

*What Dwells There? Some Reflections on the Houses that Hold Worlds**

OLÍVIA MARIA GOMES DA CUNHA

Museu Nacional, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil (omgc@mn.ufrj.br)

Museum visitors partake in the effect of what we can call the domestication of the view. They witness the constant changes in how objects are allowed to exist in a museological space. In this way, visitors are challenged to cultivate new sensibilities that simultaneously reveal and conceal things and their relationships. These meanings have been subject to political debates, controversies, disputes, and conflicts around property rights involving museum representatives and other actors. As a result, the domesticated things inside the museums threaten to displace themselves, moving towards the uncertainty of other shelters and other hands. Each time other flows and movements towards other ‘homes’ are asserted by different sort of groups and communities to reclaim or ‘bring home’ objects previously obtained through a mixture of pillaging, acquisitions, donations, and violent actions, distinct voices ask the same question: whose home? By exploring a case concerning the restitution of objects outside and inside museums, this article explores an alternative understanding of the notion of the house as a legitimate relationship between materiality and those worlds in which objects dwell. In the first sections, to explore the idea of heterotopy coined by Michel Foucault from an anthropological perspective, I return to some interpretations of notions such as ‘home’ and ‘house’ drawing on classical ethnographies. Secondly, I focus on what Ghassan Hage calls a ‘diasporic lenticularity’ to explore other “modes of existing” in multiple places and realities. Finally, I conclude by revolving distinct cases concerning museum practices and reallocation processes, transforming and (re)creating new spaces to locate and house unstable objects and presences.

Key words: house; museum; artifacts; spaces; anthropology; liberation

The places where objects from the “world cultures” are displayed have never been closed spaces. Although museum buildings originated as fortresses, warehouses, or prisons in the past, artistic mobilizations, social movements, architectural projects, and not-so-recent political occupations have been destabilizing the earlier walls, the boundaries between the inside and the outside of museums. These movements affect not only the infrastructure of buildings but also the institutional histories, their uses, and vocations toward broadening their audiences. These transformations include the spaces and objects, the institutions’ discourses, and their political and financial ties. They expose the clashes between what curators, activists, and artists call decolonial “practices” and “discourses.”¹ In conversations about the purpose and uses of the places in which they work—buildings that house

* This text was a contribution to the *Pressing Matter Project Conference*, at an encounter held in the Wereldmuseum Leiden, Amsterdam, on October 31, 2022. I thank Wayne Modest, Susan Lêgene and Rosalie Hans for their kind invitation to speculate on possible responses to the question that is the title of this article during a virtual meeting in preparation for the conference.

museum institutions in Cape Town analyzed by Joffe and Shepherd, for example—the meanings given to “colonial heritage” and the demands for other decolonial practices and discourses are constantly questioned. “Opening up” institutions implicated in pre-colonial, colonial, and apartheid histories implies rethinking the spatiality of their intra and extramural connections. What forms of inhabiting do interactive and participatory museums propose if they no longer house fortresses? What infrastructures should be demanded by other practices in tune with historical revisions and decolonial critique? If buildings and objects are brought to the center of political debates, words and naming practices are their most sensitive faces in different “interventions in and into space” (Joffe and Shepherd 2020: 84).² Museums are examples of the proliferation of spatial utopias, spaces replicating virtualities and realities, and material production that demand attention from multiple perspectives. And how different curatorial approaches mobilize conceptions of value, justice, history, reparative rights, and what western thought defined as science. As the museum practitioners and art activists interviewed by Joffe and Shepherd problematized through examples of the entanglements produced by their intervention practices, dimensions such as ‘action’ and ‘performance’ of myriad entities are also at play.

If, as suggested by Bruno Latour, “we all populate the world with entities to which is also attached—or in our case reattached—the long series of actions from which they come or to which they lead” (Latour 2016: 89)³, places such as museums share elements with other ways of inhabiting and experiencing the world. The task to which Latour commits himself, therefore, is to disclose these effects through a “de-epistemologization and to re-ontologize knowledge activity” (Latour 2007: 6).⁴ This idea, which traverses essential parts of Latour’s work, especially his discussions of concepts like ontology and modes of existence, allows us to consider museums as multiple and heterotopic spaces—subject to explicit or unnoticed change—that preserve diverse types of knowledge production. Among the temporal effects into which Latour inquires, we might add the creation of overlapping spaces, disposed in the form of strata layered to house the objects and the knowledge. These spaces can encompass, for instance, innovative technologies used to reproduce images and worlds as well as those that in the construction of virtual environments of augmented reality are designed to afford unexpected visual perspectives. All these technical apparatuses and their semiotic effects on the constitution and display of knowledge reveal a great deal about how things can inhabit the universe of museums, as well as the human and non-human interactions created through socio-technical engagements. And yet both the things displayed and the knowledge to which they relate and that they produce can be seen in the museums as either ‘realities’ or ‘virtualities.’ Museum visitors, meanwhile, voluntarily or not, partake in the effect of what we can call the domestication of the view. Visitors are witness to the constant changes in how objects occupy museological spaces. These movements allow visitors to cultivate new sensibilities toward the things and the multiple relationships they engage in when displayed in the exhibitions.

As a non-expert on museum studies, museal histories, practices and practitioners and their politics, I prefer to position myself on the other side of a divide between those who think about and prepare things for viewing and the visitors who observe these things exhibited at museums. However, as an anthropologist who has been reflecting on the relationships between people and objects in both the field and the archive, throughout my inquiries in archival institutions, it was usual to hear about disputes involving the claims around the rights to retrieve, keep, or display ‘things’ considered as owned by those who were conceived both as objects and subjects in anthropological studies, or their descendants. Yet, in this article, my reflections go in another direction. My question expresses an attempt to evict what Eduardo Viveiros de Castro has called “controlled equivocation” when we

attribute certain meanings to notions of ‘home’ in reference to museum policies and practices.⁵ These meanings come to the surface as controversies, disputes and conflicts between a museum’s representatives and other actors when domesticated things threaten to displace themselves, moving towards the uncertainty of other shelters and other hands. Although museum objects traverse the institution’s walls as they move towards forms of restitution and repatriation, they still haunt the houses that, through violent acts and/or protective aims, they inhabited, wrapped in different regimes of truth. As Achille Mbembe writes: “every authentic politics of restitution is inseparable from a capacity for truth, such that honoring truth and acts of repairing the world become, by the same token, the essential foundation of a new connection and a new relationship” (Mbembe 2021: 161).⁶

Each time other flows and movements involving objects previously obtained through a mixture of looting, acquisitions, donations, and violent actions are claimed to be recovered or “brought back home,” distinct voices seem to ask the same question: whose home? Although I intend to refer here in an abstract and non-normative way to what museum practitioners have termed ‘policies of repatriation,’ I have a simpler question in mind since, for me, bringing something home suggests not just breaking up a relationship but also simultaneously constituting another. If so, we can take ‘repatriation’ to mean the making of new relations that claim belonging, nurturing, authentication, legitimacy, and justice. But beyond the technicalities and politics in which these notions circulate, there is, I think, an interesting assumption common to all. The things claimed need to return to the places from which they came to provide ‘comfort’ and recognition for those to whom they have always belonged. The notion of the house—in its variant ‘home’—thus seems to express a legitimate link between materiality and those worlds in which objects possess significance.

