

Cultural Heritage and Mobility from a Multisensory Perspective

Edited by

**Magdalena Banaszekiewicz and Karolina
Nikielska-Sekuła**

First published 2025

ISBN: 978-1-032-71374-8 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-032-71380-9 (pbk)

ISBN: 978-1-032-71378-6 (ebk)

Introduction

Heritage and Mobility from a Multisensory Perspective: Introduction

*Karolina Nikielska-Sekuła and Magdalena
Banaszekiewicz*

(CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0)

DOI: 10.4324/9781032713786-1

This chapter was funded by the Jagiellonian University.



Heritage and Mobility from a Multisensory Perspective

Introduction

Karolina Nikielska-Sekula and Magdalena Banaszkiewicz

Heritage Communities and Global Mobilities

A Google search for the term “heritage” generates 2.1 billion hits. Rodney Harrison argues that heritage is a slippery term that can describe anything (Harrison 2013, 5). Several researchers have explored the historical and comparative development of the concept of heritage and heritage studies, including Smith (2006), Harrison (2013), and Waterton and Watson (2015). In this introduction, we focus on the complex issues that position heritage studies within the mobility turn paradigm. While doing so, we discuss the role of embodiment and multisensoriality in shaping the dynamics of mobility and the relationships between people – the intersection that has been a focal point of interest to heritage communities.

Heritage-making has been associated with nation-building in the 19th century, although some argue that its roots stretch even further back (Hall 2023 [2004], Harrison 2013, Waterton and Watson 2015). For nation-centred political ideologies, the recognition of the importance of preserving and understanding the past was essential to the creation of “imagined communities”, to use the term coined by Benedict Anderson (Anderson 1983). Thanks to the preservation of material traces from the past, shared narratives have been constructed based on physical signs of remembrance, treated as symbolic bearers of values that constitute the collective identity of the people living in a certain territory (Hall 2004, quoted in Hall 2023, 14). Nation states thus reinforced their identities through their heritage (to simplify matters, so as not to enter into a discussion of tradition and culture). It should be specified that this concerns nation states pursuing a sovereign policy towards the past. Consequently, the performative power of heritage creates an illusion of the past (Watson and Waterton, 2010). This promotes the commodification of nostalgia (Hewison, 1987) and can also become a source of conflict (Tunbridge and Ashworth, 1997). Establishing the idea of common national heritages legitimised nations’ territorial belonging, normalising immobility and gradually setting the (cross-border) mobility in the perspective of an abnormality (Schewel 2019). The state-centric concept of heritage, being intricately linked to the formation of the UN, was particularly supported by

DOI: 10.4324/9781032713786-1

This chapter has been made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license.

the work of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee (Di Giovine, 2009). Although “the UNESCO heritage regime originated in the effort to celebrate cultures in all their diversity” (Bendix et al. 2012, 16), it was created by states. Heritage listing has been used by states for various purposes, including nation-building, economic empowerment and as a soft power strategy in international relations. According to Rodney Harrison (2015, 301), the global concept of heritage as a collective ownership has become a means of expressing nationalism through international collaboration.

However, upon a critical examination of, among other things, UNESCO’s five decades of activity in heritage protection, a more nuanced understanding of the power/knowledge relations between states, nations and the heritage community has emerged (Adell et al. 2015). Although the fundamental principles of UNESCO’s definition of heritage have remained relatively constant, new forms and new ideas about heritage have been added over the years and there has been a growing recognition of the significance of intangible cultural heritage and the need for authenticity in preservation efforts. There has also been a growing emphasis on community involvement, sustainable development and the interconnectedness of cultural and natural heritage. As noted by Adell et al. (2015, 8), heritage is often conceptualised as a “living thing” and a tool for “sustainable development”, making it a project to be developed by communities of practice. This shift in the understanding of the subject of who creates heritage has found its definitional expression in the concept of “heritage community”, as introduced by the Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society of the Council of Europe (2005), widely known as the Faro Convention. According to the definition presented in its Article 2, a heritage community consists of “people who value specific aspects of cultural heritage which they wish, within the framework of public action, to sustain and transmit to future generations” (Council of Europe 2005). This definition expands the right of involvement in heritage-making beyond states and nations, in fact bringing the definition closer to the situation that takes place in reality. By challenging the dominant canon and contesting existing interpretations of the past, various subaltern groups and individuals exercise their right to heritage-making. Communities of practice do not necessarily share ethnic identities and are not identified with state governmentality, but they do share political, economic and other interests.

