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**Abstract for the special issue**

The Ethiopian diaspora is a comparatively new phenomenon, but like the population inside Ethiopia, it is growing at a rapid pace and spreading to more and more regions of the world (Demissie 2017). Besides the incessant reasons for emigration such as wars and conflicts, environmental and economic reasons, chain emigration in particular is increasing with the number of Ethiopians living in the diaspora.

The Special Issue looks at how Ethiopians are building a home and a future (Appadurai 2013) in their new host countries. Of course, the circumstances they find in the host countries - new opportunities such as freedom of expression or jobs, but also new hurdles such as immigration restrictions or racism - play a significant role. In the discussions on home- and future-making, we put a special focus on the ideas of a good life (Robbins 2013) that Ethiopians bring with them from their homeland, as well as indigenous practices that help them build a new home and future in their new environment.
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ראשי פרקים בעברית- לא לתרגם.

בין הבית הקטן הפיסי לתהליכי הגלובליזציה וההגירה בעולם נוצרים מרחבים שונים המאפשרים שייכות ותחושת ביטחון שהבית מבקש להקנות. במהלך שנים, במעבר של קהילות נוצרים מרחבי קהילה משותפים המייצרים עוגנים של שותפות, ביטחון ובית.

מילות מפתח:

Homemaking, migrants, meso level. transnational, community

מאמר זה עוסק ביצירת הבית של העולים מאתיופיה בעשרים השנים הראשונות לאחר עלייתם לישראל?

במאמר אני רוצה להגיד שבית אינו רק מבנה פיזי אלא תחושת שייכות. המעבר הפיזי מערער את הבית המוכר ובמהלך תהליכי הקליטה וגם שנים לאחר מכן מבנים לעצמם המהגרים את הבית הטראנסלוואמי. זה שמשלב בין אתיופיה לישראל. התיאוריה הטראנסלואמיות מורכבת משלושה ממדים- מקרו, מיקרו ומאסו. אבקש לטעון שבמאקרו ובמיקרו נתונים העולים פעמים רבות לפיקוח של המקומיים באוד המאסו, הבא לידי ביטוי שהקשר זה באירועיים קהילתיים הוא מרחב המייצר הכלה ותחושה של בית. במאמר זה אבקש להציג כיצד שלב המאסו בתיאוריה הטראנסלואמיות מייצר את תחושת הבית הקהילתית המשפיעה גם על תחושת הבית האישית. מרחבים קהילתיים ואירועים קהילתיים שנוצרים נותנים ביטוי (acting out) לפעולות הנותנות תחושה של בית.

מבחינה תיאורטית:

ההגעה לישראל כוללת את החלום על המקום הגדול- הרעיון הציוני היהודי לצד המקום הקטן- הפיזי הממשי היומיומי, זה הנקרא גם בית.

התיאוריה הטראנסלואמית במאמר זה תתמקד במאסו ובאפשרות ליצור ריבוי בתים והכוח שיש לאירועיים קהילתיים ליצור תחושה של בית.

**introduction**

In this paper I argue that in the context of transnational migration, the concept of home focuses on its emotional perspective rather than its territorial connection, because it is constituted as a process of change and of searching related to the construction of multiple and extraterritorial ways of belonging (Brun & Fabos 2015; Korac 2009). In addition to this, I will argue that the meso level in the transnational theory creates the possibility of community spaces that clearly integrate Ethiopia and Israel and enable the existence of an empowering transnational community space that enables the existence of the sense of home.

**Theoretical:**

**Transnational meso level:**

Transnational theory is a sociological framework that seeks to understand the social, economic, and political processes that occur across national borders. It is based on the idea that social actors, such as individuals, families, and organizations, can maintain meaningful ties and relationships across national borders. These ties can be sustained through a variety of means, such as communication technology, travel, and financial remittances[[1]](#footnote-1). There are three levels of transnational theory are: First, *Macro leve,* analysis focuses on the global political economy and the structural forces that shape transnational relations. (Faist, T 2000; XXX). Second, *Micro level*:  analysis focuses on the individual and household level and the ways in which people make decisions about transnational engagement (Levitt, P., & Merry, S. E. 2009) and third, Meso level that analysis focuses on the interactions between social actors, such as individuals, families, communities, and organizations (Portes, A., & Sensenbrenner, J. ;1993). Understanding the meso level is essential for comprehending the interactions and dynamics that occur within and between various societal dimensions, providing a holistic understanding of transnational practices.

