

Where to Locate the Self? Gendered Hospitality, African Immigration and White Self-Renewal in Nadine Gordimer's *The Pickup*

Rebecca Fasselt

Summary

This article reads Nadine Gordimer's preoccupation with migration in her 2001 novel *The Pickup* through the metaphor of hospitality. In doing so, it draws links and inaugurates a dialogue with a worldwide debate in which scholars of various disciplines and backgrounds are concerned with the philosophy and ethics of hospitality towards migrants. My attention lies on the interconnectedness of political and public discourses and private, everyday practices of hospitality in Gordimer's novel. It is here that the gendered dimension and construction of hospitality gains particular prominence as the "national home" continues to be negotiated through the female body, whose (sexual) possession now promises access and potential national membership. I argue that the novel locates the motivations behind the main protagonist's extension of welcome to an African migrant within discourses of whiteness and privilege in the post-apartheid context. I further explore ways in which the novel conceives its African migrant protagonists both inside and outside the dominant benevolent/malevolent guest paradigm.

Opsomming

Hierdie artikel ondersoek Nadine Gordimer se preokkupasie met migrasie in *The Pickup* (2001) aan die hand van gasvryheid as metafoer. Dit lê verbande met en tree toe tot 'n wêreldwye debat tussen vakkundiges in verskillende dissiplines en met verskillende agtergronde oor die filosofie en etiek van gasvryheid wat aan migrante betoon word. Ek fokus op die onderlinge verbande tussen politieke en openbare diskoerse, en private, alledaagse gasvryheid soos dit in Gordimer se roman betoon word. Dit is hier waar die genderspesifieke dimensie en konstruksie van gasvryheid opmerklik word, want die "nasionale tuiste" word steeds deur die vrou se liggaam beding: seksuele besit hou nou die belofte van toegang en moontlik nasionale lidmaatskap in. Die roman plaas die hoofprotagonis se motivering om gasvryheid aan 'n Afrika-migrant te betoon binne diskoerse oor witwees en bevoorregting in 'n postapartheid-konteks. Voorts ondersoek ek die wyses waarop die roman sowel binne as buite die dominante paradigma van die welwillende/kwaadwillige gas vorm gee aan protagoniste wat Afrika-migrante is.

Introduction

Locate: to discover the exact locality of a person or thing; to enter, take possession of.

To discover the exact location of a “thing” is a simple matter of factual research. To discover the exact location of a person: where to locate the self?

(Gordimer 2002[2001]: 47)¹

“Nadine Gordimer’s fiction”, as Katie Gramich notes, “has revealed a constant preoccupation with the politics of location, with the meaning of landscape and belonging, with the intersections of race, gender and identity, and with the utopian possibility of a shared place” (2005: 74). The author’s emphasis on the spatial, manifest in the symbolic function that homes and interior spaces assume throughout her work, is frequently connected to openings and closures of the home to others and thus with the practice of hospitality. Whereas her works in the past explored hospitality to an outside Other across the racial divide,² her third post-apartheid novel *The Pickup* (2001) broadens the theme to the transnational level (see Lathi 2012) and, specifically, the topical issue of migration from other parts of Africa to South Africa. The novel explores its practice through the interracial and transnational love relationship between Ibrahim ibn Musa (also known as Abdu), an undocumented Arab migrant from an unnamed North African country,³ and the young white South African woman Julie Summers who

-
1. Subsequent references to the novel will only provide the relevant page number(s).
 2. Gordimer’s early novels with their “interracial partying and well-meaning gestures in opposition to the codes and customs of the color bar” (Smith 2000: 191) portray the homes of the bohemian Johannesburg world as fragile counter-settings to the inhospitality of the apartheid state and its treatment of the black majority population as unwelcome “guests” in their land of birth. The white liberal hospitality in these works is increasingly scrutinised in the author’s later novels. *Burger’s Daughter* (1979), for instance, sharply exposes the ambiguities inherent in the hosting of a black child in the home of the communist Burger family. *July’s People* (1981) stages the “explosion of [conventional host-guest] roles” (1982: 117) between the Smales family and their black servant July, who provides them with a refuge in his rural home when the revolution breaks out.
 3. Scholarship on the novel has been divided between locating Ibrahim’s home country either in North Africa (see, for instance, Dimitriu 2006; Meier 2003; Sizemore 2008; Varico 2010) or the Middle East (Coetzee 2007; Clingman 2009). While Gordimer’s portrayal of the country makes it impossible to

opens her dwelling place to her lover.⁴ Indicative of Gordimer's extended lens in this novel is the question of "where to locate the self" that refuses to unequivocally place the self within the nation or homeland (Karajayerlian 2010: 86).

The Pickup provides intriguing narrative examples of hospitality as it discusses manifestations of both hospitality and inhospitality towards an African migrant from elsewhere on the African continent not only in concrete acts of hosting in the space of the private home, but also at a broader communal and state level. In this way the novel interweaves individual or private hospitality and state hospitality that is enshrined in the government's immigration legislation. By linking the two practices, Gordimer inaugurates a dialogue with a worldwide debate in which scholars of various disciplines and backgrounds are concerned with the philosophy and ethics of hospitality towards migrants (Rosello 2001; Germann Molz & Gibson 2007; Baker 2013). Drawing largely on Levinas' and Derrida's writings, this body of work engages with the question of how to welcome the "stranger" in an era of increased border fortification and surveillance across the globe.⁵ In Gordimer's novel it is in Julie's home that prescriptive discourses of South African national hospitality, and their reinvention by individuals through everyday practices of hosting, clash and enter into negotiation with each other. Moreover, her welcoming of Ibrahim is intricately connected to her own desire to reinvent her home and self in the post-apartheid context of shifting political power. Pursuing the dissociation of whiteness from its former official ideological imbrications and material privilege, Julie uses Ibrahim to further distance herself from her privileged background. It is in Ibrahim's seeking of Julie's hospitality that the gendered dimension and construction of the practice gains particular prominence.

identify with certainty any exact geographical location, my reading situates it in North Africa, given the various cultural references throughout the text.

4. Gordimer has discussed the issue of migration to South Africa from other parts of the continent previously in her early short story "Six Feet of the Country" (1956), which deals with the death of an "illegal immigrant" from then Rhodesia on the farm of a white South African couple. The narrative highlights the double vulnerability of migrants from other African countries in the apartheid state, who not only faced the restrictive laws of national hospitality, but were also confronted with the internal structures of inhospitality against black people. Gordimer's 1989 short story "The Ultimate Safari" narrates the story of Mozambican refugees fleeing from civil war across the Kruger Park to South Africa. Her latest novel *No Time Like the Present* (2012) thematises the so-called xenophobic attacks of 2008 (for a discussion of the label xenophobia, see Fasselt 2015).
5. For a critical assessment of these applications, see Galetti 2015b.

