

### Editorial: Thinking Post-Home: An Introduction

HadžiMuhamedović, Safet; Grujić, Marija

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

#### Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

HadžiMuhamedović, S., & Grujić, M. (2019). Editorial: Thinking Post-Home: An Introduction. *EthnoScripts: Zeitschrift für aktuelle ethnologische Studien*, 21(1), 5-33. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:gbv:18-8-14144>

#### Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY-SA Lizenz (Namensnennung-Weitergabe unter gleichen Bedingungen) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/deed.de>

#### Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY-SA Licence (Attribution-ShareAlike). For more information see: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0>

# EthnoScripts

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR AKTUELLE  
ETHNOLOGISCHE STUDIEN

Post-Home:  
Dwelling on Loss, Belonging and Movement

Volume 21 Issue 1 | 2019

Safet HadžiMuhamedović and Marija Grujić  
Editorial: Thinking Post-Home: An Introduction

Ethnoscripts 2019 21 (1): 5-33  
eISSN 2199-7942

**Publisher:**

Universität Hamburg  
Institut für Ethnologie  
Edmund-Siemers-Allee 1 (West)  
D-20146 Hamburg  
Tel.: 040 42838 4182  
E-Mail: [lfE@uni-hamburg.de](mailto:lfE@uni-hamburg.de)  
<http://www.ethnologie.uni-hamburg.de>

eISSN: 2199-7942



Dieses Werk ist lizenziert unter einer Creative Commons Licence 4.0 International: Namensnennung - Weitergabe unter gleichen Bedingungen.

## Thinking Post-Home: An Introduction

Safet HadžiMuhamedović and Marija Grujić

What is home *after* home? Where do bodies, landscapes and communities reside once alienated from the habitual? In its aftermath, does a dwelling continue to dwell? Can forms of belonging be replanted, or replaced with new ones? And, what kinds of claims are articulated in the belonging inclusive of absence?

The following contributions on *post-home* tackle such vexed questions by situating them within specific timespaces of movement, travel and forced migration, through gendered and bodily transformations, in religious ritual and the promise of the eternal, through the dire straits of developmental projects, the loss and disintegration of social relations, as well as through the resurrected colonial and nationalist tropes. Each contribution unfolds intertwined intimate and political (hi)stories to keep pace with the workings of the returning pasts, arrested presents and imaginatively negotiated futures.

*Post-home* considers some of the ways in which the meanings and expressions of 'home' might change after persons, communities and things 'move' – by will, force, rituals, dreams, or otherwise – towards new spaces, times and bodies, as well as through new political and affective capacities. Whatever the 'novel' horizons bring, such movements seem to always be predicated on something denied, discarded or left behind, something that lingers, dialectically, in the present positionalities. Post-home, as a condition, often entails some kind of eviction from the world – an erosion of ontological security – variously managed and felt on the skin. Yet, these evictions do not amount to *evacuation* – one's new place in the world does not mushroom in a vacuum. Home does not disappear into thin air; it is continuously generative of the place and time (or the placelessness and timelessness) of its aftermath. In other words, this special issue does not simply engage with situations where one 'home' is supplanted by another. We are looking at post-home worlding, a processual condition where the 'post-' is always in relation to 'home' and vice versa.

Post-home is also an inward perspective on the self and the other – fraught with both past and present relations of power – as they unfold the world. We think of it as a 'site' of political articulation and affect. For hooks (1990: 41-9), homeplace as a 'site of resistance' questions the ontological

(in)security that the notion of ‘home’ might suggest. It reveals a set of co-emerging and co-constructing categories of power – such as family, race, gender and class – that weave a web of unhomely and homely ‘homes’, left for us to uncover through movement.

Post-home blends the homely and the unhomely: it exposes the oft-violent structures of ‘home’, ‘homecoming’, ‘unhomeliness’ and ‘alienation’, yet it also maintains the affective pull of home as the anchoring of the self in the world.<sup>1</sup> Glancing ‘home’ from such interstices initiates the simultaneous processes of *homing* and *unhoming*. In the present, the past ‘home’ emerges as the fullness and the absence of ‘being at home’, revealing itself in different shapes and through multiple registers.

### Unhoming ruptures

In his poem ‘The Nightmare’, Abdulah Sidran (1997: 41) sketched the phantasmagorical landscapes of loss: his character narrates a dream in which he sings, *with a voice he has not, in a tongue he has not, about a house he has not.*<sup>2</sup> Through these ‘unthinkable’ workings of alienation, Sidran’s dreamer finds the only available home: its total inversion. This multiplicity of present absences locates for us a phenomenon with haunting qualities – an indelible disposition that enounces one’s self through the no longer graspable, the no longer accommodating. The post-home here sounds a reverberation of home where (or when and how) home cannot be, a present-future where the past constantly *is* despite the fact that it *is not* and *will not* be. This post-home worlding is thus anchored in the fullness of absence.

An effort to *re-place* one’s self may hurt. Post-home may be reluctant to emplacement. As we read in Saakshi Joshi’s article, the people forcefully displaced by the construction of the Tehri Dam experienced various forms of bodily resistance to new, unhomely spaces, including digestive disorders, respiratory problems and joint pain. In their critical review of Nora Krug’s (2018) graphic novel *Heimat*, Marija Grujić and Ina Schaum write for this special issue on how Krug’s feeling-at-home is shaken by the experience of

1 For Freud, *unheimlich* (usually translated as ‘uncanny’, but literally ‘unhomely’) did not simply describe the strange or the unfamiliar; rather, he argued, ‘the “uncanny” is that class of the terrifying which leads back to something long known to us, once very familiar’ (1955: 220).

In both the dictionary form and its most frequently quoted – Freudian – conceptualisation, homely and unhomely entangle, as Henriette Steiner noted: ‘*das Unheimliche*, literally meaning unhomely, enfolds the word *heimlich*, homely. [...] The transition from homely to strange, which is implied in the notion of *das Unheimliche*, more often than not has its origin in the most intimate realm relating to the body or the domestic sphere’ (2010: 135).

2 Similarly, in another of his poems, ‘Planet Sarajevo’, a girl picks non-existent flowers with her non-existent hand (Sidran 1997: 11). The homely world, dissolved, continues to exist like a phantom limb.

migration, in which familiar ‘things’ become sources of desired homeliness. Writer Dubravka Ugrešić, on the other hand, finds her post-home ‘nest’ in the ‘non-place’ of the airport: ‘I feel good here. I am a human larva. Here, in this no man’s land, I shall weave my natural nest. I shall wander from sector A to B, from sector B to sector C. I shall never leave’ (1994: 225). Her ontological (or, ‘post-ontological’) harbour is anchorless, a space where nothing ‘sticks’, an unhomely refuge from the many ‘homes’ determined to accommodate.

The authors in this special issue variously seek to understand what happens to ‘home’ – as a sense of (place in) the world – after certain *unhoming ruptures*. These moments produce tectonic rifts between *what is* in the ontological sense of the measure of the world and *what is* as the new – wanted or unwanted – existential condition. The articles highlight a set of geographically, historically and affectively different unhoming ruptures: Vanja Hamzić writes about the *nirban* rituals in the Punjabi city of Lahore, which establish not only the new ‘gender’ subjectivity and the home-kinship framework of the *dera* household for the *khwajasara* individuals, but also entail the severance of ties with natal families and the mis-sexed bodily characteristics; Katie Hayne encounters unhoming, and captures it visually, in a large public housing precinct scheduled for demolition in Canberra, Australia; Saakshi Joshi writes about the affective and geographic unhoming of Tehri in India through the construction of the Tehri Dam and the town of New Tehri; Alys Tomlinson takes us on a visual journey through the moments of spiritual displacement – unhoming and homing – at three European pilgrimage sites; Tom Selwyn takes three recent critical events in Britain (the Brexit referendum, the fire at Grenfell Tower and the ‘Windrush scandal’) as the starting points for a conversation on the persistent loss of home with the new politics of a ‘hostile environment’; Lauren Harding demonstrates how events such as the cataclysmic tsunami of the 1700s or the ‘discovery’ of the ‘New World’ and the subsequent settler policies and practices form part of the narration and negotiation of home for the Knighton family in Qua-ba-diwa (within contemporary Canada); Dragana Kovačević Bielicki looks at the rifts in diasporic belonging following the displacement produced by the 1990s war in Bosnia.

In each discussion, then, we see that post-home hinges upon unhoming ruptures – breaks within the sense of order and continuity – movements away from the habitual. By opening a critical abyss between the safety of being and the uncertain horizons, such events may defy articulation. They confuse the bodily registers; they are ‘out of place’. These ‘moments of disorientation’, Sara Ahmed (2006: 155) has argued, ‘are bodily experiences that throw the world up, or throw the body from its ground’. Post-home continues to exist precisely where home is felt as unsettled, or where the world becomes unhomed. Such journeys are often, as we read in bell hook’s (1990: 41-9) experience, diverse in their duration, sometimes simultaneous to ‘home’.