Globalisation and mobility are among the most influential factors that have altered the identification of heritage communities with nation-state entities. The acceleration of international flows of people, capital, technology, labour, corporations, language and culture in the second half of the 20th century has been unprecedented in history (Appadurai, 1996). Globalisation is a powerful stratifying factor that creates a global hierarchy of mobilities (Bauman, 1998), influencing global networks and flows that cross regional boundaries. Contemporary global, regional and local mobilities, marked by advancements in transport and technology, have profoundly transformed the nature of social relations in a world of mobility (Urry 2000). Noel Salazar, in various of his

writings (Salazar and Glick Schiller 2016, Salazar and Jayaram 2018, Salazar 2020, and Vered Amit and Salazar 2020), while discussing the “regimes of mobility”, emphasises that, although mobility is a crucial social process of late modernity, it should not be taken for granted as it is a “fragile entanglement” (Cresswell 2010, 18). The use of a mobility perspective when examining heritage-scapes (Di Giovine 2009) highlights the importance of moving beyond static and territorial analyses to cover engaging with the complexities of mobility and change that shape the agency of heritage communities.

The aim of this volume is to contribute to the flourishing literature on heritage and mobility by drawing on theoretical and methodological developments at the intersection of heritage and mobility studies. It is done with the employment of multisensory approaches that help shed new light on a wide range of empirical cases that bring together the processes of mobility and heritage.

Temporality, Place and Mobility

Besides the recognition of the *human* aspect of heritage, as discussed in the previous section, it is today widely accepted that cultural heritage is a matter of the present rather than the past (Smith 2006, Smith et al. 2011). Even when it claims to speak about past events, its meanings are created, negotiated and legitimised by *humans* within the realms of the present (Tunbridge and Ashworth 1997). As Harvey puts it: “Since all heritage is produced completely in the present, our relationship with the past is understood in relation to our present temporal and spatial experience” (Harvey, 2001, 325). Besides tying heritage with the present, Harvey’s statement names two important realms of heritage production – the *temporal* and the *spatial* – both intersecting with the *human* aspect of heritage expressed through the existence of heritage communities.

The recognition of unfixed temporal frames as part of heritage production opens the possibilities of flexible/ dynamic heritage interpretations. Linking heritage to the present, rather than to the past, indicates a constant change in its meaning – as the present changes every day. The actors engaging with heritage in the present involve long-privileged powerful groups such as regional, national and transnational institutions and nation states, along with less privileged and underprivileged individuals, local communities and so on. The privileged institutions had traditionally shaped heritage narratives and claimed the ownership of tangible and intangible heritage, using it in national and regional identity politics. According to cultural anthropologist Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (1998), this discourse plays a key role in shaping the understanding and presentation of heritage. Cultural institutions such as museums, through their privileged position of authority, created a set of narratives, representations and practices that form what is known as Authorised Heritage Discourse. The less privileged groups, comprising heritage users such as visitors, inhabitants and neighbours of heritage sites, as well as the (co-)