**Making place, Big place and small place**

A place is a space defined by an internal and external boundary. The place is created when we feel that we are not randomly placed in space but occupy a unique and significant part within it. One of the expressions of a place is a home - where the needs of life are met, where culture is created. In a situation of migration, place and home take on different meanings and are restructured. In migration processes, a place can be considered from two points of view, the 'Big place' which is more than a certain site and even more than all the sites - is the idea itself. The 'Big place' place is not expressed in a physical or tangible place, but an idea. In the Jewish context, the big place is the homecoming to Jerusalem. Alongside this, the 'small place' describes the actual day-to-day existence. It is expressed in different ways that create, among other things, a sense of meaning and belonging. The small place is reflected in the home, in everyday practice and in the physical spaces in which they are found.

### **Home and Migration: Transnational Belongings and Mobilities**

Scholarly discussions of the concept of “home” have long been structured by a series of binaries. Is home a physical place or a symbolic space? A fixed location or an imagined relation? Closed or open? Stable or ever changing? Increasingly—and, I would argue, fortunately—a growing number of studies have begun to challenge such dichotomous framings, emphasizing instead the complex ways in which migrants, in particular, negotiate between such polarized conceptions (Blunt and Dowling 2006; Lomsky-Feder and Rapoport 2003; Magat 1999; Ralph 2010; Stefansson 2004).

Multiple Homes and Transnationalism: The experiences of immigrants often involve the creation and negotiation of multiple places and homes. Nina Glick Schiller (2018) explores the concept of multiple homes in the context of transnational migration, emphasizing how migrants maintain connections and attachments to both their home country and the host society.

The concept of home holds significant anthropological and sociocultural implications, especially within the context of immigration and displacement. This literature review aims to explore scholarly works that delve into the discipline of home, homelessness, and the formation of multiple homes among immigrant populations. XXXX

Since the early 1990s, globalisation theorists have emphasised that in a world characterised by mobility and migration, social life is increasingly shaped by the virtual and remote as opposed to the real and proximate. Identities are therefore seen as transient, mobile and diasporic (Savage *et al.,* [**2005**](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/psp.1994?casa_token=ezve6sGI7QEAAAAA%3AZmOyjQHIbfzwgenSarJgvKkYveMyQFy4GIJgT7AgZXPB6kxZRnSloWTqRKuutXD4Lsw2Dk_AqfxjnaY6#psp1994-bib-0034)). In his manifesto for a new ‘sociology of mobilities’, (Urry, [**2000**](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/psp.1994?casa_token=ezve6sGI7QEAAAAA%3AZmOyjQHIbfzwgenSarJgvKkYveMyQFy4GIJgT7AgZXPB6kxZRnSloWTqRKuutXD4Lsw2Dk_AqfxjnaY6#psp1994-bib-0038): 132) extended this dimension of globalisation, arguing that contemporary forms of dwelling and belonging ‘almost always involve diverse forms of mobility’. Mobilities research focuses not only on the corporeal travel of people and the physical movement of objects, but also imaginative, virtual and communicative travel, enabling and coercing (some) people to live more ‘mobile lives’ (Elliott & Urry, [**2010**](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/psp.1994?casa_token=ezve6sGI7QEAAAAA%3AZmOyjQHIbfzwgenSarJgvKkYveMyQFy4GIJgT7AgZXPB6kxZRnSloWTqRKuutXD4Lsw2Dk_AqfxjnaY6#psp1994-bib-0015); Sheller, [**2011**](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/psp.1994?casa_token=ezve6sGI7QEAAAAA%3AZmOyjQHIbfzwgenSarJgvKkYveMyQFy4GIJgT7AgZXPB6kxZRnSloWTqRKuutXD4Lsw2Dk_AqfxjnaY6#psp1994-bib-0035): 3).