Post-home is not a 'homeless' condition, but one where the homely and the unhomely reside together and negotiate each other.<sup>3</sup> It starts with a notion of 'home' that always already contains 'movement', which implies that being 'away' does not produce a 'migrant ontology' (Ahmed 1999). In her critique of the ontologised notion of 'home' as the 'stasis of being', Ahmed (ibid.) noted that estrangement stands for the process of transition from 'familiarity' to 'strangeness', but cautioned against generalisations that 'conceal how estrangement marks out particular selves and communities' (ibid.: 344).

As we explain later in this introduction, we are not merely thinking of home in the familiar, domestic, architectural, geographical, or territorial senses; we rather see home ontologically, as the broad perimeter ('measure around') of one's 'what is'. Thus, the unhoming ruptures summon the 'what is' frames of the world, which are absorbed by bodies and landscapes, against the 'what is not' made real in one way or another.<sup>4</sup>

Fateful and disorienting as they may be, unhoming ruptures are not to be abstracted from their historical, legal, political and other contexts, as the contributors to this special issue carefully argue. Veena Das (1997) has looked at 'critical events' in India, events that propel redefinitions of social categories, after which certain novel forms of action become possible. Attempting to bridge the divide between the large-scale social processes and an individual life, she demonstrated the 'mutual implication' of various social institutions in eventful fissures.

Our contributors reflect on contested histories, past and present, within various geographies, as well as the discursive and affective registers of 'home'. They complicate any *home-as-such* through the restless intimate and political vocabularies of their research contexts. For us, then, post-home as a notion offers an analytical dimension to 'home' – as it *is*, *was*, *will be* – and summons ontologies of (in)security of being in terms of places, housing and movement, as well as through the resistance to segregation and 'status' divisions. Post-home offers a way of speaking about the tectonic social shifts that are unfinished – which reverberate and fold the past into the present-future in different ways – as well as about the dialectic between stasis and movement.

---

3 Or, as Homi Bhabha noted, '[t]o be unhomed is not to be homeless [...]' (1992: 141). Sara Ahmed (1999: 339) argued that we should avoid references to 'home' by way of what home is not ('the homelessness of migration and exile'): 'By being defined negatively in this way, home henceforth becomes associated with stasis, boundaries, identity and fixity'.

4 Anthony Giddens (1991) suggested that ontological security – an existential anchoring of reality – may be understood as 'a sense of continuity and order in events, including those not directly within the perceptual environment of the individual' (ibid.: 243). Responses to what he called 'fateful moments', which threaten ontological security, cannot easily make use of the existing formulae developed as part of one's habituated knowledge (ibid.: 45, 114, 185).

Movement is not an ‘innocent’ category. It divides people and places in terms of origin, current residency, legality and other variables, along the grids of power that define one’s status, belonging and the right to home. In this issue, we see numerous status divisions – into the gendered ‘casts’ and outcasts, as well as between the classes or castes, into the migrants, the ‘aliens’, the tourists, the pilgrims, the refugees, the returnees, the asylum seekers, the rightful citizens and the autochthonous dwellers, or the First Nations, the indigenous, and so on – but also that such categories are internally conflicted and continuously redefined.<sup>5</sup>

Even the simplest ‘journey across town’, hooks (1990: 41–49) described, may expose one’s self *as other* and *to others*. The motion from the ‘segregated blackness’ of her residence towards her grandmother’s house in the middle of a ‘white neighbourhood’ placed her body amidst the dominant power relations. What lingered in such movement through ‘terrifying whiteness’ was a tension *felt*, residing in the fissures between the processes of belonging, unbelonging and nonbelonging. Even the houses would ‘stare with hate’ and ‘speak’, warning about the lurking ‘dangers’, the nonbelonging and the unsafety (ibid.: 41). For hooks, then, homecoming seems to signify the process of bodily attunement to segregation. Such orientation (and resistance) through homing can be felt ‘inside’ the homeplaces, as ruptures on a daily basis.<sup>6</sup>

Our focus on ‘unhoming ruptures’ in the research of post-home is different from the conventional historicist focus on historical events. Fernand Braudel called such an ‘eventful’ perspective *l’histoire événementielle*, ‘the history of events: surface disturbances, crests of foam that the tides of history carry on their strong backs. A history of brief, rapid, nervous fluctuations’ (1995 [1949]: 21). Instead, he looked towards the *longue durée*, the slow yet substantial changes. In assembling a reading of post-home, we see the ‘abrupt’ historical event as part of the wider historical, political currents and the affective resonances of loss. These currents are assembled as histories of the present and intimately tied to the futurities of the present.<sup>7</sup>

---

5 Indeed, there is a (renewed) sense of urgency, to take these status divisions and the question of home seriously in light of the growing refugee displacement and anti-migrant hostility, Selwyn argues in his contribution to this issue (see also Selwyn and Frost 2018: 1).

6 In hooks’ (1990: 41) words: ‘Oh! that feeling of safety, of arrival, of homecoming when we finally reached the edges of her yard, when we could see the soot black face of our grandfather, Daddy Gus, sitting in his chair on the porch, smell his cigar, and rest on his lap. Such a contrast, that feeling of arrival, of homecoming, this sweetness and the bitterness of that journey, that constant reminder of white power and control.’

7 As Michael Foucault (2010: 20–21) suggests, the ‘history of the present’ offers a methodological frame for diagnosing and defining ‘the present’; it is the ‘critical thought which takes the form of an ontology of ourselves, of present reality’ (see also Garland 2014: 372).

The very concept of post-home signals the uncanny amalgamation of the before and the after. It is marked by precariousness of one sort or another. This kind of insecurity, synonymous to home (which is often understood as security and shelter), may only be described through situated lives. Together with the other contributors, we thus argue for an ethnographic turn to the history of the body standing in and being projected through its fluctuating world (and its political). Such history is intimate, fragile, fragmented and vivacious. It may travel through stories, cosmologies, political changes, personal and collectivised anxieties, gender taxonomies, infrastructural demands, technologies, and so on.

In his contribution to this issue, Hamzić certainly reveals how any conversation on the contemporary *khwajasara* lifeworlds requires a rummage through the fragments of spun-out histories of empires, colonial enterprises and subjective positionings (see also Hamzić 2016). Likewise, Harding suggests that the indigenous notions of home in the state of Canada reverberate with colonial (as well as pre- and post-colonial) political and environmental interventions. Tom Selwyn proposes that three recent events – Brexit, the Grenfell fire and the ‘Windrush scandal’ – may be read through the entwined histories of colonialism, racism and capitalism, as well as the right-wing ‘anti-social dispositions’ at least since the introduction of Thatcherite policies. Saakshi Joshi shows how the national, colonial and life histories intersect in the responses to the development-induced displacement of Tehri inhabitants in India. Reviewing Krug’s graphic novel *Heimat*, Grujić and Schaum write that the places reminding Krug of Germany and signifying home and homeland ‘are distant in the past, and yet emerge as intimate in proximity’. They notice that Krug, as someone who belongs to the generation ‘after’ (the war), knows these places ‘through a sense of complicity and accountability’. Post-home for the authors thus means a process of inhabiting the post-memories and the ghostly narratives about the perpetrators of the terrifying violence.

Life (hi)stories of post-home also demand a fuller conversation about the past and the future than historiography is able to provide. What is required is to open the research to various forms of ‘historicity’ (as an anthropological concept), in which the past and the future share a present horizon. As Eric Hirsch and Charles Stewart (2005: 262) have noted, historicity is about ‘the manner in which persons operating under the constraints of social ideologies make sense of the past, while anticipating the future’. To look for such histories is about more than ‘objective’ evidence about something bounded in the past and separate from the present and future. Lived, habituated home in the ‘post-’ unfences the conversation about the historical, communal and political changes from the mere sequence in the archive, and ties it into the expectations, hopes, fears and dreams of the future.



Unhoming ruptures generate an unavoidable conversation about the continuity and coherence of home – about what lingers, transforms or dissipates – requiring a pursuit of the restless genealogies of the present.

### What lingers? On home and dwelling

How do we place home into language? It may be useful to state the obvious: home and house are English words. They have partially discernible genealogies (Hollander 1991: 39-40). Home, as an English noun, may be etymologically traced through the German *Heim*, and then further into the more speculative Indo-European root *\*kei*, meaning ‘to lie or settle’ (ibid.).<sup>8</sup> An Indo-European root of an English word could, for example, relate not only to the enduring lexical forms, but also to an ontological assertion. Joseph Rykwert has noted:

*It follows that a notion so deeply rooted in human experience should have its appropriate term in every language: yet translators have always complained about the difficulty of finding an exact equivalent for it – particularly in Romance languages. (1993: 47-48)*

So, what is lost in the translation of home? And, what lingers? We do not want to offer here a broad discussion of home’s linguistic, affective and political histories. However, if we are looking at non-English-speaking spaces whilst working through the hegemony of the English language, we need to consider how other worldings might make different claims about ‘home’. We do not suggest that ‘etymology is destiny’, in English or any other context, although it does have the potential to hint at some enduring ontological frameworks.<sup>9</sup>

Translation is only ever partial. For the Pakistani *khwajasara*, Hamzić notes in his contribution, the *dera* as home may not only be a family household idealised against the violence of natal homes and the state, but also a place of vocational training, site of sex work, dance studio, ritual sanctuary, beauty salon, local kindergaten and a bank-like depository. Saakshi Joshi, in her article, observes how language registers the affectivity of home, differentiating between the house-as-home (*ghar*) and the house-as-residence (*makān*). As one of her interlocutors poignantly noted: ‘The transition from a *makān* to a *ghar* takes several generations. The former is brick and cement. The latter is filled with emotions through which it comes to life’.