1 The House and Its Lenticular Positionalities

Here, my reflection turns to the already much cited, but still remarkably fertile, formulation of Michel Foucault, first developed in the 1980s, in which nineteenth-century museums appear as an example of what he calls *heterotopias*. A concept invoked to capture the multiplicity of scales, planes and knowledge distributed in spaces open to other worlds. A space, argues the author, “in which we live, which draws us out of ourselves, in which the erosion of our lives, our time and our history occurs, the space that claws and gnaws at us, is also, in itself, a heterogeneous space” (Foucault 2019: 373).⁷ These divergent, unstable spaces proliferate as effects of the myriad relations in which humans interact with other more-than-human beings to whom agency and volition have been attributed. Among the latter, we can include those ‘things’ mobilized and oriented by the practices and knowledge that modern thought labelled ‘animistic.’ When human and more-than-human beings interact in other spatialities, constituted by distinct relations, and based on diverse affinities, the idea of space appears to defy its proximity with the material and real dimensions. But instead of revealing spaces as exoteric, invisible, or magical ‘realities,’ the idea of heterotopia questions the very idea of ‘reality,’ what this concept described, and when it could be used by whom to signal a presence or action of something or someone. A heterotopia, therefore, reflects multiple positionalities in which distinct observers see and engage with diverse others and create the spaces or planes where these relationships may have a place.

The histories and analyses of the birth of museums, particular the Ethnographic and Natural History Museums that sprang up during the nineteenth century in Europe, have unearthed a long history of politics, discourses and practices that included the gathering of heteroclitic artifacts and ideas from many different cultures in one single place. Housed in grand buildings known as ‘palaces,’ these items could be displayed by curators and museum practitioners in halls, frames, display cabinets, and showcases especially designed to accommodate diverse systems of signification. Although politics, law and language sought, among other things, to interpret the messy, intangible, unseeable, magical, or unaccomplished, the envisaged, dreamt and created, new technologies and collecting practices also made it possible to standardize the different ways of rendering the relationships between beings and artifacts. In their own fashion and through distinct semiotic regimes—as, for instance, practices aiming to establish visual, aesthetical, or semantic analogies among ‘cultures or the production of ‘contexts’ or bundle of meanings through which the artifacts displayed must be understood—, places like museums assembled things that were not yet finished or fully transformed. By confining them in salons and display cases, this utopia conjured by the projects of western museums aimed to discontinue and tame the potency of diverse *becomings*—the ways of being of things and people in diverse sorts of unfinished relations. Such practices, as we know well, are not just entangled in colonial explorations and governmentalities: they also actualize and perpetuate them.

Natural History, Ethnological and Ethnographic Museums were prime examples of these new regimes of visualization. They contained and granted access to other extant worlds through their entanglement in many kinds of connections to European colonialism and conquest. They gathered objects that allowed specialists and visitors to speculate on other temporalities, both ‘primitive’ and unfamiliar, seeing them as scaled-down models, icons of ‘cultures,’ ‘peoples’ and ‘traditions.’ Beyond the logic of accumulation and the overlapping of temporal and spatial scales that sought to translate the worlds once inhabited by the objects, museums were created as heterotopic structures because they claimed to contain different ‘places’ in the same ‘place’ (another concept crying out for further elaborations) whenever the exercises of contextualization, maps, displays and approximations of the equivalent or similar aimed to reconstitute the relationships of things and people to the worlds that both supposedly inhabited. In its desire to retrieve and safeguard—a process invariably fed by the violence of colonialism—the museological heterotopia converted the museum into a refuge of interrupted relationships set apart from the present. In other words, a shelter for worlds that no longer existed or only ever had a temporary life and are at constant risk of being destroyed and forgotten. But while thinking of Natural History and Ethnological Museums as exemplars of heterotopic regimes of visualization highlights the importance of considering the notion of place, it also appears to eschew, or ignore, other modes of creating shelters that entail different relationships with the worlds of others. Rather than distinguishing the nineteenth-century ‘museum-shelter’ from other spatial conceptions, the notion of heterotopia seems, curiously, to draw it closer to different ways of sheltering other worlds.

Let us turn then to other references and ways of thinking about specific spatial configurations as structures of relations with worlds, this time associated with anthropological explorations of the notion of the ‘house.’ As an example, I cite the correlation between spatiality and the realm of so-called social relations—an idea central to the Euro-American anthropology of the last century—which defines the ‘house’ as a societal model, a set of socialities experienced within or around the same physical space, projected as an alternative concept to the bonds of blood, kinship, war and alliance. In Claude Lévi-Strauss’s structuralism, for instance, *sociétés à maison* are complex systems of belonging in which the kind of filiation, whether maternal or paternal, through which classical anthropology

categorized the elementary forms of relationship of so-called primitive peoples no longer takes precedence. Echoing contemporary historians who defined the emergence of the ‘home’ in modern Europe as a moral domain marked not by primordial bonds but by the accumulation and exchange of wealth,⁸ Lévi-Strauss defined the house society as “a material and spiritual heritage that includes dignity, origins, kinship, names and symbols, status, power and wealth.” The focus on affluence, exchange, and inheritance all figure as constitutive elements of a space composed of both rules and relationships. In the author’s terms, the house becomes conceptualized as a ‘moral person,’ “thus owner of a domain composed of material and immaterial goods” that transmits wealth and dignity, an entity with which a bond is recognized and from which obligations are inherited (Lévi-Strauss 1983: 1224).⁹ Little adaptation is required for us to apply the author’s approach to European houses too, modern contemporary museums, ‘moral persons’ par excellence, insofar as they inherited the collections, constructions, names and objects of the aristocracy—houses that these humans and non-humans inhabited. The vast assortments of objects accumulated in aristocratic houses are distinguishable not only by the names of the owners but also by a specific architectural genre: the mansions and palaces. It is interesting to see what happens when houses—qua buildings, forms of belonging and a distinctive feature between different worlds—are designed to contain and represent the mansions and palaces in duplicated, compartmentalized, reduced, or expanded spatialities. As Tim Ingold noted: “Today, the mansion is no longer inhabited by its former aristocratic owners but has been turned into a museum. Visitors to the museum have the opportunity to examine the chest and its contents.” A chest of drawers containing feathers, animal and human bones, astronomical instruments, papers, and diagrams; these places hold something more than pure materiality. They also lodge concepts—such as animism, totemism, analogism, and naturalism—as new artifacts of knowledge. As Ingold proceeds to warn us, though, “within the drawer these things can only be imagined as the derivative emanations of an exterior physicality, masking an invisible and immobile interiority that vanishes on the instant the drawer is opened” (Ingold 2016: 319).¹⁰