Such themes have been further developed through work on ‘mobile geographies of home’, investigating the ways in which migrants dwell through travel, and *vice versa* (Ralph & Staeheli, [**2011**](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/psp.1994?casa_token=ezve6sGI7QEAAAAA%3AZmOyjQHIbfzwgenSarJgvKkYveMyQFy4GIJgT7AgZXPB6kxZRnSloWTqRKuutXD4Lsw2Dk_AqfxjnaY6#psp1994-bib-0031): 519). Research in this field has challenged the way in which ‘home’ is imagined as territorially pre-defined and fixed, offering instead a conceptualisation of home as mobile, flexible and ‘in-becoming’ (Nowicka, [**2007**](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/psp.1994?casa_token=ezve6sGI7QEAAAAA%3AZmOyjQHIbfzwgenSarJgvKkYveMyQFy4GIJgT7AgZXPB6kxZRnSloWTqRKuutXD4Lsw2Dk_AqfxjnaY6#psp1994-bib-0024)). This aspect has been emphasised in studies examining the meanings that migrants attach to home at different geographical scales, highlighting the de-territorialisation of belonging and attachments (Appadurai, [**1996**](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/psp.1994?casa_token=ezve6sGI7QEAAAAA%3AZmOyjQHIbfzwgenSarJgvKkYveMyQFy4GIJgT7AgZXPB6kxZRnSloWTqRKuutXD4Lsw2Dk_AqfxjnaY6#psp1994-bib-0003)). At the same time, the desire to fix home with particular meanings by attaching it to an immediate locale is still apparent even for highly mobile transnational migrants (Butcher, [**2010**](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/psp.1994?casa_token=ezve6sGI7QEAAAAA%3AZmOyjQHIbfzwgenSarJgvKkYveMyQFy4GIJgT7AgZXPB6kxZRnSloWTqRKuutXD4Lsw2Dk_AqfxjnaY6#psp1994-bib-0011)). Ralph and Staeheli ([**2011**](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/psp.1994?casa_token=ezve6sGI7QEAAAAA%3AZmOyjQHIbfzwgenSarJgvKkYveMyQFy4GIJgT7AgZXPB6kxZRnSloWTqRKuutXD4Lsw2Dk_AqfxjnaY6#psp1994-bib-0031)) make the point that there has been a tendency to overemphasise the shifting and mobile meanings of home, while underplaying migrants' struggles in, and attachments to, their current home. If we want to understand how migrants experience home, however, the key question remains: ‘…how (do) migrants build homes and identities through complex relationships that are plural, extensible, *but nevertheless localised?*’ (Ralph & Staeheli, [**2011**](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/psp.1994?casa_token=ezve6sGI7QEAAAAA%3AZmOyjQHIbfzwgenSarJgvKkYveMyQFy4GIJgT7AgZXPB6kxZRnSloWTqRKuutXD4Lsw2Dk_AqfxjnaY6#psp1994-bib-0031): 522, emphasis added). This point has been reinforced by Brickell and Datta ([**2011**](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/psp.1994?casa_token=ezve6sGI7QEAAAAA%3AZmOyjQHIbfzwgenSarJgvKkYveMyQFy4GIJgT7AgZXPB6kxZRnSloWTqRKuutXD4Lsw2Dk_AqfxjnaY6#psp1994-bib-0007)) who apply the concept of ‘translocality’ to enhance our understanding of the interconnections between mobility *and* locality, routes *and* roots, as well as transnational *and* local attachments (Clifford, [**1997**](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/psp.1994?casa_token=ezve6sGI7QEAAAAA%3AZmOyjQHIbfzwgenSarJgvKkYveMyQFy4GIJgT7AgZXPB6kxZRnSloWTqRKuutXD4Lsw2Dk_AqfxjnaY6#psp1994-bib-0013); Ehrkamp, [**2005**](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/psp.1994?casa_token=ezve6sGI7QEAAAAA%3AZmOyjQHIbfzwgenSarJgvKkYveMyQFy4GIJgT7AgZXPB6kxZRnSloWTqRKuutXD4Lsw2Dk_AqfxjnaY6#psp1994-bib-0014); Gustafson, [**2009**](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/psp.1994?casa_token=ezve6sGI7QEAAAAA%3AZmOyjQHIbfzwgenSarJgvKkYveMyQFy4GIJgT7AgZXPB6kxZRnSloWTqRKuutXD4Lsw2Dk_AqfxjnaY6#psp1994-bib-0017)).