Investigating home ‘within’ one codified language does not alleviate the problem of translation. In many Slavic languages *dom* (or its variants) is the word for ‘home’. *Dom* comes from the Proto-Indo-European *\*dem-* (‘to

8 On home and language, see also Selwyn and Frost (2018: 10-11).

9 Indeed, the word ‘etymology’ is a case in point. Derived from the Greek *étimos* (‘true’), etymologies are often employed in search of various truths and continuities, which have political reverberations.

build'), but it also dwells in the Ustaše Nazi salute *Za dom spremni!* ('Ready for home!'), or similar exclusionary political slogans. Selwyn and Harding, in their respective contributions, show how home as (national) homeland may run against home as a sense of security and community. In different ways, they both argue that hospitality can be an act of resistance to the (un)homing tactics of the state.

Language is a site of homing and unhoming. In her contribution, Kovačević Bielicki describes language-based discrimination experienced by one of her 'returnee' interlocutors, who was scorned by the teacher for not being as proficient in her 'mother tongue' as the other children: 'There you see. She cannot read, and all of them from the West think they are better than us'.

The English word 'dwelling' works as both a noun and a verb. As a noun it suggests a spatial home, a specific site of residence. As a verb, it reveals the temporality of being, the protracted attachment to something. It can signify a duration of life in one place, a focused meditation over some topic, but also an interval, a break within the worldly pace (a lingering of eyes upon something, a pause in the work of a machine). The etymology of 'dwelling' leads through Old English *dwellan*, 'to lead astray, deceive; to hinder; to wander; to tarry', to Old High German *twaljan*, 'to hinder, delay' and Old Norse *dvelja* 'to linger, delay, tarry' (see Klein 1966: 491, Partridge 1966: 901). As we explain later on, we do not seek to provide a definition of home in one etymology or another. Home is for us a heuristic device to canvass various ideas about being and belonging. Yet, the origins of words are phenomenological – suggestive of situated experience – and seem to offer a glimpse into the eventful, long-term and bodily histories.

Through this limited lexical sequence, we want to ask what home *might be* across difference? Language ontologises. In the context of writing descriptions of the world, there is nothing innocent about home's associated English idioms. There is a homeland, but not a *homesea*, the warmth of home, but not its chilliness; one leaves home and returns to it, but is hardly ever said to be simultaneously at home and away from it; one is homesick or homeless, but somehow never *homeful*...<sup>10</sup>

Perhaps it would be good to first start with the images summoned by home and its associated idioms. Landscape, a term with a shorter and more readable history, travelled to English language in the late sixteenth century through the *landschap* of the 'Dutch Golden Age' painting. Reaching further than *home*, it eventually became a ubiquitous term in art, science and colloquial language. Yet, it is rooted in particular kinds of representations of nature. As Eric Hirsch has noted, the painterly origin of this concept is impor-

10 Thinking about the sedentary dimensions of home lingering in some ontologies, it is interesting to notice that the words 'bondage' and 'bound' may be traced to Old Norse *būa*, 'to dwell' (see Partridge 1966: 298, 310). See also the link between habit and habitat/dwelling (ibid.: 1361).

tant: ‘What came to be seen as landscape was recognized as such because it reminded the viewer of a painted landscape, often of European origin’ (1995: 2).

These images are powerful in how they direct knowledge; they may help us discern a landscape from a random patch of woodland, or *place* from *non-place*. In Alys Tomlinson’s photograph on the cover of this issue, one is unsure whether the sight is of a dense woodland or a clearing. The tendency to provide a frame (a bounded dwelling) to the sights of the world is a lingering one. As Lakoff and Johnson (1980) argued, we tend to project a container – an in-out orientation – onto the encountered world, as an ontological metaphor, or a metaphor we live by.<sup>11</sup> In this issue, Lauren Harding notices that the Canadian colonial and national epistemologies employ the notion of ‘wilderness’ to position indigenous lands as empty – uninhabited and placeless – and thus conquerable territory.

Home’s taxonomy and imagery mix our personal experiences with the wider systems of metaphors and metonyms. To ‘see home’, like seeing a landscape, implies an application of these trajectories onto an unsuspecting community, which is why we need to critically situate our conceptual frameworks before engaging in projects of description.

### The ‘post-’ in post-home

What is this home that carries into its ‘post’? Is one measure of the world supplanted onto another, or does the world double with the new location of its sighting? In her *Lost in Translation* (2011 [1989]: 132), Eva Hoffman wrote about her Poland in the past, as seen from her exile in the United States – Poland ‘coeval with the dimensions of reality’ – from which all distances were measured. With the migrant’s ‘double vision’, she saw it as the Poland of herself and as it emerges for others on the map – a place among other places (imagined as ‘communism’ and place ‘without freedom’). With displacement, she noted, the world had been shifted away from her centre.

However, the axis that for her was displaced could be regained. Her displacement has palpable meaning; she regains what is lost and experiences it anew through language (*ibid.*: 132), which becomes a ‘memento’ of the past dwelling, loss and belonging. The post-homely grip onto the world often

<sup>11</sup> As Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 29) note: ‘A clearing in the woods is seen as having a bounding surface, and we can view ourselves as being *in* the clearing or *out of* the clearing, *in* the woods or *out of* the woods. A clearing in the woods has something we can perceive as a natural boundary – the fuzzy area where the trees more or less stop and the clearing more or less begins. But even where there is no natural physical boundary that can be viewed as defining a container, we impose boundaries – marking off territory so that it has an inside and a bounding surface – whether a wall, a fence, or an abstract line or plane.’

functions by way of references to the past, an anchoring ‘captured’ through objects, images and practices. Objects taken by refugees onto their journeys may become repositories of relations and sentiments, and may play an important role in the re-articulation of the shifting boundaries of cultural knowledge (Parkin 1999).

The ‘post-’ in post-home denotes a spatio-temporal movement. Like Marianne Hirsch’s notion of ‘postmemory’, it also ‘signals more than a temporal delay and more than a location in an aftermath’ (Hirsch 2008: 106).<sup>12</sup> It is a ‘post-’ shared by post-colonialism, post-socialism, post-modernity and post-war knowledge. Thinking ‘between the posts’ might be crucial for the knowledge production on both the ‘before’ and the ‘after’. Sharad Chari and Katherine Verdery (2009) invited us to ‘think between the posts’ of colonialism and socialism, in terms of their effects on ethnographies and knowledge production. Nevertheless, they stressed that abrupt changes are only the nominal ‘ends’ of colonialism and socialism, and that the results are much more complex for those directly affected.<sup>13</sup> The material, affective and epistemic elements of colonial homemaking, Ann Laura Stoler argued, do not disappear when empires cease to exist, but rather survive in their ‘aftershocks’ – as *imperial debris* – sticking to ‘structures, sensibilities, and things’ (2008: 194). Considering homes, landscapes and community in post-partition Cyprus, Yael Navaro turned to the concept of *ruination*, to ‘refer to the material remains or artefacts of destruction and violation, but also to the subjectivities and residual affects that linger, like a hangover, in the aftermath of war or violence’ (2009: 5, see also Navaro 2012). Whilst looking for signs of ‘shared’ Bosnian saints in the archives of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, Safet HadžiMuhamedović argued that syncretic debris is the outcome of ‘deep lacerations in the relational fabric, of the cavernous charting of otherness, of the violent unmaking of the world’ (2018b: 86). Yet, the destinations to which such debris of the social travels and gets to be re-articulated are primarily determined by the original ‘impact’ (ibid.: 79-80).

---

12 For Hirsch (2001, 2008), postmemory emerges after traumatic events for generations who did not have ‘direct’ experience of the events yet embody them as part of their own life histories. We also follow Hirsch’s argument that ‘painful histories’ and the ‘belated nature of traumatic memory itself’ form the knowledge and experience of the generations ‘after’ (2001: 11-12).

13 In their comparative reading of the postsocialist and postcolonial scholarship, Chari and Verdery (2009) have argued for a key similarity of the two ‘posts’: ‘both labels signify the complex results of the abrupt changes forced on those who underwent them: that is, becoming something other than socialist or other than colonized’ (ibid.: 11).

The eventfulness of wars and the multiple modes of violence inflicted upon ‘people and place’ marked for us a significant ‘post-’ to think with in the process of writing about post-home. As we have learnt during our formative years in the ‘countries we come from’, the remnants of war (as well as socialism) are everlasting and continuously emerge from multiple sources – bodies, homes, dreams... – in so many ways that it would require a timeless time to both record and repeat them. So, ‘post-’ does not sight ‘home’ by taking a temporal look ‘backward’; we do not attach the ‘post-’ to designate some aftermath of ‘home’, which would thus inevitably be rendered as frozen in time, left behind, destroyed, taken away, hijacked or interrupted. For us, the ‘post-’ of ‘home’ rather captures what it does for Hirsch in her analysis of postmemory – ‘an uneasy oscillation between continuity and rupture’ (Hirsch 2008: 106). To spell out post-home, we embrace the hyphen. It suggests a single condition clustering around a rupture and connects the apparently disparate meanings of being-at-home and being-after/away-from-home.