producers of heritage not acknowledged within the AHD, were not seen as important in the production of heritage meaning. The concept of AHD has been adopted by Laurajane Smith (2006) to critically analyse the ways in which heritage is defined, interpreted and presented. It is important to note that, while the AHD has tried to “preserve” the past in an “unchanged” form for the future, and in this sense can be spoken of as an institutionalised discourse reinforced by the stability of the persistence of authority and experts, it is not shaped in isolation from the practices of everyday life, which, constituting its borders and margins, transcend its heterodoxy. The grassroots engagement with heritage has introduced a multiplicity of heritage interpretations, going beyond the genealogical model of heritage preservation (Ingold and Kurttila 2000), yet referring to it in heritage practice. These grassroots heritage interpretations have never been homogenous and never sought to be so (Astudillo and Salazar 2023). Instead, each was shaped by a unique constellation of individual positionalities of the actors who engaged with genealogical heritage, and the intersectionalities of their privileges and vulnerabilities (Smith et al. 2011). Therefore, dichotomising the bottom-up and institutional perspectives, and juxtapositioning them as competing narratives standing in opposition to each other, is a significant simplification. The flows of interpretation of the past to meet present needs are multivectoral and their plasticity is not arranged along an axis of symmetry.

The status quo of a static view of heritage, as per AHD, has been slowly changing under the influence of the critical turn in heritage studies (Smith 2006; Harrison 2013). The new heritage regime (Toce and Dourou 2020) was created by contemporary societies redefining the common understandings of heritage and heritage practices. The grassroots engagement with heritage was acknowledged as a meaningful instance of heritage-making recognising the right of non-institutional users to shape heritage production by including in the heritage canon what had previously been ignored, marginalised and contested. As David Crouch (2010, 69) depicted, the process of constituting heritage is a perpetual performance of “heritaging”. The mere heritage object loses its meaning in favour of socio-cultural performances of various actors who negotiate their roles and heritage meanings in the performance *of* heritage, *at* heritage and *with* heritage (Haldrup and Bærenholdt 2015, 65). These theorisations lead to the conclusion that heritage does not exist until it is experienced. This book builds on the achievements of critical heritage studies, developing a theoretical and empirical analysis of heritage practices as performed in the present by the individuals and beyond AHD.

The second realm of heritage production named by Harvey (2001, 325) is the spatial one and acknowledges the role of place in heritage production. This aligns with the developments of the sensory turn in the social sciences (Lefebvre 1991). Smith (2006, 86) claims that “heritage is about a sense of place” and provides “a physical anchor or geographical sense of belonging”. Macdonald (2013, 121) argues “[i]n heritage it is through place – and its specific physical elements, such as buildings or natural features – that the past

is made present". Place is therefore central to heritage. This spatiality of heritage raises questions about the role of mobility in heritage production. Place is never fixed, shifting its meanings according to the social relationships taking place there (Massey 1994). Neither is the human presence in a place fixed. People travel over shorter and longer distances, changing the meaning of the places they visit, inhabit and pass through. If we accept that social relationships change the meaning of place (Massey 1994), and that the meaning of heritage is influenced by the place it relates to (Macdonald 2013), then we may conclude that human mobility influences heritage negotiations as it holds the potential to change the places where the heritage is exercised and to produce heritage performances in new destinations. This can be done in various ways. We name three of them below, involving people's conscious engagement with heritage. First, people *move to heritage* sites and places where heritage is performed as tourists, pilgrims and potential settlers to *experience* what these places offer and engage with their heritage (Kania this volume, Żaliński, this volume; Gajda and Jukna this volume). This very mobility changes the places that are arenas for heritage production and influences further the change in heritage performances. People also *move with heritage* – in an act of migrating – and recreate their heritage practices in the new settlement, which offers different possibilities than their past spatial habitus did (Desille, Nikielska-Sekuła and Håndlykken-Luz, Corrales-Øverlid, Barkeley, and Yu, this volume). To maintain their heritage practice, they often adjust their practices to the circumstances of new surroundings, introducing an inevitable change to heritage (Nikielska-Sekuła 2019). Finally, people *move through heritage*: the very movement of their body allows them to engage with heritage sites (Banaszkiewicz, Stach, and Kania, this volume), or with heritage itself: buildings (Żaliński, this volume) heritage parades (Mota Santos, this volume), capoeira (Costa de Silva, this volume), and music (Boagey, this volume). Sometimes the very movement itself becomes heritage (Bińczycka-Gacek, this volume). In each of the instances of movement presented here, the body of those involved moves along, either in terms of spatial mobility or through a micro-movement (to produce dance, to sing ...). This movement directly contributes to the creation of new forms of heritage, and this is what the contributors to this book excellently grasp. This volume analyses how place and distance play a role in heritage production, discussing through the cases the dynamic between mobility and immobility in heritage production. In this discussion, the perspective of the moving body, with its multisensory perception, takes a central role.