My purpose in referring to the *maison* here, though, is not to draw analogies with the analytic efforts of Lévi-Strauss to rethink the eroded opposition between ‘primitive’ and ‘complex’ societies—or ‘cold’ and ‘hot’ societies—by using an ethnographic concept applied to both ‘modern’ and ‘non-modern’ peoples. On the contrary, the very notions of ‘house’ and ‘home’ that seem to be contained in the *sociétés à maisons* allow us to speculate on the closeness between different worlds inscribed in movements, passages, and directions. The images of the ‘Maison Kabile’ evoked by Pierre Bourdieu and the configurations of malocas—the long-houses of the Amazonian Amerindian peoples of the upper Negro River—detailed by Stephen Hugh-Jones show us precisely how the things and people inhabiting these houses are immersed in overlapping cosmological dimensions, spaces travelled from outside to inside, from top to bottom, and in reverse.¹¹ The internal spatiality, the disposition of objects, the inflows, outflows and movements, the topographical references and the coexistence of humans and non-humans all converge in a composite space made of partitions, passages and overlappings. And most important of all, the limits of a house are located outside and beyond the built area: they are not contained. Belonging to or dwelling within a house entails participating in a series of complex, distributed and spatio-temporally signalled relationships, what Bourdieu defines as a “relative position among agents” (Bourdieu 2013: 133).¹² Moving beyond Bourdieu’s emphasis on practices and the distinction between physical and social spaces, Hugh-Jones expands on Lévi-Strauss’s insight by conceptualizing the malocas of the Barasana not simply as a depiction of social structure but as—in their manifestation within ritual contexts—a “model of the cosmos”:

[...] a cosmic Symbol for at such times the house becomes one with the universe and spirit world it represents [...]. The roof is the sky supported by the posts, which are mountains, with the walls representing the hills at the edge of the world. *Malocas* are orientated on an east-west axis with the men's door to the east and the women's door to the west. The ridgepole along the top is the path of the sun across the sky and a post above the centre of the house and centre of the world is his seat at midday. An imaginary river. Flowing down the middle of the house from west to east represents the rivers of the earth that flow in this direction and below the floor runs the river of the dead, where the dead go after burial in canoes, flowing from east to west to complete the Circuit. By day, the sun travels across the sky to set in the west where it travels up the underworld river in a canoe to rise again in the east. In this way space and time are brought together in one symbolic complex (Hugh-Jones 1985: 93).

The Amerindian *maloca* depicted by Hugh-Jones encompasses a cosmos containing the dwellings of a multitude of different beings. Movements, fruitions, and orientations of human and non-human bodies and their sensory perceptions reveal its internal and external contours. The *maloca's* inhabitants participate in a continual negotiation over the places reserved for people and things, deciding when and how they can be displayed and to whom. These varieties of dwellers inhabit interconnected, coupled, opposing and mutually implicated worlds. In Hugh-Jones's depiction, the centre of the house and the centre of the cosmos are axes around which opposing worlds converge. But as a concept, the 'house' also resists the existence of centres or any spatial and topographical binarism. We might call it a heterotopia made of passages yet borderless. Spatialities such as the Kabile house and the Amerindian *maloca* are not just dwellings for a multiplicity of beings and relations: they are the exact opposite of a contained cosmos made of beings that neither communicate nor reproduce.

Countless analytic experiments exist from which we might extract similar examples. Images of spaces made of worlds and relative positionalities in which beings and objects are situated and located evoke parallels with the universalist utopias of the modern European house and the *maison-turned-museum* as similarly heterotopic spatial variations. In citing these examples, however, I merely wish to point out the lines of force that run through the house as a concept, especially when conceived as a shelter, a space for accumulation, designed to keep hold of the inheritance and secure its transmission. Other possibilities exist, though. We can take another ethnographic example, the system of belonging or *maison-diaspora* studied by Joseph Handerson, which resembles rhizomes that spread out with the flows of the experiences of Haitian migrants.¹³ While those kin who stay in Haiti remain tied to the land where their ancestors rest, others who migrate expand the spatial boundaries of the family house while as the same time as they reinforce their obligations to kin and ancestors through the consumption and circulation of objects and money. The *maison-diaspora* contains mementos of the migratory experience of relatives who are gone, its spatiality marked by the temporality of the things that arrive and the people who leave. The existence of domestic appliances, installations, house extensions, furniture, and remittances remembers and instantiates the absence of kin living abroad. The migratory relationships and experiences are also the things received or brought by those who travel and return home. A house fuelled by a solar energy roof is recognized as a *maison-diaspora* in Haiti, the *famii* who left for other places remaining connected to their kinfolk. To 'belong to the house' and to be kin is thus to participate in mutual experiences and be affected by others.