The main argument in this article thus centres on the interplay of private extensions of hospitality with the dimensions of gender and self-renewal in the face of the altered South African political landscape. I first turn to the self-serving dimension of (re)homing lurking behind the couple's hospitable exchange. I argue that Julie's enactment of private hospitality may be termed a "transnational romance". Here, Ibrahim is hosted in order to write the host into being as an exception to both the restricted hospitality of the post-apartheid state towards migrants from other parts of Africa and the ongoing forms of white privilege. Ibrahim, in turn, uses Julie as a means to escape the violence of national hospitality. Notwithstanding this egotistic portrayal of hospitality as a pathway to self-renewal, both protagonists momentarily experience hospitality unencumbered by asymmetrical power relations. As I will demonstrate in the second section, the couple's mutual bodily hospitality serves as a fragile, utopian counter-territory to the limited hospitality of the post-apartheid nation, but at the same time also brings into focus the gendered dimension of the practice. Finally, I will address the potential transformations of hospitality for both protagonists in Ibrahim's home country.

Hosting and "Guesting" as (Re)Homing

"For there to be hospitality", Edith Wyschogrod argues, "there must be a home" (2003: 36). While the notion of home is undeniably foundational to our common understanding of hospitality, this does not necessarily imply a conventional understanding of home "as fixed, rooted, stable" or as the "antithesis of travel" (George 1999: 2). As Gordimer's novel displays, home is not necessarily a place that is prior to hospitality but can also be produced through the very act of hosting. While an in-depth engagement with the vast scholarship on the complex and contested concept of "home" (see, for instance, Ahmed, Castañeda, Fortier & Sheller 2003; Bystrom 2016 in the South African context) would reach beyond the scope of this article, I suggest here that both protagonists employ hosting and guesting as means of a possible (re)homing in South Africa.

Julie's relationship with Ibrahim, it seems, initially offers her a welcome opportunity to further her project of distancing herself from "The Suburbs" and the ideological freight she associates with their inhabitants. While a university graduate in economics, Ibrahim is forced to take up employment as a car mechanic in South Africa. He represents the very antithesis to Julie's privileged upbringing, "the man foreign to her who came to her one day from under the belly of a car" (91), an underdog, who resides in the country without official papers and under a false name. When a letter from the Department of Home Affairs arrives, ordering him to leave South Africa within two weeks on account of his prolonged overstay in the country (his

permit had expired more than a year earlier), Julie becomes actively complicit in the contravention of official laws of state hospitality. This not only manifests itself in her ongoing accommodation of Ibrahim in her cottage but also in her decision to subject herself to the same position outside the law as Ibrahim. As Wyschogrod stipulates in the context of contemporary immigration legislation: “The state is an outside that is inside so that being at home [...] in an inviolable domain is no longer possible” (2003: 37). Determined not to let the state’s laws of hospitality rule his – and by extension her – life, Julie decides to “abrogate [...] any rights that are hers, until they are granted also to him” (55). Yet the multiple connections she exploits – even if reluctantly – to keep him in the country, and her material status, make this an impossible task. Their relationship remains marked by asymmetrical access to resources and state hospitality around the world (Clingman 2009: 233).

In contrast to her group of liberal, multi-racial friends, her “elective siblings who have distanced themselves from the ways of the past, their families” (23), who regularly gather at “The Table” in the trendy L.A. Café, Julie, however, critically reflects on and questions her engagement with Ibrahim as a means of self-othering from their first meeting onwards.⁶ In a passage internally focalised through Julie we can observe this self-reflexive stance: “it was patronizing, after all, this making free encounters out of other people’s lives, a show of your conviction of their equal worth, interest, catching the garage mechanic in the net, EL-AY Café” (11). In spite of this instance of self-criticism, Julie carries on seeing Ibrahim, dubbed her “oriental prince” by the friends at “The Table”. In this manner, Julie’s extension of welcome to Ibrahim in the beginning is not so much an expression of friendship or love as a desire to live in accordance with her political ideology. Extending welcome towards the new African/Arab migrant serves as empirical proof not only of Julie’s physical but also of her

6. Capitalised throughout the narrative “The Table”, assuming the status of a proper noun, becomes a symbol of a “new”, inclusive South Africa. The name of the café already appears programmatic of its cosmopolitan world-view: Also referred to as “EL-AY” (5), it merges Western with Arabic names and places. Yet the frequently employed ironic and mocking tone of the narrative voice reveals that the friends are not as remote from “the ways of the past” (23) and its discursive practices as they fashion themselves to be. While part of “The Table’s” motto is “[t]o be open to encounters” (10), this pronounced openness is soon revealed as a superficial engagement with Ibrahim as the “migrant guest”. When Julie first introduces him to the friends, they are fervent to find out about his background, having “no delicacy about asking who you are, where you come from – that’s just the reverse side of bourgeois xenophobia” (14). The narrator’s evaluative comment at the end of the sentence here visibly ridicules the xenophilia Julie’s friends pretend to embrace with their over-emphasised anti-xenophobic stance.

epistemological un-homing from former inscriptions of whiteness. Whiteness in Julie's case does not primarily denote skin colour but rather the social and material privileges afforded to whites during colonialism and apartheid. It is through Ibrahim that she can thus position herself as a "forward-looking" South African who embraces, rather than rejects, migrants from elsewhere on the continent.

Julie's choice of dwelling in "a series of backyard cottages adapted from servants' quarters" (8) in geographical distance from "The Suburbs" mirrors in spatial terms her assumed ideological distance from her parents' generation. Although mainly defined in relation to class and material wealth in the novel, the leafy suburbs continue to be inscribed by the power politics of race. Julie's father and his young wife become their exemplary inhabitants, unquestioningly enjoying their luxurious home and lifestyle built on the system of white privilege established during apartheid. According to Rita Barnard, "[t]he house is represented in [...] [Gordimer's] work as the quintessential colonial space; the most intimate of South Africa's many ideological enclosures" (2007: 48). Yet even though domestic spaces for Gordimer play a crucial role in the individual's political conditioning (Barnard 2007), the author ironises the value of Julie's un- and re-homing as a means to feeling more at home in the "new" South Africa. Her cottage appears not so much as a space of connection but as a troubled topography, which merely creates an illusory solidarity with her less well-off friends, as well as with Ibrahim. It consequently serves as a spatial marker of the superficiality of the heroic romance tradition, as I will discuss further below. This, above all, becomes visible in the narrator's description of Julie's cottage when she first invites Ibrahim to her home:

Even though it passed muster with the whites among the friends that her "place" was sufficiently removed from The Suburbs' ostentation to meet their standards of leaving home behind, and was accepted by the blacks among them as the kind of place they themselves moved to from the old segregation, her outhouse renovated as a cottage was comfortable enough, its under-furnishings nevertheless giving away a certain ease inherent in, conditioned by, luxuries taken for granted as necessities. [...] It was untidy; the quarters of someone not used to looking after herself.

(p. 18)

The acceptance of the cottage by her black friends is deemed more important than its approval by the whites in the group, as the former acknowledge it as a "place they themselves moved to", which in Julie's eyes seems to convey legitimacy to her self-fashioning in opposition to her father. Nevertheless, Julie is unable to conceal her privileged upbringing, despite her attempt to break with the past and draw level with her black friends who have managed to move out of segregated townships and informal settlements.