Mobile, Multisensory Body in Heritage Production

Sharon Macdonald (2013, 104) suggested that the past is "materialised in bodies, things, buildings and places." In her conceptualisation of heritage, Macdonald established the relationship between the past and the present through embodiment and materialisation: the body, the material objects and the embodied

rituals bring the past to the present and materialise it. Building on the works of Nadia Seremetakis, she claimed that the traces of the past, and hence the traces of heritage, “may be transmitted through, say, sedimented bodily movements or sculptural and architectural forms” (Macdonald 2013, 121). Similarly, Rodney Harrison acknowledged the central role of embodiment and materiality in the reproduction of heritage. He stated that heritage:

constitutes the social “work” that individuals and societies undertake to produce the past in the present, this process is not one that occurs only in the minds of humans, or one that functions solely in a discursive manner, but involves a range of material beings who co-produce heritage as a result of their own affordances or material capabilities.

(Harrison 2013, 113)

In a similar line, Laura Jane Smith (2021) operationalised heritage as embodied. Building on Schatzki’s practice theory (Cetina, Schatzki and Von Savigny 2005), which puts individual practices in the focus and treats them as a starting point of analysing cultural systems of meanings, Smith underlined that all human practices are mediated/conducted by the body. Human performances (Butler 2002), which also include performances of heritage, use the body to:

materialise the meanings and normative values that underwrite and are re/formulated in the performative nature of actions. In their materialisation, abstractions (such as identity, sense of place) are made material – that is, they have consequence in the doing world and the lived experiences of people.

(Smith 2021, 48)

This volume builds on the operationalisations of heritage as embodied and spatial and is oriented on the presentation of “the ways in which heritage is caught up in the quotidian bodily practices of dwelling, travelling, working and ‘being’ in the world” (Harrison 2013, 113).

Acknowledging the subjectivity of the body and its role in heritage reproduction is an outcome of the popularisation of the sensory turn in the social sciences (Howes 2022). The canonical works of Sarah Pink (2009, 2013), Paul Stoller (1997), Nadia Seremetakis (1996, 2019) and David Howes (1991, 2003) have contributed to developing body-based approaches in the social and humanistic research. The contributors to this volume actively employ these approaches, taking a close look at the experiences of the body in heritage performances. They focus on *the body in the movement* and/or *the body on the move*, engaging with heritage through its consumption, observation, experiencing, selling and (re)production. While these ways of engaging with heritage have certainly non-bodily aspects, this particular volume places the body and the senses at the centre of the discussion. In other words, the contributors to the volume unpack what it means to *make* heritage at a bodily level. By doing so, they focus on three core instances of the embodied

engagement with heritage: (1) the body as part of touristic heritage endeavours, (2) the body as the carrier of heritage in making transnational identities, and (3) the body as the marker of local spatial belonging through embodied heritage production.

First, in this volume, the body is placed at the centre as part of visitors' endeavours oriented on heritage experience. The contributors describe how the senses react to the surroundings of heritage sites that change as the body moves along – the landscapes, smells and sounds that the body acquires as it traverses the physical distance of or between heritage sites (Banaszkiewicz and Stach, this volume). Other authors aim to comprehend the role of the senses in bodily experience, which is activated by stimuli from both the physical and virtual (immaterial) realities (Gajda and Jukna, this volume). The bodily experiences of visitors to heritage sites are an affective practice in comparison to their own memories and imaginaries to which the cultural production of literature, the film industry, and so on, contributes. A literary depiction of what has become an “attraction” for visitors to the slavery heritage sites – the Middle Passage – was analysed, grasping the paradox of the mobility of the immobile enslaved body (Bińczycka-Gacek, this volume). The way that embodied knowledge is mobilised to produce heritage spectacles to tourists, showing excellently how the mobility of others changes the everyday immobility of those who share space with heritage sites, is also discussed through the case of ethnic, living heritage (Kania, this volume).