If we compare these distinct conceptions of houses as ‘dwelling places,’ to use Ingold’s formula, including the European nineteenth-century museum, the latter can be seen not only as a paradigmatic example of a heterotopia but also as examples of what Ghassan Hage calls a ‘diasporic lenticularity’—“a mode of existing” in multiple places and realities (Hage 2021: 101).¹⁴ Hage’s point of departure for a critical anthropology that interrogates the concepts formulated to understand and describe the living, their relations, and the worlds created by them is the perspectivism (or ‘multi-naturalism’) and the critique of monorealism developed by Eduardo Viveiros de Castro.¹⁵ Hage mobilizes the effects of the theoretical dialogues between anthropology, western philosophy, and Amerindian metaphysics originally conjured by Viveiros de Castro to understand the intricate relationships between the human and more-than-human bodies conceived by South American indigenous peoples and the multiple natures in which transformation and life are experienced. Channelling perspectivism as an operator for understanding what he calls ‘lenticularity,’ Hage shows us how the experiences lived, created, remembered and speculated in the context of the Lebanese diaspora cannot be read as representations, nonrealities or utopias of an imaginary world (Hage 2011).¹⁶ Instead, as the author suggests, they stand as realities, but realities that we could also call heterotopias in which people and things exist, where they live and find shelter. This ‘multiplicity of realities’ relates to each subject in distinct intensities. Following Pierre Bourdieu, Hage argues that these are composed by movements of ‘intensification’ and ‘de-intensification’—precisely what he calls a ‘lenticular reality’:

A lenticular reality is not only a reality made of many intersecting different realities. It’s also a multiplicity of realities that differ in terms of intensity. That is, it invites us to see the diasporic subject as being not only at the intersection of multiple realities but also at the intersection of realities of varied intensities (Hage 2021: 102).

Referring to the experience of Lebanese migrants across multiple sites, Hage articulates the movement of people and things with the worlds they inhabit through an understanding of a specific way of ‘being diaspora,’ “a way of being in the world and a way in which the world comes to be. Thus, *diasporic* signifies a variety of qualities and properties that pertain to both the subjects of these experiences and to the social relations/reality/world/milieu/culture/environment in which these subjects exist” (Hage 2021: 4). Hage proposes a subversion of the principle of localization that has oriented the study of migration, becoming attentive instead to “what it means to occupy and be situated in a space or reality.” The creation of relations in multiple ‘inhabitancess,’ as he puts it, is “the capacity to experience occupying two places at the same time and being situated in them simultaneously without having to move between them” (Hage 2021: 78).

Hage’s approach to the movement of people and things through diasporic networks is useful to consider alternative ways of understanding how ‘homes’ are made for disputed or continuously moving objects.¹⁷ Amid the maelstrom of a museological politics involving debates on processes of restitution and repatriation, the term ‘home’ seems to become charged with a variety of other incomparable meanings and subjected to other practices of translation¹⁸ that turn an ethnographic artifact into an almost new entity, already saturated by different political ontologies. It is no longer just the ‘home’ referenced in the catalogs or identification documents that registered the ‘arrival’ or ‘entrance’ of objects, artifacts and knowledge into a museum, attributing their origins to particular places, cultures, societies, and times.¹⁹ Tracking the provenience of an artifact is also a process of imagining and creating ‘original dwellings’ from which their true meanings can and should supposedly

be grasped. As such, these localizing practices aim to return things to their terrestrial and human worlds so that they can be seen as part of a ‘culture.’

2 Bringing Back Home

But what does ‘home’ mean when referring to the transfer of things kept in Colonial, Ethnological or Archaeological Museums, also conceived as ‘houses,’ places designed to preserve the traces of other worlds? Not just moving but translating objects from one place to another implies asking not simply what a home *is* but what it *does* and what and who may inhabit it. Such an exercise invites us to contemplate a final and more expressive example—the ethnographic museums imagined throughout the nineteenth century, today affected by clamours to bring objects ‘back home.’ Let us briefly expand on these reflections by exploring some empirical examples. Here we can turn to experiences of repatriation that suggest encounters with—and transformations to—different conceptions of ‘home.’ As well as ‘bringing back,’ therefore, our reflection will also involve ‘putting things down,’ replacing and relocating them outside the boxes in which the categories used by the nineteenth and twentieth-century museums and their practitioners stored them. This move also requires us to pay attention to the words and actions of those who claim other forms of ownership over the things (previously housed in ‘museum institutions’), which mobilize “beyond human meanings and uses, in their ‘thingness’ and their ‘animate materiality’” (Mbembe 2021: 19). Or as Roger Sansi-Roca puts it, when he emphasizes not only the agency of things but the fact that the objects are also transformed by “their presence in the events,” we need to consider how these ‘presences’ require other places in which things can (re)establish or (re)new relationships and forms of communication (Sansi-Roca 2005: 150).²⁰ As we shall see in the cases below, the idea of what it means for a sacred object to dwell in a house sometimes has to be created.

Let us start by citing an example illustrating the need to establish new relationships. Powers attributed to the so-called ‘magic objects’ and those responsible for their creation have merited attention in the ethnographies of Maroon societies and in the descriptions of the first attempts to transform ‘colonial populations’ into scientific objects and ‘cultures.’ Describing the objects collected as well as ‘human examples’ of the “The Inhabitants of Suriname” brought from the Dutch Colony to the Colonial Exhibition in Amsterdam in 1883, Prince Bonaparte highlighted the intertwined relations between animals, objects, plants, and human beings. Not only did Maroons use amulets and clothes as ‘charms,’ but, most importantly, the presence of spirits acting through some human-made artifact, since the so-called *Bosnegers* believe that the latter “manifest their presence by hidden signs” (Bonaparte 1884: 137).²¹

Susan Lêgene followed the trails left by the observations of Gaspar P.C. van Bruegel, who, along with gourds, clothes, utensils, and other objects belonging to the enslaved of the Clifford Kocqshove plantation, donated two objects to the Haarlem Colonial Museum initially labelled as a ‘brush’ and a ‘broom.’ The donor described in minute detail the composition of natural elements combining plant leaves, beads, natural fiber cords, and clay, and characterized them as decorative objects that emulated Dutch customs in rural homes without any connection to rituals and other magical practices conducted by enslaved. After the Abolition of Slavery (1863) and the intensification of the Christian

missionary activities in the conversion of formerly enslaved, objects collected on the plantation were transformed into signs of otherness since they differentiated the ‘new Christians’ from the Maroons resistant to conversion and followers of ‘pagan’ and ‘fetishist’ practices. However, the destruction and seizure of the so-called ‘fetishes’ inaugurated the conversion trajectory. Thus, by describing the former enslaved as Christians, the link to ‘pagan’ religions would be left to the so-called *Bosnegers*. In the presentation of the ‘Populations of Suriname’ in the catalog for the 1899 Colonial Exhibition, the two ‘brushes’ would then reappear as a ‘relic’ of the moment of conversion—insofar as the catalog description refers to the difficulty of gaining access to them—and as a ‘fetish’—the materialization of a “rejected animist religion” (Lêgene 1998: 51).²² Trophies of conquest and the Christian combat against paganism, artifacts were transformed into icons of radical alterity and temporality. The destruction of things for ritual purposes involved their transformation into museum objects. These would be incontestable proof of a necessary ‘ontological separation’ between the spiritual and transcendent domains and the domain of material life (Lêgene 1998:49).