With her “living-cum-bedroom” (18), a “small all-purpose room with its three chairs, table to eat off, bed to receive them” (50), Julie has chosen for herself the style of living that startled Gordimer’s earlier liberal white character Helen Shaw in *The Lying Days* (1953) during a visit to the township home of her black fellow student.⁷ While clearly a multifunctional space, Julie’s cottage is equipped with “under-furnishings”, the “luxuries taken for granted as necessities” (18). Its untidy state reveals her as someone used to a comfortable lifestyle and a domestic worker attending to household chores. Sharing her cottage with Ibrahim, she seeks further legitimacy and recognition of her cottage as a space different from “The Suburbs”, and herself as a host representative of a multicultural, migrant friendly South Africa: “His occasional presence in this dwelling-place moved further into the nature of its containment of herself. The pad became a home – at least for the Saturday afternoon” (27).

The novel here visibly dramatises the spatial politics of hospitality which, as Derrida argues, may at times lie behind acts of hospitality (1999: 15-16). As Melissa Steyn notes, “whiteness in post-apartheid South Africa quite specifically cannot operate through mobilising tropes of national identity” (2007: 423). Rather, she contends “it is now a tactic of whiteness to protest ‘I am also an African’ in order to claim belonging in a nation state that is more likely to be defined by African nationalism” (2007: 423). Julie, therefore, appears to assume for herself a space and belongingness within the redefined parameters of the nation. Ibrahim’s “foreignness” is welcomed as it allows her to legitimise her commitment towards an inclusive South Africa that is opening up to the rest of Africa. While Ibrahim’s presence allows the transformation of the “dwelling place” into “a home”, the noun “containment” may suggest otherwise. Even if the cottage now more fully accommodates and “holds” her in its space, it at the same time, in a figurative sense, becomes a closed and confined space where Julie desperately tries to close herself off from her past and her family background. Distancing herself from “The Suburbs” without acknowledging her unbroken complicity with white privilege, Julie fails in her endeavour to become more hospitable towards others outside her known social circle. In other words, she fails in her pursuit of what Stewart Motha, in relation to Antjie Krog’s work, calls “the possibility of white people becoming otherwise in post-Apartheid South Africa” (2010: 289) – which has been one of the main preoccupations of white writing and intellectual discussion since the transition years.

Michiel Heyns argues that white South African fiction about apartheid guilt can be grouped around two opposing categories: confessional narrative and heroic romance. “The latter category”, Heyns states, “deals with white

7. The multi-purpose function of space in her friend’s home clearly stands out for Helen Shaw during the visit (Gordimer 1953: 175).

South African complicity by declaring an exception [...], the white person who miraculously escapes complicity and heroically opposes the regime, often through union, sexual or otherwise, with a black protagonist” (2000: 48). Almost fetishising their (physical and epistemological) locatedness apart from “The Suburbs”, Julie and her liberal circle of friends may, I suggest, be placed in relation to the heroic romance tradition – this being rewritten and critiqued in the post-apartheid context. Heyns observes, “[t]he heroic tradition is a profoundly uncomfortable one in white South African fiction in that it tries to find in the spirit of an individual a redemptive resistance to the malaise of a nation” (49).

The tradition of the white heroic romance of apartheid, I would argue, continues in the post-apartheid context as the “rainbow romance”. Here white characters such as Julie and her friends dissociate themselves from, rather than engage critically with, the past and their own position within the oppressive structures that are still at work in the country. Engaging not only with South Africa’s multiple cultures but also with migrants from other parts of Africa, Julie’s relation to Ibrahim exemplifies, in my reading, a “transnational romance” with an Arab African migrant, in which she is singled out as a character opposing the widespread anti-immigrant discourse.

Julie’s dissociation from “The Suburbs” is further questioned during a Sunday lunch at her father’s house, a scene that brings to light some of the ambiguities inherent in her relationship to her family. The scene reveals her inability to fully dissociate herself from her past, and therefore assigns to her an uneasy position between the roles of host and guest. It is this position that enables her to transcend the confines of heroic transnational romance. This becomes most visible at the luncheon in relation to her feeling of shame for her father and for her own upbringing: “The shame of being ashamed of them; the shame of him [Ibrahim] seeing what she was, is; as he must be what he is, away beyond the dim underworld of the garage [...], his being in the village where the desert begins near your house” (45). The shame prompted by Julie’s self-reflexion on feeling ashamed of her background seems to bring about a moment of self-estrangement. It triggers a disruption of her usual understanding of self as different to her father’s circles, which finds its stylistic echo in the elliptic and convoluted sentence structure. What consequently arises from her shameful condition is a certain expression of mutuality, for both her father and Julie herself appear as shaming agents. Julie’s experience of shame, therefore, not only indicates what Alexis Shotwell terms an “intersubjective relationship, where the actors involved [...] affect and morph one another” (2007: 135). It also points to an intrasubjective relationship that further contributes towards redrawing the boundaries of her own self.

Julie’s shameful experience may be read in this way as a minor turning point. She comes to realise her entangled identity with that of her father and

“The Suburbs”, both of which she has thus far situated as radically different. Leaving behind her assumed exceptional position outside complicity in the sense of the heroic romance, Julie adopts a more confessional tone. She no longer frames her background in terms of pastness, “of what she was”, but acknowledges its traces in the present through the appositional “is”. Her feeling of shame and embarrassment culminates in a moment of confession: “She’s responsible for *them*” (45, emphasis in the original), “all there was to tell him, confess, had been shown before him today” (50). By taking up responsibility for her father and his guests, even if involuntarily, she acknowledges her own complicity with the system she opposes and thereby moves closer towards the embrace of an oppositional stance.⁸ It is against the background of fleeting realisation that Julie is later able to redelineate her self-serving and superficial hospitality. Her hosting of Ibrahim as a means of radical unhoming from her family ironically leads to a momentary rehoming from which she is then able to take up a more hospitable stance in her imagination of Ibrahim’s shame about his own background.⁹ It is in this sense, as I argue below, that Julie’s conception of Ibrahim shifts from otherness understood as the difference that stems from her community’s exclusionary practices to otherness that surpasses culturally inscribed difference in the manner of Levinas’ Other.¹⁰

In contrast to Julie, Ibrahim seeks Julie’s companionship and hospitality as an opportunity of “homing”. Mobility, in opposition to its frequent “romanticization [...] as travel” (Ahmed et al 2003: 1), seems imposed on Ibrahim by the inhospitality of various Western countries to which he has unsuccessfully tried to gain entry. However, Coetzee’s characterisation of him as an “Arab who for ulterior motives woos and marries a Western woman” (2007: 244) seems too harsh a judgement, as throughout the