The ‘post-’ of home signals something as ‘past’, yet with long-lasting effects and multifaceted residues. The ‘post-’ of home also encounters the effects of alienation and estrangement in the forms of displacement, distiming (Jansen 2009a; Jansen and Löfving 2007) and distimeplacement (HadžiMuhamedović 2018a). Yet, as HadžiMuhamedović notes, time and place are but frames of what has been lost and entangle systems of relationships and sensations (ibid.: 111).

Through the concept of post-home, we also ask if ‘home’ is contingent on ‘not-home’, the way that ‘I’ is performed through the ‘Other’. We take inspiration from Marianne Hirsch’s (2001, 2008) concept of postmemory: she noticed how others’ memories become one’s own through deeply affective and familial transmissions after traumatic events. This conundrum – embodying another’s memory, a memory after memory – is one of our springboards for an interrogation of home that is *differently* home: a home after home. Moving away from the concept of ‘identity’ as something stable and unique in spatial, temporal or psychic spheres, we offer here seven anthropological elaborations of the concepts of (un)homely and affectivity of home, as the attempts to locate the self at the intersections of social and political realities of belonging. Our focus is on both the personal and the collective localities of belonging as they appear through the being or becoming of/at ‘home’ and ‘unhomely’. Furthermore, our contributors locate ‘home’ and ‘belonging’ in discursive positioning, movement through landscape and materialities, silences and dialectics arising from ‘new spaces’ in the process of displacement.

The notion of post-home emerged for us in continuous engagement with the question on how times of social crises become modes of interruption (in a bodily, communal and ritual sense) of ‘home’s’ dominant orders of gender, race, sexual, ethnic, class, or any other divisions that translate as power and hierarchical relations within the political contexts of displacement/emplace-

ment and their scholarly elaborations.<sup>14</sup> The ‘post-’ of home has a spatial and temporal connotation, as it materialises everything that lingers: from hopes to houses left behind. Yet, most of the contributors to the studies of home and movement habitually dealt with ‘place’. The spatiality (of both people and places) designates one valuable perspective to analyse displacements as process and movement from ‘here’ to ‘there’ or mark possible routes of return, but temporality and affectivity need to be taken into account as well.

Dwelling upon a photograph of his old house, in ‘his lost city’ of Bombay, Salman Rushdie noted:

*‘The past is a foreign country’, goes the famous opening sentence of L.P. Hartley’s novel The Go-Between, ‘they do things differently there’. But the photograph reminds me that it’s my present that is foreign, and that the past is home, albeit a lost home in a lost city in the mists of lost time. (1992: 9)*

We see such temporal incongruence in Saakshi Joshi’s article about people displaced by the construction of the Tehri Dam, or as Katie Hayne’s interlocutors watch their homes being demolished for an ‘urban renewal’ project in Canberra.

Post-home as a lingering of something past may not have any worldly coordinates outside of life-(hi)stories. Marianne Hirsch and Leo Spitzer wrote about Czernowitz, ‘a place that cannot be found in any contemporary atlas’ (2010: xiii), a place sustained in the idealised memories of its Jewish inhabitants. Hirsch and Spitzer connected this afterlife of Czernowitz to Svetlana Boym’s (2001) discussion of nostalgia ‘for a home that no longer exists or has never existed’ (ibid: xiii). They saw it as ‘a spectral return emanating both seductive recollections of a lost home and frightening reminders of persecution and displacement’ (Hirsch and Spitzer 2010: xx). Post-home is not sim-

---

14 The following academic contributions are some of the many titles that inspired our thinking of home-places as affected by the processes of displacement/emplacement, chosen and forced exile, homecoming in the setting of racialized spatial division, refugees/returnees homemaking, ‘migrants’ homes in the context of transnationalism, or home in times of various ‘crises’: Ballinger (2012), Behar (2007), Boccagni (2017), HadžiMuhamedović (2018a), Halilovich (2013), hooks (1990), Jansen (2008a, 2009b), Jilani (2015), Mallet (2004), Frost and Selwyn (2018).

ply a place; it is a condition. It may indicate a lingering of home despite its destruction.<sup>15</sup>

Homelands too may appear through the haunting, ghostly presences of the past, as we read in Grujić's and Schaum's review of Krug's *Heimat*. Selwyn, in his contribution, shows that the past lingers, forming exclusionary (or less migrant-inclusive) politics in the present: the cutting of funds for communal libraries and the increasing division between those belonging and not belonging to the 'imagined home country'. To regain what is perceived as lost requires imagination. Often, the imagination of homeland runs counter to the imagination of home (see Rushdie 1992, HadžiMuhamedović 2018a). Hamzić writes about the *khwajasara* gender-variant inhabitants of Lahore who creatively chronicle a more homely place for themselves in the 'Mughal times', but also turn away from the past of unhomely natal homes and the state. Selwyn notices the imaginative resistance in the homing strategies of migrants and civil society groups in the UK against the (un)homing violence of the state.

The notion of belonging, which so easily attaches to 'home', informs us perhaps best about the commonly unnoticed temporal sequencing of all those 'in-betweens' in the journeying from 'there' to 'here' to 'there.' Post-home appears as the only mode for the ontological home to exist *here* and *now*, in the Heideggerian sense of narrating one's being in the world(s) that too often falls apart.<sup>16</sup>

Post-home is formed through a continuous disagreement with the sedentary, reductionist thinking about homemaking anchored in a single (primordial) place or belonging to a family/ethnicity/national homeland (see Jansen and Löfving 2007). Together with the contributors to this issue, we seek to further question the inadequacies entrenched in the notion of 'home' as a static and fixed *anchor*. As an analytical category, post-home captures what it means to 'lose place', and thus becomes a condition of spatial and temporal alienation of dwelling. We notice such interruptions in the times of

---

15 Halilovich (2013) has looked at the term *zavičaj* as employed by displaced Bosnians, which may translate as a place, a region and a community of home and encompasses 'the wholeness of person-in-place and place-in-person' (ibid.: 10). *Zavičaj* is etymologically related to Proto-Slavic \*vyknŏti – 'to get used to something'. If we think of home through this habitual aspect, then post-home is about the resonances of the embodied. Home does not cease as long as the body insists upon it (see also HadžiMuhamedović 2018a: 94-100). Indeed, Halilovich noted that, 'for those whose identity remains embedded and embodied in the idea of a distinct locale, the *zavičaj* continues to coexist as an experiential reality despite its physical destruction and forced displacement' (2013: 11).

16 See Annika Lems' (2014, 2018) Heideggerian operationalisation of 'Dasein' in the field of anthropological analysis of displacement and emplacement among Somali refugee residing in Australia, and what she terms 'being here'.

various crises that increase violence (hostility) and resistance (hospitality), as Selwyn demonstrates in his article for this issue.

Post-home for us is about thinking through temporal and spatial alienation. It is a conversation about home unanchored from its imagined secure centre, inevitably sighted through experiences of loss and violence.

### The '-home' in post-home

*'The problem begins when we start to produce descriptions of the world.'*

Marilyn Strathern (1999: 172)<sup>17</sup>

Home is an ambiguous term. Thinking with and against three dominant approaches aiming to explain *what* and *how* home is, we ask about the viability of the very notion. We are interested in the scope of the damaging analytical frameworks that portray home as an ontological anchor or a point of reference in the scales of racialised imaginaries of dwellings.

A situated comparison of being and belonging might, at first, suggest that persons and communities conceptualise home *differently*. We could recognise these differences in home's semblances, its relation to kinship, or to legal, ethical, historical, political and various other contexts. Researchers of the social could (as they have) fit home into an evolutionary scale, for example by establishing a progression from primitive to modern forms of dwellings. The way in which others are 'given a home' may uncover something about our ontological arrangements. This is explicitly made visible in the projects of the nineteenth century scientific racism, the disciplinary foundation of anthropology. See, for example, how Reverend John George Wood (1866), the famous Victorian parson-naturalist, systematised the habitations of animals, or 'homes without hands', together with racialised perceptions of colonised groups:

*Of all forms of habitation, the simplest is a burrow, whether beneath the surface of the ground, or into stone, wood or any other substance. The lowest grades of human beings are found to adopt this easy and simple substitute for a home, and the Bosjesman of the Cape, and the 'Digger' Indian of America, alike resort to so obvious an expedient. (ibid: 19)*

His prelude reads as unwavering; difference neatly furnishes the scientific paradigm. If we were to think of home as an ontological anchor, then such scales of the world may too be qualified as home. Scientific disciplines may work to offer our frames to the world. Like an aperture, they control how the light reaches the film, how the world gets to be articulated. Disciplinary

<sup>17</sup> Our translation from the Portuguese: '*O problema começa quando começamos a produzir descrições do mundo*' (Strathern 1999: 172).