Schiller et al. (1992b) defined transnationalism as ‘the processes by which immigrants build social fields that link together their country of origin and their country of settlement’. They continued: ‘transmigrants develop and maintain multiple relations— familial, economic, social, organisational, religious, and political, that span borders. Transmigrants take actions, make decisions, and feel concerns, and develop identities within social networks that connect them to two or more societies simultaneously’ (Schiller et al. 1992b: 1–2).

As per Hammar et al. (1997) and Faist and Faist (2000), migration theories are divided into three main categories as micro-level, macrolevel and meso-level of migration (Figure 3). Micro-level theories consider migration decisions from an individual’s perspective, i.e. a person’s desires and expectations. Macro-level theories consider migration decisions from an aggregate point of view, i.e. the economic structure of the country. Meso-level is where migration decisions lie in between the two former theories, i.e. family bonds, social networks, peer groups and isolated minority communities.

Elliott & Urry, 2010; Sheller, 2011: 3). Such themes have been further developed through work on ‘mobile geographies of home’, investigating the ways in which migrants dwell through travel, and vice versa (Ralph & Staeheli, 2011: 519). Research in this field has challenged the way in which ‘home’ is imagined as territorially pre-defined and fixed, offering instead a conceptualisation of home as mobile, flexible and ‘in-becoming’ (Nowicka, 2007). This aspect has been emphasised in studies examining the meanings that migrants attach to home at different geographical scales, highlighting the deterritorialisation of belonging and attachments (Appadurai, 1996). At the same time, the desire to fix home with particular meanings by attaching it to an immediate locale is still apparent even for highly mobile transnational migrants (Butcher, 2010). Ralph and Staeheli (2011) make the point that there has been a tendency to overemphasise the shifting and mobile meanings of home, while underplaying migrants’ struggles in, and attachments to, their current home. If we want to understand how migrants experience home, however, the key question remains: ‘… how (do) migrants build homes and identities through complex relationships that are plural, extensible, but nevertheless localised?’ (Ralph & Staeheli, 2011: 522, emphasis added). This point has been reinforced by Brickell and Datta (2011) who apply the concept of ‘translocality’ to enhance our understanding of the interconnections between mobility and locality, routes and roots, as well as transnational and local attachments (Clifford, 1997; Ehrkamp, 2005; Gustafson, 2009).

The Maso is a phase that allows freely, without external supervision of the society that absorbs the transloam space between Ethiopia and Israel. In this article I would like to argue that many parts of the Maso phase take place in community events such as weddings, funerals, holidays and enable the feeling of home and belonging. Events in which many people from the community take part, spaces that give expression to the source culture, values and norms from a place of strength and integrate the destination country into them. The basic premise of this article is that transnationalism is not integration from a place of power relations but the creation of a third space, a space of partnership.

In everyday life there are many spaces such as the workplace, the education system, and the public space in which immigrants also operate in a transnational way, they are under the watchful eye of the majority society and face questions of integration. In the Maso spaces, and in the context of the present article, the community events give expression to the acting out of Transloamism.