-
8. As Mark Sanders argues, “[w]hen opposition takes the form of a demarcation *from* something, it cannot, it follows, be untouched by that to which it opposes itself. Opposition takes its first steps from a footing of complicity” (2002: 9, emphasis in the original).
 9. This scene is mirrored in the second part of the novel when Ibrahim undergoes a similar experience: “He is ashamed and at the same time angrily resentful that she is seeing it (over again, he sees her), it will be an image of his country, his people, *what he comes from*, what he really is – like the name he has come back to be rightfully known by” (133, emphasis in the original).
 10. In contrast to the engagement with social constructions of the Other in postcolonial theory, Levinas’ Other has been understood mainly as “precisely that which eludes construction and categorisation” (Shankman 2003: 20). For a critique of translations and readings in Levinas scholarship of the four French terms (“*l’Autre*, *l’autre*, *Autrui*, and *autrui*”) that the philosopher uses, see Galetti 2015a.

narrative Julie displays more interest in their relationship than he does. Nonetheless, he is happy to exploit her connections and familial ties for his own advancement, as he notes after he is forced to return to his home country: “this girl had failed in the purpose [...] he had counted on her as a source of Permanent Residence in her country” (219). Yet when, at the lunch party mentioned above, he has the chance to meet Julie’s father and his affluent friends, whose lifestyle he admires and strives towards, he most sharply feels the asymmetrical hospitalities of globalisation. For the attempted uniting experience of “guesthood” at the party is at times sharply disrupted in conversations that foreground Ibrahim’s status as an outsider. The luncheon, I suggest, thus bears a strong resemblance to what Julia Kristeva calls the hospitality banquet:

the banquet of hospitality is the foreigners’ utopia – the cosmopolitanism of a moment, the brotherhood of guests who soothe and forget their differences, the banquet is outside of time. It imagines itself eternal in the intoxication of those who are nevertheless aware of its temporary frailty.

(1991: 11-12)

Although Julie suspects her father will disapprove of Ibrahim as her new boyfriend, he is welcomed by Mr Summers and his new wife with all the friendliness and courtesy of good hosts. Julie learns that her “father’s pragmatic self-assurance knew easily how to deal with half-grasped names now common to the infiltration of the business and professional community by those who bore them” (41). In the manner of Kristeva’s banquet of hospitality, Ibrahim’s “foreignness” is thus initially considered as entirely insignificant.

The get-together at Julie’s father’s house has been arranged as a farewell party for one of his friends, an executive director of a worldwide website network, who is about to relocate to Australia with his family as well as his driver. Considering every possibility for immigration, Ibrahim questions the director about possible complications in the migration procedure, bearing in mind the driver’s socio-economic status. The director mistakenly believes Ibrahim is referring to him, and the narrator mockingly notes, “[n]obody must laugh at this: the idea that a man of such means and standing would not be an asset to any country. The executive director [...], kindly, only smiles, gives a brief assuring movement, the chin and lower lip pursing, at the naïvety” (46-47). Ibrahim, although intently listening to the unfolding conversations, seems well aware of the illusory nature of the hospitality banquet, which – even if set in the private home – is largely informed by national and global discourses on hospitality.

The narrative voice thus emphasises the asymmetrical hospitalities of globalisation, where desirable guests from the “West”¹¹ such as the director

11. Ibrahim frequently relates South Africa to the West in the novel.

“may move about the world welcome everywhere, as they please” (49) and those who, marked as undesirable by their country of origin and/or socio-economic status, are either refused national hospitality or, at best, greeted with utmost suspicion. Even though Ibrahim as the “young foreigner (coloured, or whatever he is)” (46) stands out physically – being next to the lawyer Motsamai¹² among the few guests of colour – his difference at the lunch party is primarily established in terms of his limited access to the national hospitality of Western countries. As Emma Hunt notes, far from celebrating the new openings of a globalised world, Gordimer critiques “a new apartheid between Westernized and non-Westernized countries” (2006: 107).

Ibrahim continually experiences the bounds of conditional hospitality¹³ and, as an immigrant with an expired permit, he is relegated to a life at the interstices between presence and absence: “He is here, and he is not here” (37). In line with this, one of Julie’s friends suggests after the arrival of his deportation order that Ibrahim “must go underground”, “the only place for those of us who can’t live, haven’t the means, not just money, the statutory means to conform to what others call the world” (58-59). In other words, Ibrahim’s experience of mobility is determined by an uncertain, precarious hospitality. Nadia Setti (2009) uses the term “precarious hospitality” in an article on migrants’ art and writing to highlight the vulnerability of migrants within (in)hospitable practices across the globe, yet without further elaborating on this concept. It seems to me that the notion offers conceptual value, inasmuch as the position of the “undesirable” guest takes centre stage here within the structure of hospitality. In this sense, “precarious hospitality” contrasts with the Derridean idea of conditional hospitality, which, though equally emphasising the restricted welcome of outsiders, foregrounds the

12. Motsamai already featured as a character in Gordimer’s *The House Gun* (1998), where the Lindgards employ him as the lawyer to defend their son in his murder trial. Here Motsamai is still referred to as a racial Other “from the Other Side” (1998: 89), whose position of power, however, has shifted considerably. The Other at the gathering at Julie’s father’s house, by contrast, is now primarily marked in terms of class.

13. It is within this context of the limitations of hospitality at the border that Derrida places his distinction between the politics and ethics of hospitality. Whereas the former type of hospitality, which Derrida also names “conditional”, relies on political laws of hospitality, the latter is an “unconditional” hospitality, free from any reciprocity and therefore breaking the laws of political/economic relations. Yet Derrida’s laws of economic hospitality and the law of ethical hospitality do not constitute a binary opposition but simultaneously enable and disable each other: “[C]onditional laws”, he notes “would cease to be laws of hospitality if they were not guided, given inspiration, given aspiration, required, even, by the law of unconditional hospitality” (Derrida 2000: 79).

perspective of the host (nation). Furthermore, it may refer not only to the condition of disempowerment and vulnerability that migrants and refugees experience in the face of the state's laws of hospitality, but also to the multifaceted precarious practices undertaken to circumvent these laws. By pursuing access to national hospitality by climbing fences at the border, employing traffickers, bribing border officials, forging documents, or (as in Ibrahim's case) overstaying their visa, migrants subject themselves to extreme risk and physical danger.

Having overstayed his welcome, Ibrahim no longer qualifies for the hospitality enshrined in the country's laws and thus finds himself within the territory of state hospitality without its hospitality: he belongs, as cited above, to those "who can't live, haven't [...] the statutory means to conform to what others call the world" (58). Drawing on Judith Butler's definition of precarious lives as "such lives who do not qualify as recognizable, readable or grievable" (2009: xii-xiii), precarious hospitality in this sense signifies the (in)hospitality experienced by those not deemed recognisable guests. Yet whereas Ibrahim's deportation order causes emotional outrage in Julie, the precarious structure of hospitality governing the world has become normalized for him. He no longer reacts emotionally but appears to support the conditions a state has to lay down with its laws of hospitality. This is demonstrated in the following conversation between Julie and Ibrahim about the situation of (undocumented) African migrants:

[Julie:] It's terrible. Inhuman. Disgraceful.

No. Don't you see them round all the places you like to go, the café. Down there, crack you can buy like a box of matches, the street corner gangs who take your wallet ...? The ones from outside who've been let in. Do you think that's a good thing for your country.

But you [...] you're not one of them.