*homeowners* are sheltered in such scalar securities. Home thus functions in different safeguarding manners. It does not only shield from the violence. It may be violent itself. It not only works to define what is on the inside and what on the outside but may also ‘swallow difference’ by imposing a given natural order onto others. Here, ontology functions much like territoriality, although it runs deeper.

Similarly, we could (as researchers of the social have) adopt a culturalist perspective, which inevitably subsumes into home a range of ethnic, national and racial imaginaries. Even though it shifts away from naturalised difference, the notion of culture, like its predecessors, produces and maintains it through the myths of essential origin (see Abu-Lughod 2006 [1991]). It is ‘shadowed by coherence, timelessness, and discreteness’ (ibid.: 472). It also naturalises a presumption of sameness. As Henare, Holbraad and Wastell have noted, this approach controls alterity: ‘Things of the world may appear different, but the point is that they are different in similar – universal – ways; nature in this sense is “one”. Culture, on the other hand, is “many”’ (2007: 9). Thus, to speak of ‘culture’ as a homing device – or, indeed, a kind of home – makes more sense than to insist on culturally specific homes.

The third option is to ‘particularise’ home and suspend the question of commensurability, in which case home seems to become a heuristic device to frame a range of questions about being and belonging.<sup>18</sup> There are two main problems with this approach. The first one is related to the hegemony of ontology in the language of the world’s elucidators – as we signal with Strathern’s words opening this section. The second, related, problem is again scalar. Whichever definition of the ‘particular’ we adopt, it rests on the presumption of something more general. So, even when the scale remains silent in our writing, we are already making an act of comparison. As Sari Wastell has pointed out, ‘[n]othing is particularly “local” unless it is measured against something “bigger”, less “local” than itself – and here so many prejudices flee from analytical view’ (2001: 186).

Scaling home then always results in an evaluative, comparative judgement about what home is or is not. We invite critical attention to the contexts in which scales emerge, as well as to their workings in the articulation of home. For, if I pronounce your home, the problem lies in the provenance of the scales into which you will be colonised by my authorial voice. Will I be ready, willing and able to shift from the perception of many temporary homes

---

18 In her critique, Abu-Lughod proposed ‘ethnographies of the particular’ as one strategy of writing against culture: ‘[T]he effects of extralocal and long-term processes are only manifested locally and specifically, produced in the actions of individuals living their particular lives, inscribed in their bodies and their words. What I am arguing for is a form of writing that might better convey that.’ (2006 [1991]: 474)

by way of your ‘nomadic’ movement through nation-states to an understanding that the centre of your world is constantly recreated in your campfire?<sup>19</sup>

This veritable mess begs some questions of definition: What is home, as such (if there is home, as such)? Are we referring to a *form* (or act, discourse, process, feeling...) of dwelling? Is home a landscape, a house, an academic discipline, a set of relations, a memory? Could it be all of this, or is it something wholly different? Where do we, then, draw some conceptual boundaries around home? Is nest to bird as home is to human? What, indeed, is the nest for a bird? A shelter? Human insistence on ‘safety’, as Selwyn demonstrates in his contribution to this issue, may erode home and hospitality (in the name of home-lands). Shelters are deeply implicated in the construction of their outsideness, the imminent threat (racial, ethnic, national, gender, sexual, class, and so on).

Can waterways be home? Or, to push this question further out of our hegemonic comfort zone, can rivers *have* a home? One need not think far beyond the Whanganui River in New Zealand, which had recently been granted legal personhood after more than a century of Māori claims of its ancestral powers. Anne Salmond (2014) reminds us that the assertive human-non-human distinction falls short of capturing the knowledge expressed in the Whanganui people’s saying ‘I am the River, the River is me’ (ibid.: 286).

Language colonises ontologies. If the Natchez gender variant persons were described by colonial administrator Dumont de Montigny in 1753 (see Hamzić 2017) as ‘hermaphrodites’, it was an act of approximation of an ‘abominable difference’ scaled into his own colonial scientific ontology. He conjured up an existing ‘anomaly’ and prescribed these bodies in proximity to his binary gender norm. Similarly, in this issue, Hamzić mentions the Italian travel writer Niccolao Manucci who found the Mughal *khwajasara* repulsive (‘a sort of animal’, ‘these baboons’) and approximated them to ‘eunuchs’. The homing of unhomely difference may be a violent process of blanketing ‘anomaly’ in definable ‘dirt’. As Mary Douglas (2001 [1966]: 39-40) proposes, ‘anomalies’ can be ignored, overseen or fitted into a classification of reality. She, however, seems to have been sceptical about the prospect of ontological shifts.<sup>20</sup>

The mistake we make is to assume that our home means something across different realms of being/dwelling/belonging.<sup>21</sup> Home effectively be-

19 On this point regarding the Mongolian nomads, see Humphrey (1995).

20 For some of the central discussions on the ‘ontological turn’ in anthropology, see Henare, Holbraad and Wastell (2007) and Holbraad and Pedersen (2017).

21 Selwyn and Frost (2018: 2) argue that ‘the concept has come to appear rather like a loose holding company for a diverse range of ideas, scales and registers used in a broad expanse of conceptual ground’. The danger they see in this scholarly eclecticism is the loss of perspective on the lived realities, which is why they also call for ethnographies of the particular when it comes to home and homemaking.

comes a scale upon which difference is forcibly mounted. Maybe we are not speaking anymore about ‘primitive’ versus ‘modern’ forms of dwellings, but we seem to (more than colloquially) retain the presumption that some ‘basic’ functions and emotions may be encapsulated *as home*. Albeit differently, we all have a home, or have lost one, or have wanted one, right?

Maybe not. We should be careful not to perpetuate home as part and parcel of the ‘ontology of one ontology’, a hegemonic project of describing the world *as such* (see Henare, Holbraad and Wastell 2007). This implies steering away from home as one ‘thing’ appearing in a variety of actualisations. Such a perspective on difference – ultimately founded in something more solid – means that others are never taken on their own terms. Your ‘home’, which I write about in my research, is ultimately but a version of Home *as such* (with a capital H). I may recognise that your home is different from mine in an evolutionary, cultural or another fashion, whilst maintaining that it has a foundational similarity to mine. Henare, Holbraad and Wastell further note:

*If we are to take others seriously, instead of reducing their articulations to mere ‘cultural perspectives’ or ‘beliefs’ (i.e. ‘worldviews’), we can conceive them as enunciations of different ‘worlds’ or ‘natures’, without having to concede that this is just shorthand for ‘worldviews’. [...] For if cultures render different appearances of reality, it follows that one of them is special and better than all the others, namely the one that best reflects reality. And since science – the search for representations that reflect reality as transparently and faithfully as possible – happens to be a modern Western project, that special culture is, well, ours. (ibid.: 10-11)*

Taking others seriously begs the question about the viability of home as an analytical concept. What if there is no such animal? What if *Home-as-such* needs to be unimagined before approaching something otherwise (for which ‘home’ acts only as heuristic placeholder)?

Since the 1960s, after almost a century of grand anthropological theories of kinship, David Schneider famously moved to dismantle the whole thing. Kinship was, he argued, but a ‘theoretical notion’, ‘undefined and vacuous’, a ‘non-subject’, which ‘exists in the minds of anthropologists but not in the cultures they study’ (2004 [1972]: 269; 1984: 185). He problematised what he saw as a concept loosely based on a Western folk model, which established as a universal fact a specific notion of biological relatedness (Parkin and Stone 2004: 19). Others have taken up his radical break. Yanagisako and Collier (1987) have, for example, geared the same critique towards gender. Mohanty and Martin (2003: 86) have considered the possibilities of unsettling feminism *as home* and various possible identitary homes within feminism (based on gender, race, sexuality, and so on). We suggest, with some caution, that

approaching home requires a similar kind of exercise. We need to *unhome home*, engage in critical reflection on our own homely shelters, before ‘writing up’ a home for an other. ‘The problem’, to repeat Marilyn Strathern’s warning, ‘begins when we start to produce descriptions of the world’ (1999: 172).

Even when we recognise the historically and spatially diverse forms of ‘dwelling’ and ‘belonging’, the signified is durable in the signifier. The problem is not solved by the lack of exact definition. Beyond words, and this is where it gets sticky, ‘we’ tend to *know* or *feel* what home is or might be. Feelings are here not only the discursive, but also the more-than-discursive – bodily – locus of the sustained power of concepts. As part of our habituated dispositions, to deflect off Bourdieu’s words on taste, ‘[home] classifies, and it classifies the classifier’ (1984: 6).

An ontological turn to home then does not seek to propose bubbles of radical difference. Rather, by joining the voices calling to *take others seriously*, we suggest that home should be, first and foremost, approached as a heuristic device, one that always requires an ontologically reflexive mooring as a critical methodological positionality (by asking: what are our homes?) and a holistic understanding of our interlocutors’ statements and actions (by asking: what is left of *home* without an imposition of our own homes?). Such an approach does not ‘deny’ others their homes by theoretically pushing them into indeterminacy. On the contrary, the ontology of one ontology is actually the denial of difference; it acts as both a home and a site of confinement, with an inherently obstructed view onto an other.