My second example comes from debates on the right of law enforcement agencies to confiscate and keep ritual objects owned by people accused of sorcery, false medicine, and social disorder.²³ In Brazil and Cuba in the early twentieth century, these controlling practices were invariably aimed at Black and indigenous people. I have in mind cases like the Perseverança (Perseverance) Museum in Maceió Alagoas state, the Nina Rodrigues Museum, associated with the Faculty of Medicine in Salvador, Bahia state, the Guanabacoa Museum, inaugurated during the first years of the Cuban Revolution, and more recently the case of the collection of 519 Afro-Brazilian objects that inhabited the Rio de Janeiro Police Museum, later transformed into the exhibition ‘Nosso Sagrado’ (hereafter, the ‘Our Sacred Collection’) hosted by the Museum of the Republic in 2020.²⁴ What do these cases share in common? They are among the most frequently cited and analyzed examples involving mobilizations and clashes between science, law, cultural/national heritage, and defenders of national heritage. Specialists and religious authorities have claimed that police authorities were wrong to transform evidence of other cultures and practices into evidence of a crime, while practitioners reclaimed their ritual tools. From their side, law enforcement authorities insist that they had merely been taking the socially prophylactic measures demanded of them. The specialists, authorities, practitioners, and the police asserted in common that the seized artifacts ‘represented’ other powers and worlds. Hence, the sciences needed to study or control the objects and their ‘magical’ meanings. But the specialist’s arguments also drew on evidence concerning the clashes and disagreements over the ways in which the sacred and ritual things seized from the houses of African-origin cults can be transformed into ‘objects.’ Creating museums inside police institutions represented an intermediate zone between the prisons and the science cabinets. In some cases, the practitioners agreed with the claim that the artifacts should leave the police museum and enter the science halls.

Observing the different contexts and actors involved, however, at least two elements call my attention. First, we can note a gradual reduction in the plurality of meanings attributed to the places from which the things came. All these cases show that authorities, science specialists, and practitioners had to open spaces and transform them into “appropriated” places to locate this materiality. Second, the things concerned did not come from regular and stable places. On the contrary, their exotic appearance for some and danger for others was traceable to the fact that they were nomadic objects. For instance, the term ‘syncretism,’ created by Arthur Ramos and popularized by Melville J. Herskovits in the late 1930s to understand the plurality of meanings that African-origin practices mobilized in the Americas, was a “descriptive and analytical concept” invented precisely to cope with the instability of these material forms.²⁵ The artifacts seized were connected to distinct cultural logics, places, and

conceptions of dangerous, pure, sacred, and animated worlds. When accommodated in their new ‘homes’—and as ‘cultural,’ ‘museum’ or ‘scientific’ objects,’ as illustrated below, they had to be preserved in appropriate places—the conditions and rules that defined the properties of these things, the places where they should be kept, and what could or should remain visible or hidden, were all up for discussion.

The arguments of the collection specialists seem to take into consideration the movement of magic and the relations of each artifact transformed into an object. If they were part of a ‘culture’ or a ‘people,’ what kinds of ties created them as material forms? Housing them implied mapping these connections, ensuring that assembling the parts and wholes of disappearing worlds was a task essential to a project with a universalist endeavour. Not coincidentally, anthropologists and practitioners were engaged in rescue movements early in the last century, reconnecting artifacts to their supposed places of origin through what we could call the ‘magic movement.’ Anthropologists and practitioners amassed displayed these artifacts under a swarm of cultural and scientific tags. This gathering created new relations while simultaneously concealing others. In effect, the best way to ‘de-animate’ such things was to interrupt their nomadic trajectory. Drawing on Hage’s observations about the relationships between ‘diasporic subjects’ and diverse spaces and realities, we could say that the work of concealing some and highlighting others is analogous to the control and channelling of intensities.

I invoke the term ‘magic’ because the power of visualization was not an invention of scientific museums. The Guanabacoa Museum’s case in Cuba is a case in point to illustrate that the separation and partial visibility of ritual artifacts into houses were part of the recognition of their power by the practitioners. Since the houses in which ritual specialists dwell were places where human and other-than-human entities made and reaffirmed sacred bonds, they should control the flow of these *potencias* (powers) through the visualization and concealment of ritual apparatus. Stephan Palmié noted that objects of worship had to conform to a spatial economy in which visualization was restricted and subject to ‘temporal segregation.’ Though present in the homes of *paleros*, *santeiros* and members of *abakuá*, they “tend to be tucked away in closets or converted pantries or—if the owners’ situation permits such a solution—housed in a shed in a backyard garden” (Palmié 2002: 163). In the case of *candomblé*, the possibility of an offering or tool of a deity (or for a deity) being seen is directly connected to their proper localization. Stored or displayed by their practitioners in places called *casas* (houses), *terreiros* (yards) and *roças* (plantations), the site of the things enhanced the relationship between objects and people, vessels of divine presence. In this sense, a sacred tree is the ‘house’ of a god and where the food, gifts and offerings must be placed by practitioners. It is in the vicinity of these sites that the deity’s presence is instantiated, incorporated, and nurtured. The same applies to a modest building covered with tiles or palm leaves, or a domestic shrine, destined to localize the relationships between the worlds of divinities and humans.

As Mbembe remarked, “no object existed except in relation to a subject, as part of a reciprocal definition. The attribution of subjectivity to any inanimate object took place through rituals, ceremonies, and these relations of reciprocity. Such is the world that we lost, that African objects bore, and whose epiphany they celebrated through the plurality of their forms. This world is one that no one will ever be able to reconstitute to us” (Mbembe 2021: 166). In all these cases, then, we can perceive a multitude of ways of sheltering and living inside and outside places like museums that elide the opposition between animate beings, on one hand, and non-animate beings and things, on the other, located in ‘real’ or imaginary spaces. The places where relations with the sacred occur are ‘houses’

because they welcome and simultaneously distinguish and distribute affects in continuous transformation. The things that inhabit these dwellings contain and are contained in/by worlds under constant (re)creation. These examples also invite us to reflect on the meanings and values attributed to the stories and traces left by objects removed from and/or inserted into 'houses.' As actions, the seizure, protection, safeguarding, and exhibition of things all seem to be actions secondary to how their itinerancy always triggers diverse understandings about their destination. Not only which houses they should inhabit, but also which new relationships will render their existence possible.

