage.

To do this global reworking is the real challenge. In transnational spaces, it is far

more difficult to imagine the highly integrated experience of both Israelis and

Palestinians. Where Israelis and Palestinians regularly collaborate *in* Palestine/Israel on

initiatives toward a just peace, such practices often seem exceptional in global spaces.

For example, groups such as *Zochrot* and *Emek Shaveh* actively engage Palestinians and

Israelis in disrupting official and state-sanctioned memories of Israel's contemporary and

ancient past. *Zochrot* aims to introduce the *Nakba* (the Palestinian Catastrophe of 1948)

to the Israeli public through joint Israeli-Palestinian tours to the ruins of Palestinian

villages destroyed in the violent events of 1948 (Lentin 2010). *Emek Shaveh* leads

alternative tours of settler-managed archaeological sites in occupied East Jerusalem,

developed in collaboration with Palestinian residents (Greenberg 2009). They also

regularly pursue legal action against notorious settler-archaeology group *El'ad* to halt

expansion of excavations and development of tourist facilities in densely populated

Palestinian neighborhoods. Despite lacking their own museums to narrate alternative

narratives of the past, these groups regularly lead clandestine tours through state- or

privately-operated parks and organize conferences and meetings in allied institutional spaces.

Outside of Israel/Palestine, even at sites of supposedly critical and intellectual reflexivity, such as the American university, it is all too easy to fall to one side or the other—Student Alliance for Israel or Students for Justice in Palestine; BDS or JStreet. Reflecting on her personal and professional relationship to the histories of Israel and Palestine, anthropologist Jasmin Habib (2004; 2007) articulates a hope that more people will understand the sense of being caught between places, to understand Israel/Palestine as a shared place—integrated, if inequitable (Habib 2007:1098). How can social justice-minded people act toward just representations of one region that multiple peoples know only as home while also recognizing injustice, past and present?

Returning to the problematic of constructed authenticity, we must again ask of our sites: who is raising a doubt? If the need for authenticity is great enough for millions of people to seek access to these sites, then there must be something to affirm that is up for debate: the form and future of Israel (and Palestine) based on the chronotope maintained in these representations. To open these debates, those concerned about the global dimensions of heritage-politics might draw on the Harrison's (2013) concept of "hybrid forums" for democratizing heritage, and the practice of local interventions in Palestine/Israel (Killebrew *et al* 2006; Greenberg 2009; Ya'ari 2010) that manifest as parallel community-based interpretations that operate on the margins of official representation, yet speak directly to them. They must, however, reflect the interests and concerns of their global environments. Such actions could include supplementary programming within or outside the sites of contested narratives, where visitors are invited

to express their views in a public forum. Such programming would engage with contemporary issues related to those historical themes being represented. From such engaged and participatory practices, we have seen radical transformation in, for example, Indigenous representation in American (Lonetree 2012) and Canadian (Taylor 2011) museums, and archaeological projects that respond to community needs and desires around the world (for example Atalay 2012; Hamilakis and Theou 2013).

What possibilities might also arise with the dramatic emergence of a national Palestinian heritage enterprise? De Cesari (2008) has tracked the emergence of a "new Palestinian past," one that stands on its own—apart from mere counter-narratives to the dominant Israeli heritage discourse—and one through which Palestinian identity is increasingly governed. It will also be important to follow new forms of representing regional heritage when the Palestinian Museum, the national museum now well into construction outside of Ramallah, opens in late 2015. What will global players learn from these emergent representational forms?

Representation is a complex practice, and requires more than a text that *re*-presents some subject. There are of course authors to these representations and consumers, and there is constant feedback between the two outside of the physical spaces of representation. While we may expect transformations ahead given historical and current trends in heritage management, it is critical to follow these analyses with informed interventions. How else might land be conceptualized? What other meanings might the Scrolls have for local and global communities? How else might we in the West position ourselves with Israelis and Palestinians who strive for justice in their daily lives? And how might these alternative discourses articulate? As we begin to understand how

power operates locally and globally through everyday discourses of heritage and place, we advance to a point of just interventions. There, through the politics of lived culture, we might find the moment of transformation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abu El-Haj, Nadia
  2001 Facts on the Ground: Archaeological Practice and Territorial Self-Fashioning in Israeli Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Agha, Asif
  2003 The social life of cultural value. Language & Communication 23:231-273.
  2005 Voice, Footing, and Enregisterment. Journal of Linguistic Anthropology 15(1):38-59.