Post-home is not an absence of home; to *unhome home* is to invite ourselves to make space for others without the necessary disclaimer of *what home is*. We suggest an analytical framework of post-home without presuming that one can ever be completely disentangled from the enduring constellations guiding our ‘ways of seeing’. Yet, before endeavouring to provide a stable home for anyone through acts of representation, we need to make sure that these beguiling matrices are left unprotected.

Post-home is an articulation of the homely and the unhomely amidst the temporal, spatial and affective structures and intensities of present loss. It is a timespace, a condition and a process of disorientation and orientation. And, post-home, willy-nilly, shakes the habitual registers of the world.

### Post-home in seven case studies

**Vanja Hamzić** leads the reader through *deray* (singular: *dera*) households in the Punjabi city of Lahore in Pakistan, inhabited by *khwajasara*, a gender-variant subjectivity known as *hijre* in the wider South Asian context. *Dera*, Hamzić argues, is a post-home not only because it articulates detachments and new loyalties and forms of belonging, but also as a station in the process of homecoming, a journey towards the Unity of Being, a return to One Self.

A novice initiated as a *khwajasara* attains a new household, a new name, language, kin (including a mother and a *guru*), as well as spiritual and vocational training. The author observes a wide range of political and intimate meanings in *dera* arrangements. The lives of his *khwajasara* interlocutors include multiple – homely and unhomely – registers of home, from the homing projections into Mughal histories, through the (non)belonging to natal families, school environments and the national body, still through the defining haven of the *dera* household, and the being towards the eternal, true Home of the afterlife.

*Dera*, claims Hamzić, also blurs the boundaries of gender, religion, ethnicity and language. It may be a locus for the articulation of moral panic, everyday violence and a lingering coloniality, but also a site of resistance. We are cautioned not to slip into easy romanticisations of *deray*, which also have to be ‘constantly negotiated’ and are fraught with their own hierarchical arrangements. The contemporary status of *deray* intertwines with the post-colonial geographies of homeland, which assign *khwajasara* to a specific ‘there’ within the town and yet profoundly exclude them. Hamzić invites us to think *dera* through the lens of the ‘post-’ of the South Asian colonial histories. As gender non-conforming modes of dwelling and belonging, *dera* and *khwajasara* were both exposed to systemic violence and the legal and political domination of colonial rulers. The post-home of *dera* stands for the ‘thereness’ of bodily and spiritual homecoming journeys. This *khwajasara* ‘homecoming’ is a process of ‘identitary journeying towards collective there-ness’, the author argues. It is a journey of belonging to one’s own body, community and One Self – a being-in-becoming. *Khwajasara* home is at odds with homeland; it is, as Hamzić notes, ‘contingent on a loss of the homeland’s prescriptive forms of dwelling in the world’. Yet, by inviting a symbolical recuperation of the Mughal past and continuously travelling towards home, *khwajasara* project a more homely future.

**Katie Hayne’s** contribution is an artistic-anthropological engagement with post-home. She considers the Northbourne Avenue public housing precincts in Canberra, Australia, scheduled for demolition as part of a project of ‘urban renewal’. Hayne guides us through the moment of this unhoming rupture – homes being demolished or awaiting imminent demolition. Drawing and painting in the street, Hayne slowly comes to be invited into the individual life (hi)stories. This artistic process, she argues, focused her attention to the place *as lived*: its relations, colours, scents and sounds, the architectural details, and so on. It also made her aware of the responsibilities inherent to the representation of home. Revealing the boundedness of her knowledge about these homes and indicating the precariousness of the future for their residents, Hayne leaves parts of these works unpainted. Hayne’s interlocutors face us with the uncanny everydayness of homes about to disappear; they tell her that the best time to see the houses is in the afternoon, when

‘those long shadows and the railings and pergolas make interesting patterns’, or simply point out ‘That was my bathroom’ whilst watching their house being demolished. Hayne tries to imagine the feeling of watching your home being demolished. The demolition as an unhoming rupture figures differently in the residents’ positionings.

The artistic process offered Hayne a way into various conversations on housing, politics, fears, plans and hopes. She discovers the Northbourne Housing and its life (hi)stories to be entangled with the modernist ideals of functional and egalitarian architecture, but also the reduction of public housing in Australia since the 1960s and the growing perceptions of such spaces as unhomey and alienating. Countering these broad brushstrokes, Hayne portrays a quotidian stillness of the architecture, with rubbish bins and washing lines, occasionally interrupted by a dog walker or the slow rhythm of the seasons marked by the changing colours of the trees. House as a home thus moves between the ideal and the real, Hayne notices. Her argument is captured by one of the residents: ‘I loved and hated the place but I will never forget the experience of living there’.

**Saakshi Joshi’s** contribution considers post-home in the echoes of the town of Tehri in the Himalayan state of Uttarakhand in India, which was submerged by the gigantic Tehri Dam in the early 2000s. However, Tehri-as-home continuously resurfaces in everyday conversations and affective capacities. It is contrasted against the unhomeliness of the ‘replacement’ town of New Tehri and other sites to which people were relocated, becoming a way to recover the histories of home and displacement against the state’s developmental projects of erasure. Bodies highlight the configuration of home in friction with the new spaces: they resist the altitude, the winds, the necessity for jackets in summertime, the absence of the river and its sounds, as well as the transformed kinship and caste relationships. Mementoes of home appear everywhere, in children’s names, the photographs on living room walls, or the salvaged doors and window frames. Post-home also appears as an actual bodily ailment – people complain that the new provision of reservoir water causes digestive disorders, or that the altitude and the climbing of stairs give them joint pain and respiratory problems.

The absence of the river also intervenes into the cremation rituals. The damming of sacred rivers more generally causes cosmological and ontological ruptures, Joshi notes. The town and the river, she argues, come into sight as animate beings. The river is understood as a mother carrying the town in its womb, despite destruction. It harbours the potential to resist the arrogance of developmental projects. The town is not simply a ‘container’ but appears as a person who was ‘left to drown’. Temporal orientations of Joshi’s interlocutors revolve around the time ‘after Tehri’s death’ and ‘when Tehri was alive’. The displaced people, she argues, make both a spatial and temporal distinction between Tehri and New Tehri (here vs. there; now vs. then).

They also make an affective differentiation, between the house-as-home (*ghar*) and the house-as-residence (*makān*). Displacement affected marriage and caste alliances. Yet, the change in these structures of home also provided opportunities for upward social mobility. Joshi sees the prevalence of the selective, idealised turn to the past-as-home to be a form of political insistence on the desired communal life.

**Alys Tomlinson's** photo essay takes us through three pilgrimage sites – Ballyvourney in Ireland, Mount Grabarka in Poland and Lourdes in France. It visually explores the meaning of 'ex-voto' religious offerings and provides an intimate view onto sacral landscapes, temporally and spatially removed from the everyday. Through the complex entwining of people, places and objects, Tomlinson's images of the offerings and their devotees raise numerous questions about the modalities of belonging and spiritual displacement ('unhoming'). Personal possessions are left out in the open; they dwell and belong as absences of home. Emplacing themselves in the world, these objects unfold collective and individual histories, yet also become charged with affective capacities beyond the intended purpose of their pilgrim producers. The post-home 'ex-voto' offerings are implanted in the setting of nature. The landscape in which they transpire takes them inside nature's time. Spatially and temporally intersecting, they articulate a worlding of things without their faithful owners. Tomlinson's photo essay is an excellent example of the various dimensions of 'home' from the perspective of one's everlasting desire to find shelter and experience belonging as 'being-at-home'. By opting for monochrome imaging and depicting the stillness of the human-forest conversations, she achieves a peculiar temporal confusion (the scenes are at once in the past and suggest a lingering of traces into the future). Tomlinson thus reminds that home is fragile and persistent, and never solely anthropogenic.

**Tom Selwyn** offers an anthropological analysis of post-home in contemporary Britain through the nautical metaphors of mooring, un-mooring and re-mooring. He juxtaposes the notions of 'hostility' and 'hospitality' as modes of belonging in the post-home world. The article elaborates three home-challenging events: the 2016 Brexit referendum, the fire at Grenfell Tower in London in 2017, and the so-called 'Windrush scandal' exposed in 2018. Analysing numerous examples from the media that demonstrate these events as unhoming ruptures, he notices hostility and the lack of hospitality towards migrants as the post-home norm in Britain. These events situate totalitarian discourses that inspire resentment against the migrants; they are a consequence of the normalisation of a 'hostile environment' that will have long-term effects on homing and unhoming among both the 'migrant' and 'non-migrant' populations.