Second, this volume assesses the role of sensory impressions in heritage reproduction in the context of migration and globalisation. The body takes part in the consumption, production and selling of heritage, here materialised as ethnic food (Corrales-Øverlid, Barkley, and Yu, this volume), contributing to the maintenance of transnational identities. In a similar line, the role of the body in conveying a connection with transnational identities, some of them globalised, through the performance of various heritage: music, dance, embroidery and more (Desille, Boagey and Costa de Silva, this volume) is discussed.

Third, this volume analyses the central role of the body in creating a sense of belonging to the local community through embodying heritage performances. The body is shown as engaged in the production and reproduction of the local heritage, highlighting its spatiality in contesting the city's space through public heritage engagement (Mota Santos, this volume). The contributors to the volume show how the body is mobilised to create physical and mental homes in new settings through heritage production and rephrasing (Nikielska-Sekuła and Håndlykken-Luz, this volume). The way embodied heritage is mobilised to legitimise belonging by newcomers is also discussed: either through presenting the manifestations of newcomers' heritage through bodily means (Dessile, this volume), or through discussing the reinterpretations of the local heritage assessed through sight, smell and touch by mainstream settlers in an ethnic minority-populated area (Żaliński, this volume).

Besides the focus on how heritage is exercised on the level of the body, the collection of chapters in this volume pushes the aspect of the multisensoriality

and embodiment of heritage a step further. The contributors to the volume ask the question of whether sensory impressions and sensory practices can be seen as heritage themselves. As exemplified at the beginning of this section, the view on heritage as embodied seems to have entered the canon of critical heritage studies. The consequence of acknowledging the embodied nature of heritage is the recognition of sensory experiences as constituting heritage – in or beyond the relationship with the materiality of heritage sites, objects, rituals, and so on. This view has not been widely explored in heritage studies so far (Firat 2021). Instead, multisensoriality has been mainly presented as a means to access heritage, rather than as heritage on its own. Against this dominant view, the collection of chapters in this volume approaches this problem from an empirical perspective of individual experience, showing that often the observable actions oriented on performing heritage are less important than the multisensory stimuli that become the outcome of these performances. The act of cooking ethnic food is important, but this is the experience of the taste that activates the discursive reference to a group identity constituting *sensory heritage* (Corrales-Øverlid, Barkley, and Yu, this volume). For many passers-by, a walk through the almost invisible remains of the Kraków-Plaszów concentration camp (KL Plaszów) is an ordinary walk in the park. That changes, however, when the walker is encouraged to imagine and embody the history of the WWII genocide that took place there, translating this multisensory experience into *sensory heritage* (Banaszekiewicz, this volume). The multisensory impressions are therefore not only a part of heritage performances but may also constitute heritage itself and further theorisations of this phenomenon are needed (see Firat 2021, Bendix 2022).

Overview of the Volume

As indicated, this volume takes a grassroots perspective of individual heritage performances of mobile and moving actors, analysing them with close attention to their embodied aspects: bodily experiences, sensory impressions and the affect and emotions they evoke. As with the senses, heritage shapes the daily experiences of individuals and communities, even though its role goes largely unacknowledged. A heritage community is an amorphous structure of dynamic relationships whose constellation is fragile and transient, especially due to the nature of its movement. The three aspects mentioned at the beginning of this introduction – *human*, *temporal* and *spatial* – contribute to this complexity. To explore this fluid and quotidian phenomenon, research must be attentive and sensitive. As presented in the volume, a multisensory approach accepts its epistemological foundation based on its own vulnerability stemming from dynamic and elusive encounters of researchers.