Allegro, John
  1956 The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reappraisal. Baltimore: Penguin Books.

Anderson, Benedict
  2006 Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism, Revised Edition. New York: Verso.

Atalay, Sonya
  2012 Community-Based Archaeology: Research with, by, and for Indigenous and Local Communities. Berkeley: University of California Press

Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich
  1981 The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Baram, Uzi
  2007 Heritage, Tourism, and Archaeology in Israel. *In* Selective Remembrances: Archaeology in the Construction, Commemoration, and Consecration of National Pasts. Philip L. Kohl, Mara Kozelsky, and Nachman Ben-Yehuda, eds. Pp. 299-325. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Baumann, Richard and Charles L. Briggs
  2003 Voices of Modernity: Language Ideologies and the Politics of Inequality. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bennett, Tony
  1998 Culture: A Reformer's Science. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
  2004 Pasts Beyond Memory: Evolution, Museums, Colonialism. New York: Routledge.

Benvenisti, Meron
  2000 Sacred Landscape: The Buried History of the Holy Land since 1948. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ben-Yehuda, Nachman
  1995 The Masada Myth: Collective Memory and Mythmaking in Israel. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Brownlee, W.H.
　　1955　John the Baptist in the New Light of Ancient Scrolls. Interpretation 9(1):71-90.

Bruner, Edward M.
　　1994　Abraham Lincoln as Authentic Reproduction: A Critique of Postmodernism.
　　　American Anthropologist 96(2):397-415.

Canaan, Tawfiq
　　1922　Haunted Springs and Water Demons in Palestine. Jerusalem: Palestine Oriental
　　　Society.
　　1927　Mohammedan Saints and Sanctuaries in Palestine. Jerusalem: Ariel Publication
　　　House.
　　1933　The Palestinian Arab House: Its Architecture and Folklore. Jerusalem: Syrian
　　　Orphanage Press.

Cary, Stephanie Hom
　　2004　The Tourist Moment. Annals of Tourism Research 31(1):61-77.

Chilton, Elizabeth and Neil Silberman
　　2010　Heritage in Conflict and Consensus: towards an international agenda for the
　　　twenty-first century. Museum International 62(1-2):6-8.

Clifford, James
　　1997　Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century. Cambridge:
　　　Harvard University Press.

Collins, John J.
　　2013　The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Biography. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Davies, Philip R.
　　1995　In Search of 'Ancient Israel'. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
　　2008　Memories of Ancient Israel: An Introduction to Biblical Israel—Ancient and
　　　Modern. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

De Certeau, Michel
　　1984　The Practice of Everyday Life. Berkeley: University of California Press.

De Cesari, Chiara
　　2009　Cultural heritage beyond the 'state': Palestinian heritage between nationalism and
　　　transnationalism. PhD dissertation, Dept. of Cultural and Social Anthropology,
　　　Stanford University.
　　2010　World Heritage and Mosaic Universalism: A View from Palestine. Journal of
　　　Social Archaeology 10(3):299-324.

De Vaux, Roland
　　1973　Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls. London: Oxford University Press.

Dead Sea Scrolls: Life in Ancient Times
  2013 Exhibit text for Dead Sea Scrolls: Life in Ancient Times. Hosted at the Museum
    of Science, Boston, May 19-October 20, 2014. Recorded May 21, May 22, and
    October 19, 2013.

Del Sorto, Rafaella A.
  2003 Israel's Contested Identity and the Mediterranean. Mediterranean Politics
    8(1):27-58.

Dever, William G.
  1998 Archaeology, Ideology, and the Quest for an "Ancient" or "Biblical" Israel. Near
    Eastern Archaeology 61(1):39-52.