The metaphors of mooring, un-mooring and re-mooring home capture, in Selwyn's words, 'a world shaped by seascapes which are nowadays full of small, often unseaworthy, boats carrying refugees'. These notions help us

understand the process of the house becoming a home in the age of global migration and refugee movement. What the author shows is that the home-related acts of intimate doings should not be bounded by the notion of 'home' as a familiar and familial space. The gerund form of mooring, un-mooring, and re-mooring aims to stress the meaning of 'home' as unfixed. Homes are 'moored' within smaller and extensive social and political networks. Also, they are, Selwyn writes, 'un-moored' by violence, so the refugees 'by definition' search for new moorings. In the post-home world, 'home and home making need co-ordinated co-operation at domestic, regional, national, and global levels', he adds. Selwyn's contribution draws our attention to various upsetting facts of the structural hostility against the migrants and refugees. The author invites us to rethink the notion of resistance as connected to homespace, and critically approach the post-home Britain. Thus, we have to ask ourselves, how much hospitality (and what kind of hospitality) is needed to 'un-moor' the oppressive atmosphere of a society in which the media most commonly attached the word 'illegal' to the words 'migrant' and 'immigrant' in the last decade. Finally, we read Selwyn's choice of the author's plural (or the first-person plural: 'we') as an emphasis on collectivity, an act of solidarity with those un-moored, and of resistance to the unhoming ruptures encapsulated in Thatcher's 'no such thing as society' as much as in May's 'hostile environment'.

**Lauren Harding** writes about the entangled histories of colonial settlement and First Nations displacement to discern post-home in the competing claims for home(land) in contemporary Canada. Building on her fieldwork in Qua-ba-diwa (known to the state as the Indian Reserve Number 6), she contrasts the notions of belonging and territorial claims of one Ditidaht family, the Knightons, against the national belonging articulated by the hikers through the West Coast Trail. Harding takes the host-guest relationship of domestic tourism as central to these competing visions. The settler-Canadian tourists understand this land of the national parks as the national natural 'backyard' or 'pristine wilderness', crucial to the definition of citizenship. In the national imaginary, she notes, these spaces are deterritorialised, understood as people-less and place-less. Wilderness is not a 'place' but a symbolically saturated abstraction within Euro-American (and Canadian colonial) epistemologies. Canadianness is confirmed through an active participation in such environments. The West Coast Trail, Harding argues, is a 'ritual test of one's ability to corporeally participate in the wilderness-based rituals of citizenship'. The hikers' language echoes the colonial tropes of conquered empty space. Endurance in the wilderness and the 'genuine' bond with the nature are performative; they enact the colonial-national scripts.

This kind of homeland has, however, always been in friction with the homemaking practices of the First Nations people, who experienced systematic forced removal and other forms of alienation from their land. By recog-



nising the domestic Canadian visitors as tourists, Harding's interlocutors resisted the deterritorialising tendencies of the state narratives. By reiterating that the non-indigenous Canadians are the guests, they constructed the First Nations as the hosts. Home thus appeared as a political claim against homeland. Harding summarises this claim in the words of Monique, one of her interlocutors: 'This isn't Canada, it's home'. Monique made this distinction for one of the hikers who asked about the application of Canadian smoking laws in front of her burger stand at Qua-ba-diwa. For the Knightons, hospitality became an assertion of ownership, Harding concludes. Post-home is here a quest to redefine belonging against the (post-)colonial, nationalist visions of homeland in which the fetish of 'wilderness' continues to invalidate non-settler dwelling.

**Dragana Kovačević Bielicki's** contribution invites thinking of post-home through the lens of nonbelonging and spatial and temporal alienation of 'home'. Focusing on Bosnia, she understands the refugee diasporic belonging as different from other types of transnational living. Diasporic ethnic (br)others are *othered* through their national belonging, she argues. Patriotism and belonging to the designated homeland are questioned for displaced refugees. Displacement and the decision to either return or 'remain displaced' in the countries of Western Europe created new types of boundaries between the diasporic 'co-ethnics'. The author juxtaposes diasporic and homeland belonging, which she also sees through the lenses of 'outsiderhood' and 'insiderhood'. However, these terms are entangled with the 'post-' of the notion of 'back home', which refers to the belatedness of spatial and temporal being. The article's primary focus is the discursive othering among the so-called 'stayers' in and 'leavers' from homeland during wars and conflicts. These notions intend to describe dynamic relations of exclusion among 'ethnic' other(s). In the setting of post-home, the so-called 'leavers' experience nonbelonging 'back home', since their markers of belonging are lensed through movement away from homeland. Kovačević Bielicki, for example, notes that one of her interlocutors was scorned for not knowing her 'mother tongue' as good as the local children.

The us-them positioning between 'stayers' and 'leavers' exemplifies that the required attachments to homeland are (still) dominantly seen as sedentary and that national belonging continues to be fixed to a 'primordial' soil. Kovačević Bielicki shows that 'anchored' soil-belonging becomes a source of continuous spatial and temporal alienation for refugees. Moreover, the sedentary thinking of belonging to a homeland unlocks multi-layered unhoming ruptures. The 'real' nation-ness is constructed through the identification with a homeland territory. The diasporic (br)others experience alienation precisely on the grounds of the 'same soil' semiotic, as their loyalty to 'home' is questioned (leaving during the war is interpreted as treacherous act).

### A note on the becoming of the *Post-home* special issue

For us, the editors of this special issue, the notion of post-home suggested itself in various settings, over a period of more than ten years. Both of us matured against the changing articulations of homelands, the systematic destruction of home (albeit, in the name of ‘home’), and amidst the absences, debris and violent identity politics that somehow made themselves *at home* in our worlds. Whenever and wherever home attained its homely outlines, it was quickly countered by its incompleteness and ambiguity, or ricocheted with the violence inscribed into the concept. It is precisely because of what our homes are, and what they are not, because of the homes prescribed and ‘allowed’ for us, and what our homes seek to be against such authorisations, that we strive to understand the workings of belonging and alienation more generally. We have also ventured into long-term explorations of post-conflict, post-homely lives of refugees, displaced persons and returnees (and post-homely ‘others’) in spaces that were officially ‘our home’, yet spaces that also remained homely and unhomely in different ways, often simultaneously.

The core of this special issue was formed as part of our panel ‘Post-Home(land): Being and Belonging after Spatial and Temporal Alienation’, organised at the 2015 International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (IUAES) Inter-Congress *Re-imagining Anthropological and Sociological Boundaries* at Thammasat University in Bangkok, Thailand. Other contributors have joined us on the way, including through Tom Selwyn’s 2018 panel ‘Representations of Displacement and the Struggle for Home and Homemaking’ organised by the Royal Anthropological Institute, the British Museum and SOAS University of London as part of the *Art, Materiality and Representation* Conference. The critical review of Krug’s graphic novel *Heimat* originated in a class discussion that Marija Grujić organised for one of her courses on displacement and belonging at Goethe University Frankfurt.

We warmly thank the contributors – Vanja Hamzić, Katie Hayne, Saakshi Joshi, Alys Tomlinson, Tom Selwyn, Lauren Harding and Dragana Kovačević Bielicki – as well as our many meticulous reviewers of individual articles. We would also like to thank Mijal Gandelsman-Trier and Michael Pröpper for their collegiality, patience and a well-run journal editorship. We celebrate the value of open-access platforms such as *Ethnoscripts* for the advancement of responsible academic visibility. As concepts travel and run into their *otherwise*, we hope that our inherently unfinished conversations might acquire post-home extensions elsewhere.

## References

- Abu-Lughod, Lila (2006 [1991]) *Writing against Culture*. In: Henrietta L. Moore and Todd Sanders (eds.) *Anthropology in Theory: Issues in Epistemology*. Oxford: Blackwell: pp: 466–479.
- Ahmed, Sara (1999) *Home and Away: Narratives of Migration and Estrangement*. *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 2 (3): pp. 329–347.
- Ahmed, Sara (2006) *Queer Phenomenology: Orientations, Objects, Others*. London: Duke University Press.
- Ballinger, Pamela (2012) *Borders and the Rhythms of Displacement, Emplacement and Mobility*. In: Thomas M. Wilson and Hastings Donnan (eds.) *A Companion to Border Studies*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell: pp. 387–404.
- Behar, Ruth (2007) *An Island Called Home*. Piscataway, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.
- Bhabha, Homi (1992) *The World and the Home*. *Social Text* 31/32: pp. 141–153.
- Binder, Susanne and Jelena Tošić (2005) *Refugees as a Particular Form of Transnational Migrations and Social Transformations: Socioanthropological and Gender Aspects*. *Current Sociology* 53 (4): pp. 607–24.
- Boccagni, Paolo (2017) *Migration and the Search for Home: Mapping Domestic Space in Migrants' Everyday Lives*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1984) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Boym, Svetlana (2001) *The Future of Nostalgia*. New York: Basic Books.
- Braudel, Fernand (1995 [1949]) *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II: Volume I*. Translated by Siân Reynolds. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Chari, Sharad and Katherine Verdery (2009) *Thinking between the Posts: Postcolonialism, Postsocialism, and Ethnography after the Cold War*. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 51 (1): pp. 6–34
- Das, Veena (1997) *Critical Events: An Anthropological Perspective on Contemporary India*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Douglas, Mary (2001 [1966]) *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London: Routledge.
- Foucault, Michel (2010) *The Government of Self and Others*. Edited by F. Gros, F. Ewald and A. Fontana. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Freud, Sigmund (1955) *The 'Uncanny'*. In: James Strachey (ed.) *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud: Volume XVII (1917–1919)*. London: The Hogarth Press: pp. 219–52.
- Frost, Nicola and Tom Selwyn (eds.) (2018) *Travelling Towards Home: Mobilities and Homemaking*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Garland, David (2014) *What Is a 'History of the Present'? On Foucault's Genealogies and Their Critical Preconditions*. *Punishment and Society* 16 (4): pp. 365–84.