This volume is the result of intensive collaboration by an international and interdisciplinary research group initiated in late 2022 as part of the Critical Heritage Studies Hub (CHSH). The Hub emerged as an initiative bringing together representatives of various disciplines involved in heritage research at

the Jagiellonian University in Krakow. Being one of the flagship projects of the Excellence Initiative programme, CHSH was designed to develop critical studies on heritage in close relationship with the socio-economic environment. The goal of setting up the research group was to offer fresh insight into issues at the interface of heritage and mobility studies, by approaching them with a multisensorial framework.

Synergies between the research conducted by the members of the group were vibrantly discussed by contributors and editors at numerous online meetings. However, the key to developing common threads and transversal topics was an in-person workshop held in Krakow (Poland) at the end of April 2023. The workshop served as a stimulating space for critical engagement with individual chapters and thematic sections. The process was supported by experienced, world-renowned researchers Kelvin E.Y. Low and Noel B. Salazar, who agreed to take part in the project as discussants. The discussions on the cultural aspects of world perception and the bodily experience of exploring heritage through multi-sensoriality revealed a strong awareness of the researchers' position. This is also reflected in the auto-ethnographical narrative style of the individual chapters.

The volume opens with Monta Santos's participatory ethnography dealing with the *rusga* parade, an annual street festival organised in old Porto. This living heritage in its multisensory, corporeal aspect is a meaningful performance of working-class inhabitants who emancipate their social identity by moving through the streets of the dominant city that had been heritagised and, as a result, heavily tourismified by including it in the UNESCO World Heritage List. The problem of the heritagisation of living tradition is brought up also by Kania, who, over the years, has observed changes in the three-day traditional annual ceremony of the renovation of the woven bridge Q'eswachaka (Cusco Department). Kania emphasises that the gradual commercialisation of the Andean people's heritage due to UNESCO recognition deprives visitors of the possibility of engaging all senses in contact with the Qhapaq An heritage. Tourism is often perceived as a significant factor in the preservation of heritage, but it is also criticised as leading to commodification and a withdrawal of the local community from any genuine involvement in heritage-making. The subsequent chapters in this volume demonstrate that, despite this risk, it is possible for the visitor's experience to resist staged encounters and explore heritage through an intense multisensorial relationship of body and space. Maria Jukna and Kinga Gajda use a comparative perspective to examine bodily engagement with displays in trauma museums, using the examples of the Jewish Museum in Berlin and the Museum of Military Sexual Slavery by Japan in Daegu, South Korea. The researchers demonstrate how various modalities of experiencing reality activate the senses with different intensities, which is relevant to a wider debate about visitors' agency in relation to heritage sites (Smith 2021). It also opens a new path in multisensory research. This volume focuses on multisensoriality that is oriented towards the experience of the material world in direct physical, embodied

relation. However, multisensory research also requires extended insight into the epistemology of multimodal mobility in the experience of virtual heritage spaces, ranging from the social worlds of new media to the metaverse. The question of the immobilised body that yet experiences mobility continues in Elżbieta Bińczycka-Gacek's contribution, an analysis of literary depictions of the Middle Passage – the heritagised forced journey of slaves from the African continent to North America. She offers suggestive literary descriptions of “multisensory mobility”, using them as a pretext to discuss the interplay between mobility and immobility as seen through the perspective of the tied-up body on the sailing ship. The topic of travel, though now voluntary, is continued in the contributions of both Stach and Banaszekiewicz, who in their anthropologically oriented considerations, penetrate sightseeing beyond mainstream routes. They focus on a heritage that is difficult, contested and peripheral to the canon and, as such, it is also more diverse when it comes to the sensorial aspects of encounters. Banaszekiewicz demonstrates that a sensory-oriented strategy of heritage interpretation focusing on the present can be utilised to reveal the complexity, intricacy and disturbing nature of traumatic sites.

The kinaesthetic approach in Stach's contribution is indirectly continued in the chapter by Thais Costa de Silva, who focuses on the transnational heritage of capoeira. Her contribution shows how the movement of the body in capoeira, traditionally connected to Afro-Brazilians, constitutes the globalised multisensory heritage that has the power to initiate dialogue between people of different geographical, racial and socio-cultural origins. Continuing the topic of music, Delphine Boagey's contribution discusses how the diasporic individuals identifying as British Indian use sound to foster the (re)production of ancestral and new homelands. She grasps how music operates in people's lives, constituting an important aspect of their transnational identity negotiations.