(p. 19)

Besides Ibrahim's own perpetuation of stereotypes against migrants, the passage once again reinserts the Manichean structure of good versus bad African migrants so often found in public discourse, a structure that has also come to impoverish many literary preoccupations with new African migration to South Africa (Garuba 2011: 7; Fasselt 2014, 2015).

Ibrahim is only fleetingly able to break through these binary reinscriptions, which include his fixed image of Julie. The moment comes after she has informed him about her radical decision to accompany him to his home country, when she presents him with two air tickets:

And now's the time: there has been no description of this Julie, little indication of what she looks like, unless an individual's actions and words conjure a face and body. There is, anyway, no description that is *the* description. Everyone who sees a face sees a different face. [...] The face he

WHERE TO LOCATE THE SELF?: ...

sees is the definitive face for the present situation. The two air tickets he holds in his hands, turns over, unfolds, verifies, materialize a face, her face for him, that didn't exist before, the face of what is impossible, can't be. So what she was, and now is – what the woman Julie looks like comes through his eyes.

[...]

It's impossible, this idea of hers. What could she do there.

[...]

What use will she be. To herself, to me. She's not for me, can't she realize that?

[...]

I can't be responsible. I don't want it.

(pp. 93-95, emphasis in the original)

The annunciatory formula at the beginning of this passage immediately raises reader expectations. We assume Julie's long-withheld physical description is about to follow. Yet this promise is left unfulfilled and the narrative voice, in an anti-realist tenor, questions the truth-value of a single characterisation. For the face that materialises in front of Ibrahim does not refer to Julie's physical features as such but engenders an image of the face beyond that of simple visual perception. It appears to encapsulate the essence of the "present situation". Ibrahim does not seem to be facing Julie: the two air tickets as the subject of the sentence give existence to 'a face' independent from her actual physique. The subsequent appositional phrase qualifies this as-yet indefinite face as "her face *for* him" and thereby defines it primarily in terms of relationality. Non-existent prior to this incident, the face exceeds the parameters he has thus far used to define her and to reveal her love for him. As Coetzee notes in his interpretation of the scene, "[f]or a moment he sees her in all her mystery, an autonomous being with hopes and desires of her own" (2007: 246). In this instance, the face propels him out of his otherwise rigid image of Julie as the white girl from an affluent background, whom he believes to be either sexually infatuated with him or using him to advance her own project of self-othering. In terms of Derrida's conceptualisation of hospitality, we find in Ibrahim's encounter of Julie's face a momentary glimpse of an unconditional welcome as this appearance of her face is unannounced, prior to any invitation, and thereby escapes categorisation.

Julie's intended dislocation thus propels Ibrahim into a fleeting realisation of his human relatedness that thwarts the politics of detachment he otherwise pursues. It is in this instance that the citizen/foreigner binary structuring of the novel is broken down and rethought in terms of a possible ethics of responsibility from which new languages of hospitality outside the familiar and recognizable scripts may develop. Reflecting Julie's feeling of shame at her father's dinner party, Ibrahim also experiences a moment of responsibility towards her – even if he is determined to reject it – that breaks

through the novel's seemingly binary oppositions. These are further dismantled during their lovemaking, which comes to signify a utopian moment of bodily hospitality, as we will see below.

Hospitable Bodies: Lovemaking as Another Country

While neither Julie nor Ibrahim feels fully at home in post-apartheid South Africa, their sexual union engenders a more habitable space for both of them. It is through the very act of lovemaking – often assuming a central role in Gordimer's fiction (Barker 2007) – that the couple are able to transgress their otherwise gaping incompatibilities and unfamiliarity: “Neither knows either, about the other” (38). Not only is their outlook on life predominantly framed in terms of oppositions – he admires “The Suburbs” and her father's lifestyle, which she detests – but their social surroundings continually remind Julie that “*he's not for you, she's not for him*” (79, emphasis in the original), a phrase that runs like a refrain through the novel. Yet as the narrator (using Julie as an internal focaliser) emphatically states, “but they have been, they are, for each other!” (79) and have developed an “intriguing special bond in their intimacy against all others” (38).

The mutual ground they gain with the sexual act, however, only develops gradually. For Julie, their first lovemaking already possesses the “other-worldly” quality they later both come to value: “she so roused and fulfilled that tears came with all that flooded her” (27). Afterwards, unable to describe the exceptional nature of their encounter in her own words, she cites from Jorge Luis Borges' poem “Happiness” to express her feelings: “*Praise be the love wherein there is no possessor and no possessed, but both surrender Everything happens for the first time but in a way that is eternal*” (28, emphasis in the original). Crucial in her characterization of their sexual union is the absence of a hierarchical power relationship, and its conception as an encounter between equals. In the bedroom, Ibrahim is no longer Julie's exotic “pickup”, nor is she his “meal ticket” (92), but both, in Julie's eyes, give up a possible exertion of power for the sake of the uniqueness of the other person. If we assume that, as Judith Still argues, the “body is the first sphere of hospitality” (2010: 22), we may frame sexual intimacy as a form of bodily hospitality, where bodies may invite, welcome, receive but also reject each other. Involving a renouncement of both identity and power, the act of surrender Julie believes to occur during their lovemaking brings about a momentary collapse of their bodily boundaries in which one may be able to locate the Self in the Other. In that sense, Julie might be said to fashion their sexual encounter in terms of a radical notion of hospitality where both partners become wholly vulnerable towards one another.

Ibrahim, by contrast, does not initially share Julie's feeling of happiness and equal surrender. Yet, with his juxtaposition of the term "lovemaking" to the coarse expression "fuck", he – even though he seeks to conceal it – displays a certain form of tenderness towards Julie: "He drove back [...] in the calm and passing content that follows love-making as it does not, he recognizes, what her friends round The Table call a fuck. [...] He knows that at least he gave complete satisfaction. He resists residue feelings of tenderness towards this girl. That temptation" (28). The oscillation between nearness and distance marked by the concomitant use of the proximal and distal demonstratives "this girl" and "that temptation" is indicative of Ibrahim's relationship to Julie throughout the novel. On the one hand, he does not allow himself to regard their relationship as anything other than a convenience, reducing their lovemaking to bodily "content" and "satisfaction". His precarious lifestyle requires him to "be able to take whatever the next foothold might offer" (96), which any emotional involvement with a partner would unnecessarily complicate. On the other hand, however, Ibrahim increasingly has to admit Julie's love for him.

While the inhospitality he continues to experience from states around the world forbids him, in his mind, any feelings towards Julie, her bodily hospitality and tenderness towards him comes to represent the counterpoint to the denied state hospitality, engendering an alternative state of hospitality where he can no longer hide his incipient affection for her. Gordimer's oppositional conception of these two forms of hospitality comes most sharply into focus after Ibrahim receives the deportation order from the Department of Home Affairs. The letter, which leaves a feeling of numbness in his body, causes him to experience temporary erectile dysfunction. Yet her display of tenderness makes him realize that "this foreign girl has for him – there are beautiful words for it coming to him in his mother tongue – devotion" (96). Realising her attachment to him, he is able once again to sleep with her:

The capacity returned to him, for this foreigner makes him whole. That night he made love to her with the reciprocal tenderness – call it whatever old name you like – that he had guarded against – with a few lapses. [...] That night they made love, the kind of love-making that is another country, a country of its own, not yours or mine.