The demands made by some *terreiro* 'houses' in the Baixada Fluminense region of Rio de Janeiro provide a final and illuminating case through which I shall return to my opening reflections. State and police institutions removed ritual artifacts from *terreiros*, *casas de santo* and domestic altars between 1889 and 1930. Later science specialists guided the transformation of the violent looting into the so-called 'Black Magic Collection' exhibited in Rio de Janeiro's Police Museum. After almost a century of confinement of these sacred objects, a coalition composed of candomblé and umbanda priests, the black movement and cultural activists won a legal battle against the state institution and its argument that the museum should be maintained as envisaged in the early twentieth century so as to tell the history of the institution and the effects of racism in Brazil. On the opposite side, the religious practitioners transformed the vocabulary of belonging, authenticity and cultural intimacy that seems to hover around the debates on similar cases. Rather than bringing the objects 'back home,' they preferred the idea that their things would be 'liberated.' A media and legal campaign, 'Liberate Our Sacred Collection,' involving significant participation from civil society, black movements, Afro-Brazilian religious, universities and human rights groups, vocalized the demands of the priests, priestesses and *terreiro* practitioners and their claim that what had been kept inside the Police Museum were more than objects of *casas* (houses) pertaining to persons who no longer existed.²⁶ This understanding comprised not just a discursive shift but a significant change in a cosmopolitical practice relating to the ways in which things labelled 'sacred' must do more than simply exist: they should also inhabit a different world to the one in which they became entrapped. Not only would the objects be 'liberated' but also their creators and users, manifested in multiple spacetimes.

The language of liberation had the power to contaminate because thereafter 'the sacred'—everything that instantiates the connections between humans and a wide range of agencies—can be released from any kind of containment. Materialized in objects—and people—both inside and outside the sacred or scientific houses, the 'Our Sacred Collection' was at the epicentre of a wider political struggle against intolerance, violence, and hatred. Although attempts to move the objects from the police institution had begun early in the twentieth century, the campaign has acquired momentum with the escalation in attacks on *terreiros* and *roças* by neo-Pentecostal and paramilitary groups over the last five years. Hence, the language of liberation not only emancipated the demands for 'Our Sacred Collection' from the politics of authenticity, cultural diversity, and national patrimony, it also promoted an interesting shift, reframing other compositions involving ritual and cult objects and the relationships that they created and kept on creating. Among them is the religious authorities' demand for the objects to be 'returned' to the places where the owners' descendants practice their religious. But which places and which descendants, given that these artifacts were made and used in discontinuous, unknown, and non-visible interactions? The latter also involve the danger that unwelcome and dangerous forces may have tamed a thing kept in inappropriate hands or places—a fear expressed in both Bahia's and Guanabacoa's cases. Allowing the object's release, return or transference may, in this case, threaten those set to receive it. An unpredictable gift should not be returned because it inhabits nowhere, a trail of potential perils, unknown worlds saturated by powerful presences.²⁷

Curiously, the campaign's representatives had decided to bring 'back home' the seized things in dramatic fashion. They chose to liberate the 'Our Sacred Collection' at the Museum of the Republic, the institution that had crystalized and magnified the ideals of a eugenicist and disciplinary white Brazilian society in the early 1900s—the same republic that had created the police apparatus to maximize vigilance of the undesirable blacks and their primitive practices, destroying their sacred houses and objects. Moreover, this was the house from which the Brazilian State itself had been governed, and later, when the modernist city of Brasília was built as the country's new capital, was transformed into a museum to celebrate the republic's early years and its heritage. Under the threat of conservative and authoritarian projects for the country's rule, though, it also became a place to remember and celebrate the 1988 Constitution, the long fight against the military dictatorship during the 1960 and 1970s, and the social movements that had spread across the country at the end of the civil-military dictatorship. Thus, the building and the museological institution are entangled in multiple temporalities, historicities and spatial references. The reasoning behind this choice appears in tune with the issues raised at the beginning of this essay: the priests and their campaign not only recreated new connections to the material expression of the sacred, they envisaged and redesigned other dwellings where refugee objects could find shelter in turbulent times. Thus, *inquices*, *orixas* and other deities not only occupied these everchanging heterotopic places that contain multiple worlds, they also transformed them.

Here it is worth quoting one of the priestesses whose forebears had witnessed police violence in their own homes in the early twentieth century. Mãe Meninazinha de Oxum explains why the things should not return to the *terreiros*. In the view of the Museum of the Republic's director, however, their actual owners, *o povo de santo*, should still be the recipients and thus witnesses of some kind of 'reparation.' Instead of a returning, therefore, the 'Our Sacred' collection represented a reparation, a means to compensate for the destruction and violence wrought. The discursive and political moves that make possible shifts away from terms like 'return' towards others like 'liberate,' along with the language of reparation, also affect our imagination. They stake out new possibilities for conceiving places, and homes, where these objects can dwell and be cared for.²⁸ In this case, the site chosen for this transformation was the Museum of the Republic—a house celebrating the modern Brazilian state. For the priestess, though, the past events of violence and persecution generated a power that could no longer be curbed or negated were these objects to be kept in a state institution. The sacred has its own memory and the objects that materialize it have a power of transformation that cannot be contained in any one place. Everyone who sees the collection will be affected in some way. As Mãe Meninazinha de Oxum says, "what I have learned from my grandmother and others was not just for that moment; it was important in the past, it continues to be so today and will be so in the future."²⁹ The words of the Yalorixá warn us about the future effects, at once unavoidable and unknown, of the traces created by sacred things in their itinerancy through homes and hands.

3 We Do not Know Yet What Things Will be Still

The examples cited here have sought to establish approximations between the ways of inhabiting those spaces designated 'houses' beyond the universe of museums to highlight their similarities. These

include the multiplicity of plans, interweavings and communications constituted through different affections that make the house a cosmos of relationships. This approach sets out to undo the singularity of museums as an example, historical and western, of a heterotopic place par excellence, by evincing other ways of conceptualizing terrestrial and/or cosmic dimensions by delimiting ‘interiors’ and ‘exteriors,’ locating objects and practices in spaces of coexistence and kinship, and, most important of all, by connecting subjects and things on spatial planes and in discontinuous realities.³⁰ This exercise has revealed the replication and multiplication of interiors/exteriors through the affections produced in the formation of diasporas—reproducing material houses that replicate non-existent models but also where migrants create the spaces in which they live by fashioning ‘lenticular realities,’ as perspectives of the migratory experience. These approximations have limitations, however, since, as Latour observed concerning the case of the museum, “it is taken for granted that ‘history of science’ means the history of our knowledge about the world, not of the world itself” (Latour 2016: 3; Hage 2021: 21).