The production of heritage as an outcome of a forced mobility, though in a completely different context, is continued by Amandine Desille in her account of the heritage production of Ukrainians in Portugal after the expansion of the Russian aggression in Ukraine in February 2022. Desille presents a powerful account of the embodiment of heritage by Ukrainian women, which sometimes takes very direct bodily forms such as tattooing traditional Ukrainian embroidery. Diasporic heritage, here recreated through food production, is also discussed by Yuanyuan Yu on the example of the Chinese in Sri Lanka. Yu approaches diaspora practices with the idea of multisensory transcoding mechanisms that in various forms activate domesticated cultural senses and values. The production of heritage through food in exile also takes the central point in the chapter by Lucy Barkley. She discusses the culinary heritage-making in the context of diasporic im/mobility. Using the case of British-Palestinians, Barkley excellently grasps how the multisensory heritage of food can serve as an escape from forced immobility – amidst the lack of access to Gaza. Food production is also discussed by Ann Cathrin Corrales-

Øverlid, who presents the efforts of Peruvians living in the US to mark their distinctive identity through selling the heritage of food in their new homeland. By doing so, they engage in the process of homemaking, where the multi-sensory experiences of consuming food becomes central.

This topic of homemaking is continued by Karolina Nikielska-Sekuła and Åsne Håndlykken-Luz, who discuss the performative and sensory practices of homemaking by women from the favelas in Rio, around the imagining, materialising and making sense of their houses, approached here as their personal heritage. The authors refer to these embodied performances of people oriented on house-building and maintenance as heritage homemaking, and they constitute acts of contesting the space amidst state and drug cartel violence in the area. Homemaking through a multisensory engagement with heritage, this time not contesting the space but as the spatial appropriation of local heritage, is discussed by Adam Żaliński. Żski describes the process of members of mainstream Polish society settling in the ethnic areas of Lemko land in Poland. He does it by taking a perspective of the encounters between the feeling body and the local heritage. Significantly, the new residents are reclaiming a heritage that was abandoned by the community under dramatic circumstances. Through their actions, they give new meaning to the legacy of a difficult past.

The volume ends with the concluding contribution of Noel B. Salazar, in which he theorises that movement is inherent to the body. He argues that sensory perception is unequivocally entangled with the kinaesthesia of our bodies, making a case for the importance of this volume's focus – multisensoriality and movement as a means to perceive heritage.

While the content of this volume significantly contributes theoretically, methodologically and empirically to the intersection between mobility and cultural heritage studies, as outlined in the introduction, the existing scholarship also presents certain limitations. First, while the geographical distribution of the showcased cases is reasonably extensive and spans different continents, it does not uniformly cover the entire globe. If it comes to the authors' affiliations, they are predominantly European. The efforts to address this bias, such as issuing an open call for papers widely disseminated across global research networks, lead to securing contributors based in Europe, South America and Asia, but not from other continents. This shows the regionalisation within global research, prompting the academic community to actively seek meaningful cooperation with scholars based in world regions that are underrepresented in what we see from a Euro-American perspective as international science. Second, the presented research predominantly employs anthropological and ethnographic approaches. Nevertheless, the volume also features chapters that demonstrate that researching the cultural heritage and mobility nexus from a multisensory perspective can be fruitfully conducted in other academic domains like cultural studies (see Chapter 4, Bińczycka-Gacek, this volume). Third, it is apparent that the language used to describe processes at the intersection of mobility and cultural heritage

viewed through the lens of multisensoriality, is still evolving. While this volume contributes to the advancement of this linguistic development, it is at the same time limited by the constraints of the existing terminology produced within academia thus far. The limitations of the volume show that it is crucial to collaborate across and between disciplines to bridge scholarly gaps and collectively explore the meaning of phenomena under investigation within the framework of synergistic research fields and jointly self-reflective and critical development of narratives that reflect the specificity of intercultural and multisensory experiences.