(p. 96)¹⁴

Later, when they have both moved to his country, their bodies for a while remain the sites that generate a space of unconfined hospitality: "They make love, that unspoken knowledge they can share; that country to which they can resort" (130). The notion of "another country" explicates yet another

14. The expression "another country [...], not yours or mine" is taken from the poem "Another Country" by William Plomer.

dimension of hospitality within the novel. Used as a metaphor for lovemaking, it gives further reason to read Julie and Ibrahim's intimate sexual relationship as a form of erotic bodily hospitality, as I proposed above. Here the Other is not simply invited to the geographical/spatial territory inhabited by the Self, but to the bodily territory of the Self, which becomes an erotically charged site of hospitality. Conceptualised by Julie as an act of equal and mutual giving and receiving, their bodily surrender to each other engenders an a-geographical space of its own, the third space of "another country", belonging neither to him nor her, which can be accessed only in the moment of their physical union. Hospitable exchanges, the novel thus suggests, occur not only in hospitable spaces, but can themselves generate (alternative) landscapes of hospitality.

Yet the equilibrium of "another country" begins to crumble after Ibrahim – to the dismay of his entire extended family – turns down his uncle's offer that he take over his car repair workshop in his home village. From this moment on, a distinctly different nuance emerges in their former bodily hospitality: "In her body he was himself, he belonged to nobody, she was the country to which he had emigrated" (193). The act of lovemaking here no longer leads to the creation of an entirely different country. Her body becomes *his* country, invoking the patriarchal tradition of figuring nations as female bodies. Reducing Julie's body to a hospitable landscape that allows him "to be himself", to establish and assert his identity through sexual penetration, Ibrahim claims for himself a belongingness otherwise denied. Locating the self, for Ibrahim, only seems possible by – to recall the epigraph to this section – "tak[ing] possession of" her body.

An instrument rather than equal in the sexual act, Julie now becomes the possessed in an unequal power relationship – the absence of which she so exuberantly praised after their first sexual encounter. Ibrahim, it appears, redresses the unequal access to hospitality across the world through the female body. Just as he, in his endless attempts to gain access to the West during their time in his home country, most harshly feels the limited hospitality of Western nations, so Julie's body serves as a substitute for the geographical territory whose hospitality he is denied. The return to his home country and the familial obligations he is confronted with thus visibly alter Ibrahim's performance of bodily hospitality.

Complementing her literary exploration of African migration with the portrayal of private acts of hosting, Gordimer thus emphasises the gendered dimension and construction of hospitality. As Rosello states, "[i]f a general discourse about immigration and hospitality tends to remain non-gender-specific [...] a study of what happens once the (male or female) guest is inside the house will make it much more difficult to ignore the gender specificities of the host or hostess's role" (2001: 120). Julie's self-serving dimension inherent in her welcome of her migrant lover thwarts the frequent expectation of selfless female hospitality (see McNulty 2007; Hamington

2010). Yet as Samuelson has shown in the South African context, historical women and female fictional characters during the nation-building period were frequently represented and reduced to mother figures or mere wombs in the “making of the national home” (Samuelson 2008: 131; 2007). The national home after 2000, as Gordimer’s text shows, continues to be negotiated through the female body, whose (sexual) possession now promises access and, potentially, national membership.

Finding Hospitable Locations?

Ibrahim is at last granted immigration papers to the United States with the help of Julie’s mother and her husband, who live an affluent life in California. Julie, in turn, finds a sense of belonging among Ibrahim’s family in the desert village where she decides to stay instead of accompanying her husband. In this way, it seems, the novel closes with both characters having found a more hospitable place, or, to recall the epigraph to this article, a place in which to “locate the self”. However, these final hospitable openings remain compromised.

Ibrahim appears convinced that – even though there is no doubt about initial hardship and humiliation – “this time”, in America, “I have the chance to [...] live like I want to live” (227). Yet we can already foresee what Ibrahim in his desperation carefully suppresses. His trajectory to make a life in the West as an immigrant will follow the common pattern of betrayed hopes and disillusionment. With her decision to stay in his country, Julie saves herself “the pain of seeing him return to the same new-old humiliations that await him, doing the dirty work they don’t want to do for themselves” (266). Forever cast in the role of (undesired and hence undesirable) guest – even in his home country where he never unpacks his bags – Ibrahim seems to have no choice but to continue his life of precarious hospitality.

In her attempt to host stories of new African migration to South Africa and undocumented migration on the global scale, Gordimer does not give much room for conceiving Ibrahim outside the trope of underdog. It is only in moments of face-to-face encounter that these roles seem to be destabilised and complicated rather than condensed into a Manichean framework. These scenes point towards a “guest-host-continuum” (Rosello 2001: 173) with its fluidity and interchangeability of roles and its risk for both parties involved: a continuum of danger, yet one that is necessary to move hospitality away from being a merely static concept. For the metaphor of (in)hospitality as a way to characterise the relationship between nation states and their citizens (as hosts) and migrants (as guests) is in itself constrictive unless it too is reimagined and extended beyond these already available frames and discourses.

As indicated earlier, Julie, by contrast, undergoes a profound development in the second part of the novel. Her transformation occurs when the central binary pattern of the novel manifest in her relationship to Ibrahim is replaced by a triangular structure. The couple's relationship is doubly "triangulated" (Clingman 2000), first by Julie's evolving friendship with Ibrahim's younger sister, and second by her experience in and of the desert. It is on her relation to the desert that I would like to focus here in my attempt to unearth the fault lines in what Winkiel and others have referred to as the newfound openness/hospitality to alterity Julie achieves through her transcendental experience there.

As Inge E. Boer observes, "[t]he geographical expanses called deserts evoke two related responses: one is to consider deserts as empty, devoid of signs of life, and the other is to subsequently move in, conquer, traverse or colonize these spaces by setting up boundary markers" (2006: 107). She critiques these portrayals of the desert in terms of emptiness, arguing instead that they are always already inhabited places while "emptiness is a feature of deserts only when [...] they are perceived from the outside" (2006: 108). While speaking of an "expedition into the desert" (132), Julie sharply distances herself from representations of the desert by Hester Stanhope and T.E. Lawrence about which she reads in books her mother has sent her from the USA. In contrast to these imperial travelogues, Julie, it initially appears, does not intend to map the desert:

The desert. No seasons of bloom and decay. Just the endless turn of night and day. Out of time: and she is gazing – not over it, taken into it, for it has no measure of space, features that mark distance from here to there. In a film of haze there is no horizon. [...] Sky-haze is indistinguishable from sand-haze. All drifts together, and there is no onlooker; the desert is eternity.

(p. 172)

Yet the quoted passage may lend itself to two alternative and quite divergent readings, depending on whether one foregrounds Julie's position as an active ("gazing") or passive subject, being "taken into" the desert.