Fish, Rachel
  2014 Bi-Nationalist Visions for the Construction and Dissolution of the State of Israel.
    Israel Studies 19(2):15-34.

Finkelstein, Israel and Neil A. Silberman
  2001 The Bible Unearthed: Archaeology's New Vision of Ancient Israel and the
    Origin of its Sacred Texts. New York: Free Press.

Galor, Katharina, Jean-Baptiste Humbert, and Jürgen Zangenberg, eds.
  2006 Qumran, the site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and
    Debates: proceedings of a conference held at Brown University, November 17-19,
    2002. Boston: Brill.

Gerges, Fawas A.
  2013 The Obama approach to the Middle East: the end of America's moment?
    International Affairs 89(2):299-323.

Glock, Albert
  1999 Archaeology as Cultural Survival: The Future of the Palestinian Past. *In*
    Archaeology, History and Culture in Palestine and the Near East: Essays in Memory
    of Albert E. Glock. Thomas Kapitan, ed. Pp. 302-323. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Gramsci, Antonio
  1971 Selections from the Prison Notebooks. London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Greenberg, Raphael
  2009 Towards an Inclusive Archaeology in Jerusalem: The Case of Silwan/The City of
    David. Public Archaeology 8(1):35-50.

Habib, Jasmin
  2004 Israel, Diaspora, and the Routes of National Belonging. Toronto: University of
    Toronto Press.
  2007 Both Sides Now: Reflections on the Israel/Palestine Conflict. Human Rights
    Quarterly 29(4):1098-1118.

Hall, Stuart
  2001 Encoding/Decoding. *In* Media and Cultural Studies: KeyWorks. Meenakshi Gigi
    Durham and Douglas M. Kellner, eds. Pp. 163-173. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
  2005 Whose Heritage? Un-Settling 'the Heritage', Re-Imagining the Post-Nation. *In*
    The Politics of Heritage: The legacies of 'race'. Jo Little and Roshi Naidoo, eds. Pp.
    23-35. New York: Routledge.

Halotte, Rachel and Alexander Joffe
  2002 The Politics of Israeli Archaeology: Between 'Nationalism' and 'Science' in the
    Age of the Second Republic. Israel Studies 7(3):84-116.

Hamilakis, Yannis and Efthimis Theou
  2013 Enacted multi-temporality. *In* Reclaiming Archaeology: Beyond the Tropes of
    Modernity. Alfredo Gonzalez-Ruibal, ed. Pp. 181-194. New York: Routledge.

Handelman, Don
  2004 Nationalism and the Israeli State: Bureaucratic Logic in Public Events. New
    York: Berg.

Harrison, Rodney
  2013 Heritage: Critical Approaches. New York: Routledge.

Huntington, Samuel P.
  1996 The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order. New York: Simon
    & Schuster.

Indyk, Martin S., Kenneth G. Lieberthal, and Michael E. O'Hanlon
  2012 Scoring Obama's Foreign Policy: A Progressive Pragmatist Tries to Bend
    History. Foreign Affairs 91(3):29-43.

Irvine, Judith and Susan Gal
  2000 Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation. *In* Regimes of Language:
    Ideologies, Polities, and Identities. Paul V. Kroskrity, ed. Pp. 35-83. Santa Fe: School
    of American Research Press.

Kersel, Morag M.
  2011 When Communities Collide: Competing Claims for Archaeological Objects in
    the Market Place. Archaeologies 7(3):518-537.

Kersel, Morag M. and Christina Luke
  2012 A Crack in the Diplomatic Armor: The United States and the Palestinian
    Authority's Bid for UNESCO Recognition. Journal of Field Archaeology 37(2):143-
    144.