In the final part of the essay, the universe of museums encountered—through clashes and conflicts surrounding the ownership of the return of objects to their places of origin—worlds in the plural. In the process of reclaiming things kept in a museum dedicated to collecting items, practices and knowledge once classified as criminal, these objects would subsequently be housed in another location where their past and present meanings would come to the fore. The Yalorixá and those who reclaimed alternative forms of reallocating, sheltering, and protecting the objects re-evaluated the traces left by the State institution’s attempts to isolate them in the realms of ‘criminality’ and ‘culture.’ To name the objects seized as ‘sacred,’ to receive them as an extension of the practitioners and to take possession of them all implied multiplying the places where these things existed in the past and where they might exist in the future. In other words, in some sense, such practices, seen here as constitutive processes, revolved around layers of comprehension surrounding the meanings of sacred things and how and where they should exist. Instead of interrogating what these things were, practitioners and activists pointed to where the things—‘Our Sacred Collection’—could be.

This mode of existence of the sacred already reclaimed by the hands of others, asserting a relationship with its ancestral holders, is not limited to the boundaries of a new home or institution. The ‘Our Sacred Collection’ that encountered a new shelter re-inscribes the borders of the worlds in which the objects were first created, muted, and reappropriated. They are not simply worlds inhabited in the past: they are also worlds set to become. More still, the ‘liberation’ movement reassembles relations of intensities—with time, historicity and the original spatial links—capable of making the collection not just intelligible in the present but, as the Yalorixá observes, also and primarily in the future (Soares 2021: 327).³¹ The movement of reclaiming, moving and settling things infuses the collection—a new inscription made of various entities (‘fetishes,’ artifacts, ritual objects)—with new worlds in which the ‘invisible,’ the ‘uncanny’ and the ‘incomprehensible’ are liberated from the museological frameworks. Their effects, force, potency, and creations are amplified and cannot be contained.

Olívia Maria Gomes da Cunha is Professor of Social Anthropology at the Post-Graduate Program in Social Anthropology at the National Museum, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro. She is also a researcher of the Brazilian National Research Council (CNPq) and the Rio de Janeiro Research Foundation (FAPERJ). Her most recent publications include *The Things of Others: Ethnographies*,

Histories, and Other Artifacts (Brill, 2020) and the edited volume *Maroon Cosmopolitics: Personhood, Creativity, and Incorporation* (Brill, 2018).

-
- 1 Wayne Modest, “We Have Always Been Modern: Museums, Collections, and Modernity in the Caribbean,” *Museum Anthropology* 35, no. 1 (2012): 85–96; and Helen Mears, and Wayne Modest, “Museums, African Collections and Social Justice,” *Museums, Equality and Social Justice* (2013): 294–309.
 - 2 Daniela Franca Joffe, and Nick Shepherd, “Specters of Cape Town: Heritage, Memory, and Restitution in Contemporary South African Art, Architecture, and Museum Practice,” *Heritage & Society* 13, no. 1-2 (2020): 75–97.
 - 3 Bruno Latour, “How Better to Register the Agency of Things” in *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*, Volume 34, (Salt Lake City: The University of Utah Press, 2016), 79–117.
 - 4 Bruno Latour, “A Textbook Case Revisited: Knowledge as Mode of Existence,” in *The Handbook of Science and Technology Studies*, ed. Sheila Jasanoff and Society for Social Studies of Science (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2007), 83–112 (URL: <https://sciencespo.hal.science/hal-00972922>, last accessed: October 18, 2023).
 - 5 I discuss the artifacts and the ethnographic archives in Olívia Maria Gomes da Cunha, *The Things of Others: Ethnographies, Histories, and Other Artefacts* (Leiden: Brill, 2020). As for the use of analogies in practice of comparison and translation as ‘controlled equivocation,’ see Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, “Perspectival Anthropology and the Method of Controlled Equivocation,” *Tipiti: Journal of the Society for the Anthropology of Lowland South America* 2, no. 1 (2004): 3–22.
 - 6 Achille Mbembe, *Out of the Dark Night* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2021).
 - 7 Michel Foucault, “Texts/Contexts: of Other Spaces,” in *Grasping the World: The Idea of the Museum*, ed. Donald Preziosi and Claire Farago (London: Routledge, 2019 [1986]), 371–79. See also Kevin Hetherington, “Foucault, the Museum and the Diagram,” *The Sociological Review* 59, no. 3 (2011): 457–75.
 - 8 See, for instance, Deborah Cohen’s analysis of domestic furnishing practices in the Victorian period and their intimate relations with the popularization of museums. Deborah Cohen, *Household Gods: the British and Their Possessions* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006).
 - 9 Claude Lévi-Strauss, “Histoire et ethnologie,” *Annales. Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations*, 38, no. 6 (1983): 1217–31.
 - 10 Tim Ingold, “A Naturalist Abroad in the Museum of Ontology: Philippe Descola’s *Beyond Nature and Culture*,” *Anthropological Forum*: 26, no. 3 (2016): 301–20.
 - 11 Pierre Bourdieu, *The Logic of Practice* (California, Stanford University Press, 1990); and Stephen Hugh-Jones, “The Maloca: a World in a House,” in *The Hidden Peoples of the Amazon*, ed. Elizabeth Carmichael, Stephen Hugh-Jones and Brian Moser (London: British Museum Publications, 1985), 77–93.
 - 12 Pierre Bourdieu, “Espaço físico, espaço social e espaço físico apropriado,” *Estudos Avançados* 27 (2013): 133–44.
 - 13 Joseph Handerson, “Maisons diasporas et maisons locales: mobilités haïtiennes et réseaux transnationaux,” *Etnográfica. Revista do Centro em Rede de Investigação em Antropologia*, 24, no. 3 (2020): 749–74.
 - 14 Ghassan Hage, *The Diasporic Condition: Ethnographic explorations of the Lebanese in the World* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2021).
 - 15 Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, *Métaphysiques Cannibales: Lignes d’Anthropologie Post-Structuraliste* (Paris: PUF, 2009).