Focussing on the retreating "I" implied in the passive construction, we are inclined to read the passage as Julie's surrendering to a unique, unknown Other. In a figurative sense, the absent horizon in the desert may signal the absence of a preconceived framework within which she can interpret her experience. Abstaining from mapping the desert, Julie is able to welcome the unanticipated arrival of Derrida's hospitality of visitation. In other words, as Laura Winkiel suggests,

Julie's metaphysical encounter with the desert "outside of time" allows her to commune with something other than what she experiences within human, everyday time. These meditations, then, open her subjectivity to an existential and epistemological plurality that allow for a recognition of other

WHERE TO LOCATE THE SELF?: ...

modes of being and knowing. She experiences a passive receptivity to transformation that undoes her pretension to know and her ability to act. Instead, it is the desert that acts.

(2003: 37)

Winkiel admits that one might understand Gordimer's portrayal of the desert as a romanticized space against which Julie's adventure and journey of self-discovery unfolds. The implausibility of her decision to live in Ibrahim's home country, criticised in readings of the text within a realist framework, however, leads her to conceive the desert as a "modernist locus of otherness" (2003: 34). Reading *The Pickup* against the backdrop of the recently noted spiritual turn in Gordimer's works, Ileana Dimitriu similarly posits that the desert gestures towards Julie's "spiritual transformation" as part of her rite of passage from her "old identity" to her "rerouting" in the new environment (2015: 43).

If we, however, take the active voice of "gazing" in the earlier quoted passage as our starting point, we reach a different conclusion that may better account for Julie's later vision of mapping the desert. Here, the immutability and fixity as central characteristics of the desert position is in opposition to the time Julie inhabits as gazing subject. The desert's location "outside of time" does not suggest an uncompromised openness to the unknown, but rather entails a temporal othering in the sense of Johannes Fabian's "allochronism" (2002: 32, emphasis in the original). Even while distancing herself from Stanhope and Lawrence's Orientalist accounts, Julie's rendering of the desert as a frozen presence equally draws on the Orientalist archive. According to Edward Said, "the Arabian desert is [...] considered to be a locale about which one can make statements regarding the past in exactly the same form (and with the same content) that one makes them regarding the present" (2003: 235).

The "denial of coevalness" (Fabian 2003: 32) by the representing (gazing) subject to the ethnographic Other at the centre of Fabian's allochronic time becomes even more pronounced when Julie ponders buying a piece of oasis and drilling a well so she can have a "water field of rice growing [...] in the desert" (214). In her vision, she actively maps the desert by drilling for water and introducing cultivation techniques. We can therefore suggest that she assumes the role of a quasi-colonial guest master who, rather than opening herself to "other modes of being and knowing" as Winkiel (2009: 37) proposes, enforces her ways of knowing – even if well-meant – onto the villagers. As Daniel Martin Varisco puts it, "[o]n the broadest level there is no redeeming value in the local society apart from the personal relationships for the foreigner, who brings civilization to a world deprived, and in this case, depraved" (2010). While the novel at this point appears to fall back into the tradition of the heroic transnational romance focussing solely on the transformation of a white character, Gordimer at the same time calls into question the closing utopia by signalling that Julie's vision of the plantation

is “based on a camouflage enterprise for an arms-smuggling business” (Meier 2003). As Dana C. Mount contends in her insightful ecocritical reading of the novel, “[t]he novel trades on ambiguities and ultimately refuses to condone or condemn Julie’s decision to remain in the desert” (2014: 120).

The Pickup demonstrates that extensions of hospitality in the private home, while never unencumbered from official laws of welcome, cannot simply be regarded as subsets of national hospitality. They may also express the host’s resistance to official discourses of (in)hospitality towards migrants or be employed strategically to assert or redefine an individual’s own national membership. Gordimer’s novel shows how whiteness in fiction after 2000 has begun to be negotiated in relation to African migrants from beyond the country’s borders. An acknowledgement of complicity in persistent structures of privilege at the heart of whiteness, the novel teaches us, is crucial for redefining post-apartheid white identities. Without this, attempts to turn away from former definitions of whiteness by affording hospitality to an African migrant as a means to legitimate the adoption of an identity that transcends the boundaries of the nation ultimately have to fail. It is only then, Gordimer suggests, that rigid demarcations between the “new” multicultural “good” whites embodied by *The Table* and the “bad” whiteness of “*The Suburbs*” may be overcome.

Physical intimacy in the novel appears as a double-sided enactment of hospitality. Sexual intercourse here gains a new transnational dimension and does not appear as remote from “the political efficacy of sexual intercourse” that Heyns (2000: 48) observes in some apartheid texts. Even though Barnard, commenting on sexual practices in post-apartheid novels, contends that “it is sexual intercourse of a very different sort from that featured in the ‘sex across the colour bar’ fictions of earlier times” (2012: 665), Gordimer’s “sex across national boundaries” equally bears the burden of a politics of exclusion. While the novel closes by pointing towards new ways of “locating the self” for both characters, this does not elicit a reshuffling of customary host/guest configurations and relations of power. Yet besides these closures, as I have shown above, the novel also stages a few brief openings where both characters – leaving behind their self-interest in the hospitable exchange – acknowledge their responsibility for one another and may momentarily transcend their static, preconceived image of their lover. These incidents are crucial to the task of thinking hospitality beyond the structure of static role allocations in immigration discourse.

References

- Ahmed, S., Castañeda, C., Fortier A.-M. & Sheller, M.
 2003 Introduction: Uprootings/Regroundings: Questions of Home and Migration. In: Ahmed, S. et al. (eds) *Uprootings/Regroundings: Questions of Home and Migration*. Oxford: Berg, pp. 1-19.
- Baker, G. (ed.)
 2013 *Hospitality and World Politics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Barker, D.A.
 2007 Crossing Lines. The Novels of Nadine Gordimer with a Particular Focus on *Occasion for Loving* and *The Pickup*. *Literator* 28(3): 91-107.
- Barnard, R.
 2007 *Apartheid and Beyond: South African Writers and the Politics of Place*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 2012 Rewriting the Nation. In: Attwell, D. & Attridge, D. (eds) *The Cambridge History of South African Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 652-675.
- Boer, I.E.
 2006 *Uncertain Territories: Boundaries in Cultural Analysis*. Bal, M., Van Eekelen, B. & Spyer, P. (eds). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Butler, J.
 2009 Performativity, Precarity and Sexual Politics. *AIBR: Revista de Antropología Iberoamericana* 4(3): i-xiii.
- Bystrom, K.
 2016 *Democracy at Home in South Africa: Family Fictions and Transitional Culture*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chapman, M.
 2009 Introduction: Conjectures on South African Literature. *Current Writing* 21(1-2): 1-23.
- Clingman, S.
 2000 Surviving Murder: Oscillation and Triangulation in Nadine Gordimer's *The House Gun*. *Modern Fiction Studies* 46 (1): 139-158.
 2009 *The Grammar of Identity: Transnational Fiction and the Nature of the Boundary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Coetzee, J.M.
 2007 Nadine Gordimer. In: *Inner Workings: Literary Essays 2000-2005*. London: Harvill Secker, pp. 244-256.
- Derrida, J.
 1999 *Adieu to Emmanuel Levinas*, translated by Brault, P.-A. & Michael Naas, M. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
 2000 *Of Hospitality: Anne Dufourmantelle Invites Jacques Derrida to Respond*. Trans. Bowlby, R. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Dimitriu, I.
 2006 Postcolonialising Gordimer: The Ethics of "Beyond" and Significant Peripheries in the Recent Fiction. *English in Africa* 33(2): 159-180.
 2015 Pathway under Construction, Spirituality in Unexpected Places: Nadine Gordimer's Recent Fiction. *Journal of Postcolonial Writing* 51(1): 34-47.