Three research questions arising from the above will be addressed in this paper: first, How do immigrants create a home and a sense of belonging in the first twenty years in the destination country ? second, what is the role of the big and small place and how are they reflected in the creation of the house? And third, what meanings do migrants attach to their mobility and (potential) transnational relationships, and how do they evaluate the significance of such connections for the idea of ‘home’?

Anthropologists and scholars have approached the notion of home from various perspectives. Brian Moeran's (2015) work offers a comprehensive understanding of home and homelessness, emphasizing the cultural and sociopolitical factors that contribute to experiences of homelessness. This perspective highlights how home is not solely a physical space but is also deeply intertwined with social, emotional, and cultural dimensions.

**Multiple Homes and Transnationalism:**

The experiences of immigrants often involve the creation and negotiation of multiple homes. Nina Glick Schiller (2018) explores the concept of multiple homes in the context of transnational migration, emphasizing how migrants maintain connections and attachments to both their home country and the host society. The notion of multiple homes challenges traditional understandings of home as a fixed and singular entity.

Transnationalism refers to the maintenance of connections, identities, and practices across borders. Scholars have explored transnationalism as a framework to understand how immigrants establish and navigate multiple homes. Nina Glick Schiller (2018) examines the concept of multiple homes within the context of transnational migration, highlighting how immigrants maintain attachments to both their home country and the host society. This perspective challenges traditional notions of home as a singular and fixed place.

אפדוראי טען שבית אינו רק צורת הדיור: הוא מבטא את האופן שבו בני אדם מארגנים בדרכים חומריות את הרכוש, היחסים והמשאבים האינטימיים ביותר שלהם, במסגרת עבודה מתמדת של ייצור מקום. הוא התייחס למשמעות של היצירה המתמשכת של הבית והדגיש את הקשר האינטימי המתקיים בבית בין חיי משפחה, העיצוב הפיזי והקהילתיות. המשמעות העמוקה של בית טמונה אפוא בזיקתו הישירה למגורים, לכבוד ולעיצוב התרבותי של אינטימיות פיזית; הוא מאפשר לבני האדם ליצור מקום מחסה לאנושיות שלהם4

**METHOD**

This article is based on an ethnographic study that took place in 2020-2023 and is a continuation of the study that took place in 2005-2012, which included in-depth fieldwork, observations, and interviews in each of the journey’s stations – villages of origin in northern Ethiopia, transit camps in Ethiopia, absorption centers in Israel, and permanent dwellings in Israel.

This study is unique in that the theoretical affinity between immigration and journey had a methodological parallel, as I, too, moved with the people who had arrived in Israel and with those en route. This is a departure from most immigration studies, where the researchers meet the immigrants after they had arrived at their destination. In this study, the movement itself is one of the issues examined. To do so, I travelled along with the ZBI for seven years, lived in each of the places they lived, and witnessed their experiences. I lived and learned the experience of waiting and moving.

Prior to embarking on this study, I studied Amharic so that I was able to converse with people in their native language. The ethnographic study I conducted in Ethiopia and in Israel dealt with the people and places made throughout this journey, beginning with life before deciding to make aliyah and ending with the daily routine of life in their permanent dwellings in Israel. Hence, the research is based on material collected during these years – participant observations, conducting interviews, and asking people to fill in questionnaires.

My study is a multi-sited ethnography (Marcus 1995), which takes place in four stations of the journey: (1) the villages of origin in Ethiopia; (2) the transit camps in Ethiopia, where people had waited for up to 12 years; (3) absorption centers in Israel; (4) permanent dwellings in Israel. In the latter, I spoke to people who had been living in Israel for up to 7 years.

Like the people I studied, the study itself crossed boundaries and underwent transformations that enrich and expand learning about the journey, and allow us to see journeys in all their dynamic fluidity and complexity.

My research method was grounded theory (Glaser and Strauss, 2009), and I tried not to predetermine the questions but rather find the main issues while conducting the study and following the fieldwork. I got to learn and experience day-to-day life (Kleiman, 1995; Seaman 2004), social encounters, conversations, prayers, and most of all – the experience of waiting and movement.