- ¹⁶ Ghassan Hage, “Dwelling in the Reality of Utopian Thought,” *Traditional Dwellings and Settlements Review* (2011): 7–13.
- ¹⁷ See Patricia Spyer, *Border Fetishisms: Material Objects in Unstable Spaces* (London: Routledge Press 1998).
- ¹⁸ Shamanic translation, for instance, as differently observed by Carneiro da Cunha and Viveiros de Castro, complicates the terms of the objective modes of existence of the subjects and the things mobilized in human and non-human interventions, stressing their relationships to bodies. See Maria Manuela Carneiro da Cunha, “Pontos de Vista sobre a Floresta Amazônica: Xamanismo e Tradução,” *Mana* 4, no. 1 (1998): 7–22; and de Castro (2009).
- ¹⁹ The quote marks used here highlight the deeply problematic and unstable dimension of these categories, as extensively discussed by other authors.
- ²⁰ Roger Sansi-Roca, “The Hidden Life of Stones: Historicity, Materiality and the Value of Candomblé Objects in Bahia,” *Journal of Material Culture* 10, no. 2 (2005): 139–56.
- ²¹ Roland Bonaparte, *Les Habitants de Suriname à Amsterdam. Notes Recueillies à L'Exposition Coloniale D'Amsterdam en 1883* (Paris: Imprimerie de A. Quantin, 1884).
- ²² Susan Lêgene, “From Brooms to Obeah and Back: Fetish Conversion and Border Crossings in Nineteenth-Century Suriname,” in *Border Fetishisms: Material Objects in Unstable Spaces*, ed. P. Spyer, (London: Routledge, 1998), 35–59, and Peter Pels, “The Spirit of Matter: on Fetish, Rarity, Fact, and Fancy,” in *Border Fetishisms: Material Objects in Unstable Spaces*, ed. P. Spyer, (London: Routledge, 1998), 91–121.
- ²³ See, for instance, Stephan Palmié, *Wizards and Scientists: Explorations in Afro-Cuban Modernity and Tradition* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2002).
- ²⁴ See Maicon F. Marcante, “O outro em narrativas sobre a Coleção Perseverança,” *Revista Mundaú* 12 (2022): 158–81; Ordep Serra, “Sobre psiquiatria, candomblé e museus,” *Caderno CRH* 19, no. 47 (2006): 309–23; Alexandre Fernandes Corrêa, “A Coleção Museu de Magia Negra do Rio de Janeiro: o primeiro patrimônio etnográfico do Brasil,” *Mneme—Revista de Humanidades, UFRN*, v. 7, no. 18 (2005): 404–38; Michelle Antoinette Tisdell, *Cuban Museums and Afro-Cuban Heritage: Fragments and Transition in Daily Life* (Harvard University, 2006); Michelle A. Tisdell, “From House-Temples to Museum Showcase: Afro-Cuban Religions, Heritage and Cultural Policy in Cuba,” *Cultural Contestation: Heritage, Identity and the Role of Government* (Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2018), 105–37; and “Nossas coisas estão nas mãos da polícia” (URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QZz3jSvSKsY>, last accessed: October 20, 2023).
- ²⁵ See Palmié, Stephan. *The Cooking of History: How Not to Study Afro-Cuban Religion* (Chicago: University of University of Chicago Press, 2013), 115.
- ²⁶ Many studies exist on the conflicts between candomblé practitioners and Brazilian state institutions and museums that store collections resulting from all forms of symbolic, physical and material violence, as well as studies on the emergence of the first ‘communitarian museums’ and ‘memorials’ linked to *terreiros/casas*, containing particular claimed and restituted objects. A comprehensive bibliography, however, is beyond the scope of this text. In the case of the ‘Liberate Our Sacred Collection’ campaign, I draw on analyses made by Luiz Gustavo Guimarães Aguiar Alves, *Liberte nosso sagrado: as disputas de uma reparação histórica* (M.Sc. Dissertation. Niterói: Universidade Federal Fluminense, 2021); Pamela de Oliveira Pereira, *Novos olhares sobre a coleção de objetos sagrados afrobrasileiros sob a guarda do museu da polícia: da repressão à repatriação* (Master Thesis, UNIRIO, 2017); Pinto Filho, Olavo Souza, and Bárbara Cruz, “Police Stole Sacred Objects From Afro-Brazilian People. Now Museums Hoard Them,” *Truthout.org*, July 11, 2021 (URL: <https://truthout.org/articles/police-stole-sacred-objects-from-afro-brazilian-people-now-museums-hoard-them/>, last accessed on October 30, 2023); Mãe Meninazinha de Oxum, Mãe Nice de Iansã, Maria Helena Versiani, and Mario de Souza Chagas, “A chegada do nosso sagrado no Museu da República: “a fé não costuma faia,” in *Sociomuseologia: para uma leitura crítica do Mundo*, 2021 (<http://www.museologia-portugal.net/apresentacao/sociomuseologia-leitura-critica-mundo>, last accessed on October 20, 2023); and Francisco César Manhães Monteiro, , Maria Helena Versiani, and

-
- Mario de Souza Chagas, “A chegada e chegadas do nosso sagrado à república,” *Museologia & Interdisciplinaridade* 11, no. 22 (2022): 14–32.
- ²⁷ I discuss the agency of ‘art objects’ displayed in territory occupied by maroons Cottica Ndyuka as “dangerous presence” elsewhere. See Olívia Maria Gomez da Cunha, “Vivendo em mundos saturados de várias presenças,” *Etnográfica. Revista do Centro em Rede de Investigação em Antropologia* 24, no. 2 (2020): 401–25.
- ²⁸ On the politics of care, see Wayne Modest, and Claudia Augustat, “Spaces of Care: Introduction,” *Spaces of Care-Confronting Colonial Afterlives in European Ethnographic Museums* (Transcript Verlag, 2023), 9–23 (URL: <https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/9783839468487/html?lang=en>, last accessed on October 30, 2023).
- ²⁹ Mãe Meninazinha de Oxum, Mãe Nice de Iansã, Maria Helena Versiani, and Mario de Souza Chagas, “A chegada do nosso sagrado no Museu da República: “a fé não costuma faiá,” in *Sociomuseologia: para uma leitura crítica do Mundo*, 2021 (<http://www.museologia-portugal.net/apresentacao/sociomuseologia-leitura-critica-mundo>, last accessed on October 20, 2023).
- ³⁰ See Gretchen Buggeln, “Museum Space and the Experience of the Sacred,” *Material Religion*, 8, no. 1 (2012): 30–50, and Bruno Brulon Soares, “Every Museum has a God, or God is in every museum?” *ICOFOM Study Series* 47, nos. 1-2 (2019): 57–72.
- ³¹ Layza Rocha Soares, “Entrevista com Mãe Meninazinha de Oxum,” *Revista Fim Do Mundo* 2, no. 4 (2021): 364–74 (URL: <https://doi.org/10.36311/2675-3871.2021.v2n4.p364-374>, last accessed on October 20, 2023).