Kiesler, Frederick
  1964 Inside the Endless House. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Killebrew, Ann E.
  2010 Who Owns the Past? The Role of Nationalism, Politics, and Profit in Presenting Israel's Archaeological Sites to the Public. *In* Controlling the Past, Owning the Future: The Political Uses of Archaeology in the Middle East. Ran Boytner, Lynn Swartz Dodd, and Bradley J. Parker, eds. Pp. 123-141. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Killebrew, Ann E., Sandra A. Scham, Hanaa Abu-Uqsa, Walid Atrash, Ron Be'eri, Rachel Hachlili, Hanan Halabi Abu Yusef, Orna Nagar-Hillman, Vered Raz-Romeo, and Mina Weinstein-Evron
  2006 From Dialogue to Polylogue: Exploring the Israeli and Palestinian Past in the Present. Archaeologies 2(2): 7–23.

Knopf-Newman, Marcy Jane
  2011 The Politics of Teaching Palestine to Americans: Addressing Pedagogical Strategies. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kohn, Risa Levitt and Debora Ben Ami
  2012 Dead Sea Scrolls: Life in Ancient Times. Herzliya: Albatross.

Lefkowitz, Daniel
  2004 Words and Stones: The Politics of Language and Identity in Israel. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lentin, Ronit
  2010 Co-memory and melancholia: Israelis memorialising the Palestinian Nakba. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Lewis, Justin and Sut Jhally
  1998 The Struggle Over Media Literacy. Journal of Communication 48(1):109-120.

Lonetree, Amy
  2012 Decolonizing Museums: Representing Native America in National and Tribal Museums. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

MacCannell, Dean
  1973 Staged Authenticity: Arrangements of Social Space within Tourist Settings. American Journal of Sociology 79(3):589-603.

Magness, Jodi
  2002 The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publications.

Malkki, Liisa H.
  1995 Purity and Exile: Violence, Memory, and National Cosmology among Hutu Refugees in Tanzania. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mazar, Amihai
  2009   Archaeology of the Land of the Bible: 10,000-586 B.C.E. New Haven: Yale
    University Press.

Nature and Parks Authority
  N.d.   Site text for Qumran National Park. Recorded August 7, 2013.

Netanyahu, Benjamin
  2014   Full text of Prime Minister Netanyahu's UN speech, September 29, 2014.
    Electronic resource, http://www.jpost.com/Arab-Israeli-Conflict/Full-text-of-Prime-
    Minister-Netanyahus-UN-speech-376626, accessed October 30, 2014.

Noy, Chaim
  2004   This Trip Really Changed Me: Backpackers' Narratives of Self-Change. Annals
    of Tourism Research 31(1):78-102.

Permanent Delegation of Palestine to UNESCO
  2012   QUMRAN: Caves and Monastery of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Electronic document,
    http://whc.unesco.org/en/tentativelists/5707/, accessed November 17, 2014.

Palestine Exploration Fund
  N.d.   The History of the PEF. Electronic resource, http://www.pef.org.uk/history/,
    accessed November 17, 2014.

Pappe, Ilan
  2014   The Idea of Israel: A History of Power and Knowledge. New York: Verso.

Peirce, Charles Sanders
  1955   Philosophical Writings of Peirce. New York: Dover Publications.

Peretz, Sapir
  2013   Biblical Zoo: Most Visitors in 2012. Electronic resource,
    http://www.globes.co.il/news/article.aspx?did=1000831778, accessed November 17,
    2014. (Hebrew)

Pes, Javier, Emily Sharpe, Toby Skeggs, Pac Pobric, Laurie Rojas, Vanessa Saraceno,
and Victoria Stapley-Brown
  2013   Visitor Figures 2012: Exhibition & Museum Attendance Survey. Electronic
    resource, http://www.theartnewspaper.com/attfig/attfig12.pdf, accessed February 27,
    2014.

Prior, Nick
  2006   Postmodern Restructurings. In A Companion to Museum Studies. Sharon
    Macdonald, Ed. Pp. 509-525. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Rancière, Jacques
  2009   The Emancipated Spectator. New York: Verso.

Roitman, Adolfo
  2001 Exhibiting the Dead Sea Scrolls: Some Historical and Theoretical
    Considerations. *In* Archaeology and Society in the 21st Century: The Dead Sea
    Scrolls and Other Case Studies. Neil A. Silberman and Ernest S. Frerichs, eds. Pp. 41-
    66. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.