- Giddens, Anthony (1991) *Modernity and Self-identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- HadžiMuhamedović, Safet (2018a) *Waiting for Elijah: Time and Encounter in a Bosnian Landscape*. Oxford: Berghahn.
- HadžiMuhamedović, Safet (2018b) *Syncretic Debris: From Shared Bosnian Saints to the ICTY Courtroom*. In: Ann Wand (ed.) *Tradition, Performance and Identity Politics in European Festivals*. Special issue of *Ethnoscripts* 20 (1): pp. 79-109.
- Halilovich, Hariz (2013) *Places of Pain: Forced Displacement, Popular Memory and Trans-local Identities in Bosnian War-Torn Communities*. Oxford: Berghahn.
- Hamzić, Vanja (2016) *Sexual and Gender Diversity in the Muslim World: History, Law and Vernacular Knowledge*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Hamzić, Vanja (2017) *Interruption*. Paper presented at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton on 8 May 2017. <https://eprints.soas.ac.uk/24526/> [accessed 20 March 2019].
- Henare, Amiria, Martin Holbraad and Sari Wastell (2007) *Introduction: Thinking Through Things*. In: A. Henare, M. Holbraad and S. Wastell (eds.) *Thinking Through Things: Theorising Artefacts Ethnographically*. London: Routledge: pp. 1-31.
- Hirsch, Eric (1995) *Introduction: Landscape—Between Place and Space*. In: Eric Hirsch and Michael O’Hanlon (eds.) *The Anthropology of Landscape: Perspectives on Place and Space*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1-30.
- Hirsch, Eric and Charles Stewart (2005) *Introduction: Ethnographies of Historicity*. *History and Anthropology* 16 (3): pp. 261–74.
- Hirsch, Marianne (2001) *Surviving Images: Holocaust Photographs and the Work of Postmemory*. *The Yale Journal of Criticism* 14 (1): pp. 5–37.
- Hirsch, Marianne (2008) *The Generation of Postmemory*. *Poetics Today* 29 (1): pp. 103–28.
- Hirsch, Marianne and Leo Spitzer (2010) *Ghosts of Home: The Afterlife of Czernowitz in Jewish Memory*. Berkeley; University of California Press.
- Hirsch, Marianne and Valerie Smith (2002) *Feminism and Cultural Memory: An Introduction*. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 28 (1): pp. 1–19.
- Hoffman, Eva (2011 [1989]) *Lost in Translation: A Life in a New Language*. London: Vintage Digital.
- Holbraad, Martin and Morten Axel Pedersen (2017) *The Ontological Turn: An Anthropological Exposition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hollander, John (1991) *It All Depends*. *Social Research* 58 (1): pp. 31-49.
- hooks, bell (1990) *Yearning: Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics*. Boston: South End Press.
- Humphrey, Caroline (1995) *Chiefly and Shamanist Landscapes in Mongolia*. In: Eric Hirsch and Michael O’Hanlon (eds.) *The Anthropology of Landscape: Perspectives on Place and Space*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: pp. 135-162.

- Jansen, Stef (2009a) Hope and the State in the Anthropology of Home: Preliminary Notes. *Ethnologia Europaea: Journal of European Ethnology* 39 (1): pp. 54–66.
- Jansen, Stef (2009b) *Struggles for Home: Violence, Hope and the Movement of People*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Jansen, Stef and Staffan Löfving (2007) Introduction: Movement, Violence, and the Making of Home. *Focaal: Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology* 49: pp. 3–14.
- Jilani, Sarah (2015) Writing Exile: Displacement and Arrival in Eva Hoffman's *Lost in Translation* and Edward Said's *Out of Place*. *Life Writing* 12 (1): pp. 59–73.
- Klein, Ernest (1966) *A Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary of the English Language. Volume I: A-K*. London: Elsevier Publishing Company.
- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson (1980) *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lems, Annika (2014) Placing Displacement: Place-Making in a World of Movement. *Ethnos* 81 (2): pp. 315–337.
- Lems, Annika (2018) *Being-Here: Placemaking in a World of Movement*. New York: Berghahn.
- Mallet, Shelley (2004) Understanding Home: A Critical Review of the Literature. *The Sociological Review*. 52 (1): pp. 62–89.
- Mohanty, Chandra Talpade and Bidy Martin (2003) What's Home Got to Do with It? *Feminism Without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*. Durham: Duke University Press: pp. 85–105.
- Navaro, Yael (2009) Affective Spaces, Melancholic Objects: Ruination and the Production of Anthropological Knowledge. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 15 (1): pp. 1–18.
- Navaro, Yael (2012) *The Make-Believe Space: Affective Geography in a Post-war Polity*. London: Duke University Press.
- Parkin, David (1999) Mementoes as Transitional Objects in Human Displacement. *Journal of Material Culture* 4 (3): pp. 303–320.
- Parkin, Robert and Linda Stone (2004) General Introduction. In Robert Parkin and Linda Stone (eds.) *Kinship and Family: An Anthropological Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell: pp. 1–23.
- Partridge, Eric (1966) *Origins: A Short Etymological Dictionary of Modern English*. London: Routledge.
- Rushdie, Salman (1992) *Imaginary Homelands: Essays and Criticism 1981–1991*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Rykwert, Joseph (1993) House and Home. In: Arien Mack (ed.) *Home: A Place in the World*. New York: New York University Press: pp. 47–58.
- Salmond, Anne (2014) Tears of Rangi Water, Power, and People in New Zealand. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 4 (3): pp. 285–309.
- Schneider, David (2004 [1972]) 'What is Kinship All About?'. In R. Parkin and L. Stone (eds.) *Kinship and Family: An Anthropological Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell: pp. 257–274.

- Schneider, David M. (1984) *A Critique of the Study of Kinship*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Selwyn, Tom and Nicola Frost (2018) Introduction: Home and Homemaking in a Time of Crisis. In: Nicola Frost and Tom Selwyn (eds.) *Travelling Towards Home: Mobilities and Homemaking*. New York: Berghahn Books: pp. 1–14.
- Sidran, Abdulah (1997) *The Blindman Sings to His City*. Sarajevo: International Center for Peace.
- Steiner, Henriette (2010) On the Unhomely Home: Porous and Permeable Interiors from Kierkegaard to Adorno. *Interiors* 1 (1): pp. 133–48.
- Stoler, Ann Laura (2008) Imperial Debris: Reflections on Ruins and Ruination. *Cultural Anthropology* 23 (2): pp. 191–219.
- Strathern, Marilyn (1999) No limite de uma certa linguagem: Entrevista com Marilyn Strathern. *Mana* 5 (2): pp. 157–75.
- Sutherland, John (2018) *Literary Landscapes: Charting the Worlds of Classic Literature*. New York: Black Dog & Leventhal Publishers.
- Ugrešić, Durbavka (1994) *Have a Nice Day: From the Balkan War to the American Dream*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Wastell, Sari (2001) Presuming Scale, Making Diversity: On the Mischiefs of Measurement and the Global: Local Metonym in Theories of Law and Culture. *Critique of Anthropology* 21 (2): pp. 185–210.
- Wood, John George (1866) *Homes without Hands: The Habitations of Animals, Classes According to Their Principle of Construction*. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers.
- Yanagisako, Sylvia and Jane F. Collier (1987) Toward a Unified Analysis of Gender and Kinship. In: J. F. Collier and S. Yanagisako (eds.) *Gender and Kinship: Essays Toward a Unified Analysis*. Stanford: Stanford University Press: pp. 14–50.

---

Safet HadžiMuhamedović is an anthropologist of sacral landscapes, currently teaching anthropology at SOAS University of London. He has conducted ethnographic fieldwork in Bosnia, Palestine, and the Basque Country since 2009 and has been recipient of a number of prestigious research awards. He has previously taught at the University of Bristol, Goldsmiths and SOAS, University of London, and Goethe University Frankfurt. He has convened anthropological courses on landscapes, religion, Islam, kinship, social theories, gender, travel, tourism and pilgrimage, methods and methodology. Safet has written on sacral landscapes, historicity, and political agency of ‘nonhuman’ beings, and ontological approaches to the question of home. He is the author of *Waiting for Elijah: Time and Encounter in a Bosnian Landscape* (2018).

Marija Grujić is a sociologist of gender studies, home, and refugee displacements, currently teaching and working as Scientific Associate at Goethe University Frankfurt. She has convened courses on the sociology of gender, nationalism, refugee displacements, post-socialism, care, religion and migration. Marija has previously worked for the Center for Interdisciplinary Postgraduate Studies, University of Sarajevo and the Transcultural Psychosocial Educational Foundation (TPO). She was engaged in various non-governmental organisations and published on gender, sexuality, politics and religion. Her current project considers ‘unhomely homelands’ through the biographical narratives of the ‘internally displaced persons’/‘refugees’ from Kosovo.