The participants were dozens of immigrants and hundreds of people in Ethiopia and Israel, all related to the process of immigration and affecting it – men and women, adults and children, villagers and city people, those with immigration permits and those whose requests to immigrate were denied, Jews and Christians, members of Beita Israel and of ZBI, and professionals involved in absorbing immigrants in Israel. I conducted in-depth interviews with 106 participants. These were open interviews, based on the assumption that interviews are a means to help people express their perceptions, thoughts, and hidden attitudes. I constructed the guidelines for the ethnographic interview guidelines (Spradley, 1979) based on a timeline adapted to each participant, and listing aspects of that person’s everyday life in each of the stations. Interviews were conducted in Hebrew or Amharic, with the help of an interpreter, as required by the location and the interviewee’s language.

In 2020-2023 I interviewed 30 people at the ages 20-60 about life in Israel. Additionally, I did field work in Israel and transit camps in Gondar and Adiss Abeeba.

**Zera Beita Israel**

The Zera Beta Israel Ethiopian Jews preserved their religious identity for many generations in isolation from the rest of the Jewish world (Corinaldi 2001; Waldman 1995). The community comprises two main groups: Beta Israel and Zera Beta Israel. The Beta Israel community are Jews who maintained their Jewishness throughout their lives. The first immigrants arrived in Israel in the 1950s; most of the rest arrived in two large-scale operations: Operation Moses (1984–1985) and Operation Solomon (1991). The community adhered to a religious Jewish lifestyle based on the “halachic” tradition of Ethiopian Jews4 (Shalom 2016). The ZBI is defined by Israel’s High Court of Appeals as “being of ethnic Jewish origin (Beta Israel) who converted to Christianity because of specific circumstances of time, place and environment. At the same time, they preserved their uniqueness, partly because of distinctions and aversions of their non-Jewish neighbours. Now they seek to return to their Judaism and to immigrate to Israel” (Israel Supreme Court of Appeals 3317/93). Their conversion to Christianity is attributed to man-made and natural disasters at the end of the 19th century. Known as kapo-ken—the bad time—the community experienced years of drought, hunger, and plagues. Many villages were destroyed in the war that broke out between the Ethiopians and Muslim Dervish invaders from Sudan. Furthermore, during the period of the Kaiser Yohannes, conversion to Christianity was made obligatory, aided by European Christian missionaries. These forces led some Beta Israel to convert to Christianity mainly as a means of survival (Corinaldi 2001; Waldman 1995). Today, members of the Zera Beta Israel contend that the non-Jewish lifestyle adopted by their forebears was the result of their being offspring of anusim—converts whose parents or grandparents had been coerced into conversion. They further argue that their separation from Ethiopian Judaism was never absolute; rather, the ZBI retained their original social frameworks and maintained ties with Beta Israel families. This view is confirmed by a variety of research (e.g., Cohen 2011; Salamon 1993; Seeman 2009; Shabtai 2006; Talmi-Cohn 2018) showing that while ZBI left the Jewish religion, their conversion to Christianity was far from complete, suspending them and their descendants between Ethiopian Jews and Christians—not fully assimilated or accepted by either group. Their arrival in Israel began around 1993 and continues sporadically today. In summary, about 150 years ago, members of the ZBI community began converting and living in villages as Ethiopian Christians (even if the locals continued to identify them as Beta Israel). Around 1991, they began arriving at transit camps where they started a process of returning to Judaism before departing to immigrant absorption centres in Israel. There they underwent a conversion process before permanently residing in Israel. It is important to note that their conversion was not based on Beta Israel’s written scriptures (the “Orit”), but on the conversion requirements emerging from state-sanctioned rabbinic Judaism’s interpretation of halacha (Jewish law)—revealing the power of the state to define who is “in” or “out”.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

סוגיית הזמן באירוע קהילתי- אירוע כמו לוויה או חתונה הם אירועים המוגדרים בזמן, קצר יחסית.