Roy, Sara
  2012 Culturally Unconscious: Intercultural Implications of the New York Times
    Representations of the Israel-Palestine Conflict in 2009 and 2011. International
    Communication Gazette 74(6):556-570.

Said, Edward
  1992 The Question of Palestine. New York: Vintage Books.
  2001 The Clash of Ignorance. The Nation 273(12):11-14.

Salazar, Noel B.
  2014 Anthropology. *In* The Routledge Handbook of Mobilities. Peter Adey, David
    Bissell, Kevin Hannam, Peter Merriman, and Mimi Sheller, eds. Pp. 55-63. New
    York: Routledge.

Scham, Sandra
  2009 Diplomacy and Desired Pasts. Journal of Social Archaeology 9(2):163-199.

Schiffman, Lawrence H.
  1994 Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of
    Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.

Shankar, Shalini and Jillian R. Cavanaugh
  2012 Language and Materiality in Global Capitalism. Annual Review of Anthropology
    41:355-369.

Silberman, Neil Asher
  1989 Between Past and Present: archaeology, ideology, and nationalism in the modern
    Middle East. New York: H Holt.
  1994 Hidden Scrolls: Christianity, Judaism and the War for the Dead Sea Scrolls. New
    York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.

Silk, Mark
  1984 Notes on the Judeo-Christian Tradition in America. American Quarterly
    36(1):65-85.

Smith, Laurajane
  2006 Uses of Heritage. New York: Routledge.
  2007 Empty Gestures? Heritage and the Politics of Recognition. *In* Cultural Heritage
    and Human Rights. H. Silverman and D.F. Ruggles, eds. Pp. 159-171. New York:
    Springer.

Stephan, Stephan Hanna
  1923   Modern Palestinian Parallels to the Song of Songs. Jerusalem: Palestine Oriental
    Society.

Stephan, Stephan Hanna and Boulos Afif
  1947   This is Palestine: A Concise Guide to the Important Sites in Palestine,
    Transjordan & Syria. Jerusalem: Modern Press.

Susan Slyomovics
  1998   The Object of Memory: Arab and Jew Narrate the Palestinian Village.
    Philadephia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Tarnopolsky, Noga
  2013   Why it matters that Obama visited the Dead Sea Scrolls, *Global Post*, March 22,
    2013. http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/news/regions/middle-east/israel-and-
    palestine/130322/obama-dead-sea-scrolls-israel, accessed May 1, 2013.

Taylor, Evan P.
  2011   Whose Spirit Sings? Twenty-Five Years of Transformation in First Nations
    Museum Representation. Undergraduate Honours Thesis, Department of
    Anthropology, University of Waterloo.

Tov, Emanuel
  2001   The Decipherment and Publication of the Dead Sea Scrolls. *In* Archaeology and
    Society in the 21st Century: The Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Case Studies. Neil A.
    Silberman and Ernest S. Frerichs, eds. Pp. 96-103. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration
    Society.

TripAdvisor
  2014   Things to do in Jerusalem. Electronic resource,
    http://www.tripadvisor.com/Attractions-g293983-Activities-
    Jerusalem_Jerusalem_District.html, accessed November 17, 2014.

Urciuoli, Bonnie
  1996   Exposing Prejudice: Puerto Rican Experiences of Language, Race, and Class.
    Boulder, CO: Westview Press, Inc.

Urry, John
  2007   Mobilities. Malden, MA: Polity.

Vermes, Gaza
  1995   The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, Fourth Edition. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic
    Press.

Whitelam, Keith
  1996   The Invention of Ancient Israel: The Silencing of Palestinian History. New
    York: Routledge.

Wimmer, Andreas and Nina Glick Schiller
  2002   Methodological nationalism and beyond: nation-state building, migration and the
    social sciences. Global Networks 2(4):301-334.

Ya'ari, Elizabeth
  2010   Promoting Understanding of Shared Heritage (PUSH). Museum International
    62(1-2):9-13.

Zerubavel, Yael
  1995   Recovered Roots: Collective Memory and the Making of Israeli National
    Tradition. Chicago: Chicago University Press.