- Fabian, J.
1983 *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Fasselt, R.
2014 Opening up to the Rest of Africa? Continental Connections and Literary (Dis) Continuities in Simão Kikamba's *Going Home* and Jonathan Nkala's *The Crossing*. *Journal of Literary Studies* 30(1): 70-93.
2015 A "Touch of Africa": Liberal "Bildung" through an Encounter with African Immigrants in Andrew Brown's *Refuge*. *scrutiny2* 20(1): 128-146.
- Galletti, D.
2015a The Grammer of the Other, the Other, *autrui, Autrui*. *South African Journal of Philosophy* 34(2): 199-213.
2015b Before Levinas, after Derrida: From Alterity and Hospitality to Xenophobia. *English Studies in Africa* 58(2): 41-54.
- Garuba, H.
2011 Foreword. *Voices: A Compilation of Testimonials: African Artists Living and Working in Cape Town and Surrounds*. Cape Town: African Arts Institute, p. 7.
- George, R. M.
1999 *The Politics of Home: Postcolonial Relocations and Twentieth-Century Fiction*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Germann Molz, J. & Gibson S. (eds)
2007 *Mobilizing Hospitality: The Ethics of Social Relations in a Mobile World*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Gordimer, N.
1953 *The Lying Days*. London: Gollancz.
1956 Six Feet of the Country. *Six Feet of the Country: Short Stories*. London: Victor Gollancz, pp. 8-20.
1979 *Burger's Daughter*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1979.
1982[1981] *July's People*. London: Penguin.
1991 The Ultimate Safari. *Jump and Other Stories*. Cape Town: David Philip, pp. 31-46.
1998 *The House Gun*. London: Bloomsbury.
2002[1970] *A Guest of Honour*. London: Bloomsbury.
2002[2001] *The Pickup*. 2001. London: Bloomsbury.
2012 *No Time Like the Present*. Johannesburg: Picador Africa.
- Gramich, K.
2005 The Politics of Location: Nadine Gordimer's Fiction Then and Now. *Current Writing* 17(2): 74-86.
- Hamington, M. (ed.)
2010 *Feminism and Hospitality: Gender in the Host/Guest Relationship*. Lanham: Lexington Books.
- Heyns, M.
2000 The Whole Country's Truth: Confession and Narrative in Recent White South African Writing. *Modern Fiction Studies* 46(1): 42-66.

WHERE TO LOCATE THE SELF?: ...

- Hunt, E.
2006 Post-Apartheid Johannesburg and Global Mobility in Nadine Gordimer's *The Pickup* and Phaswane Mpe's *Welcome to Our Hillbrow*. *Ariel* 37(4): 103-121.
- Karajayerlian, A.
2010 Large Worlds/Small Places: Critical Cosmopolitanism and Stereoscopic Vision in the Global Postcolonial Novel. PhD thesis, Case Western Reserve University.
- Kristeva, J.
1991 *Strangers to Ourselves*, translated by Roudiez, L.S. New York: Columbia University Press.
- McNulty, T.
2007 *The Hostess: Hospitality, Femininity, and the Expropriation of Identity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Meier, F.
2003 Picking Up the Other: Nadine Gordimer's *The Pickup*, *Erfurt Electronic Studies in English (Eese)* 2. Online: <http://webdoc.gwdg.de/edoc/ia/eese/artic23/franz/2_2003.html>. 22 May 2012.
- Motha, S.
2010 "Begging to Be Black": Liminality and Critique in Post-Apartheid South Africa. *Theory, Culture & Society* 27(7-8): 285-305.
- Mount, D.C.
2014 Playing at Home: An Ecocritical Reading of Nadine Gordimer's *The Pickup*. *Ariel* 45(3): 101-122.
- Rosello, M.
2001 *Postcolonial Hospitality: The Immigrant as Guest*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Samuelson, M.
2007 *Remembering the Nation, Dismembering Women? Stories of the South African Transition*. Scottsville: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.
2008 Walking through the Door and Inhabiting the House: South African Literary Culture and Criticism after the Transition. *English Studies in Africa* 51(1): 130-137.
- Said, E.W.
2003[1978] *Orientalism*. London: Penguin.
- Sanders, M.
2002 *Complicities: The Intellectual and Apartheid*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Setti, N.
2009 Migrants' Art and Writings: Figures of Precarious Hospitality. *European Journal of Women's Studies* 16(4): 325-335.
- Shankman, S.
2003 The Saying, the Said, and the Betrayal of Charity in Mongo Beti's *Le pauvre Christ de Bomba*. In: Hoving, I. Korsten, F.W. & Van Alphen, E. (eds) *Africa and Its Significant Others: Forty Years of Intercultural Entanglement*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp. 19-33.

- Shotwell, A.
2007 Shame in Alterities: Adrian Piper, Intersubjectivity, and the Racial Formation of Identity. In: Horstkotte, S. & Peeren, E. *The Shock of the Other: Situating Alterities* (ed.) Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp. 127-136.
- Sizemore, C. W.
2008 The Return to Hijab in Nadine Gordimer's *The Pick-Up* [sic] and Leila Aboulela's *Minaret*. *Journal of Commonwealth and Postcolonial Studies* 15(2): 70-83.
- Smith, R.
2000 Nadine Gordimer. In: Scanlon, P.A. (ed.) *Dictionary of Literary Biography: Volume 225: South African Writers*. Detroit: Gale Group, pp. 184-204.
- Steyn, M.
2007 As the Postcolonial Moment Deepens: A Response to Green, Sonn, and Matsebula. *South African Journal of Psychology* 37(3): 420-424.
- Still, J.
2010 *Derrida and Hospitality: Theory and Practice*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Varisco, D.
2010 Grease-Monkeys and Bedouin Girls: The Rhetorical Fate of Arabs and Muslims in Nadine Gordimer's *The Pickup*. *Tingis Redux*. Online:
<http://www.tingisredux.com/article/greasemonkeys_and_bedouin_girls.html>. 20 May 2012.
- Winkiel, L.
2009 Immigration and the Practice of Freedom in Nadine Gordimer's *The Pickup*. *Safundi* 10(1): 27-41.
- Wyschogrod, E.
2003 Autochthony and Welcome: Discourses of Exile in Levinas and Derrida. *Journal of Philosophy and Scripture* 1(1): 36-42.

Rebecca Fasselt
University of Pretoria
Rebecca.fasselt@up.ac.za