הלוויה זה אירוע

לפני מספר שנים נסעתי להלוויה ולקחתי טרמפ בחורה, שאלתי אותה מהיכן היא מכירה את מנוחה והיא סיפרה לי שהיא לא ממש מכירה אותה, לפני למעלה מ 20 שנה, שהלכה מכפר לכפר היא שתתה אצלה קפה וככה זה נהוג...גם אם אתה לא ממש מכיר יש אחריות חברתית קהילתית של שותפות ואחווה. אחריות זו באה לידי ביטוי בעיקר אצל המבוגרים אך גם אצל הצעירים.

אירוע של הלוויה הוא אירוע שבישראל בדר"כ מתקיים כמה שעות בבית העלמין ולאחר מכן הולכים לבית המנוחה. לרוב בהלוויות של אנשי הקהילה יום ההלוויה הוא יום ארוך אליו מגיעים מאות אנשים מכל רחבי הארץ כדי לתמוך ולהיות עם המשפחה. מעבר לאירוע עצמו המתקיים בבית העלמין כמקובל, מתקיים במרחב ציבורי אחר (מועדון, פארק...) יום שלם של אירוע ההלויה הכולל קינה בדומה לזו שבאתיופיה, כניסה של המבוגרים לפני הצעירים, תמונות של הנפטר ושירה פיוטית עליו ועל מעשי הגבורה שלו.

אירוע זה מתקיים במקום אחר (לא בבית העלמין) באורך זמן אחר (יום שלם ולא אירוע קצר) ומאפשר התנהלות טראנסלאומית המקבלת ביטוי ותוקף דרך השותפות הקהילתית

כך גם הלוויות של קרובי משפחה שנפטרו באתיופיה, מתקיים יום שבו כולם מוזמנים לנחם, קינה,

**חתונה** חתונות בישראל מתקיימות לרוב באחד מימות השבוע בערב. קבוצות שונות בישראל חוגגים באופנים שונים, בין אם קבוצות החוגגות חינה (אירוע לפני), אלו החוגגים שבע ברכות (....

בקרב העולים מאתיופיה בשנים האחרונות קיים אירוע מובנה יום שלישי או רביעי חינה, יום חמישי אירוע, יום שישי מועדון ויום שבת מועדון.

גם האירוע באירוע הכולל לרוב 3 מנות בנוי ממבנה טקס קקס קבוע המשלב בית אתיופיה לישראל, שירים באמהרית לצד ישראלים, בגדים של חתן וכלה לצד בגדים מסורתיים....

לאחר מכן המועדון כל כולו מבוסס על אירועים כפי שהיו באתיופיה , לרוב בכפר של שחיתת פרה, הגעה של קרובי משפחה, חילופי מתנות, רישום של מתנות ועוד.

כל אלו אירועים...

קיימות ריבוי צורות של טראנסלאומיות ובמאמר זה ביקשתי לשים את הדגש במרחבים הקהילתיים המשותפים. חשוב לציין שהקהילה היא הטרוגנית (להוסיף רפרנס) וקיימים הבדלים בין דוריים, בין מגדריים אשר מאפשרים את קיומים של המרחבים האלו אך לאורך שנים הם מתהווים ומשתנים

מרחבי מזו אלו הם מרחבים המעצימים את הקהילה, נותנים אנרגיה וחופש, מאפשרים להרגיש בבית , לשמוע את המוזיקה והשפה, ולעבור יחד עם השאר את תהליך ההגירה. מאפשרים חוסן והתמודדות עם חיי היום יום במיוחד עבור המבוגרים.

1. * Faist, T. (2000). The volume and dynamics of international migration and transnational social spaces. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
   * Levitt, P., & Merry, S. E. (Eds.). (2009). Transnational migration and legal regimes. New York: NYU Press.
   * Portes, A., & Sensenbrenner, J. (1993). Embeddedness and immigration: Notes on the social determinants of economic action. American Journal of Sociology, 98(6), 1320-1350.

   [↑](#footnote-ref-1)