Towards Mobile and Sensory Heritage(s)

This volume aims to bridge the gap between cultural heritage and mobility studies by employing theoretical and methodological multisensory perspectives. Under the influence of globalisation, mass migration and mass tourism, heritage studies have become permanently intertwined with the processes of mobility. The intersection of heritage and mobility studies has been the subject of extensive research, with burgeoning literature on heritage and tourism, a growing interest in the heritage of migrants, heritage politics in the context of mobility and an expansion of the field of memory studies in a transnational and translocal perspective. These developments have resulted in offering a fresh contribution to critical heritage approaches.

The current volume aims to contribute to this body of literature by engaging with theoretical and methodological developments from both cultural heritage and mobility fields of study in order to present a broad range of empirical cases that bring together the mobility and cultural heritage processes. What is more, its ambition is to take this discussion further, through the employment of theoretical and methodological approaches from the multisensory studies in the presented analyses. As a result, the collection of case studies presented in this volume covers empirical, theoretical and methodological accounts of the embodiment of heritage in the context of mobility on macro, meso and micro levels, as well as heritage change under mobility and from a multisensory perspective.

The approach to heritage presented in this volume considers performative constellations of people, time and space. It does not exclude a post-anthropocentric focus from the horizon of reflection. Nevertheless, the aim of the project was to delve into the sensual world of people who exercise the senses of their existence in embodied heritage. The volume consists of reflexive, interdisciplinary, comparative and multi-sited studies. It takes the perspective of synaesthesia – a phenomenon where the stimulation of one sensory or cognitive pathway leads to involuntary experiences in another. Acknowledging the embodied aspect of heritage, which, as mentioned, does not exist beyond human experience, the contributors to the volume theorised embodied aspects of heritage practices look at the body as it moves *to*, *with* and *through* heritage.

Collaborative projects, such as the one that led to this volume, being conducted in a critical dialogue, are essential to address the interdependencies and complementarities of the phenomenon of mobile and sensory heritage(s). The geographical representation of the cases presented throughout the chapters of this volume covers countries and regions including Germany, South Korea, Peru, Poland, Slovakia, the UK, Portugal, Brazil, Sri Lanka, the US and the Middle Passage between the Africa and North America. The featured groups include Palestinians and British in the UK, Chinese in Sri Lanka, Ukrainians in Portugal and Peruvians in the UK. This makes for great regional and cultural diversity of the contributions presenting commonalities on the embodied experience of heritage on the move between different, and often arbitrary “borders” – national and regional. The empirical accounts the contributors present give an insight into the interdisciplinary discussion on methodological, theoretical and empirical advancements of the multisensorial approach in studying heritage in the context of mobility. This further opens the debate on researching mobility regimes in crises, at both global and local scales, as well as people’s agency in relation to the sensory experience of heritage, which takes into account the issue of in/ex-clusiveness, (in)accessibility, and various modes of participation in cultural heritage, making for a timely contribution of the book.

References

- Adell, Nicolas, Regina Bendix, Chiara Bortolotto and Markus Tauschek, eds. 2015. *Between Imagined Communities and Communities of Practice: Participation, Territory, and the Making of Heritage*. Göttingen: Göttingen University Press.
- Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Appadurai, Arjun. 1996. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Astudillo, A.E. and N.B. Salazar. 2023. Heritage imaginaries and imaginaries of heritage: An analytical lens to rethink heritage from ‘alter-native’ ontologies. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 1–14. doi:10.1080/13527258.2023.2284739.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. 1998. *Globalization: The Human Consequences*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bendix, R. 2022. Life itself: An essay on the sensory and the (potential) end of heritage making. *Traditiones*, 50 (1), 43–51. doi:10.3986/Traditio2021500104.
- Bendix, Regina, Aditya Eggert and Arnika Peselmann, eds. 2012. *Heritage Regimes and the State*. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen.
- Butler, J. 2002. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. London: Routledge.
- Cetina, K.K., T.R. Schatzki and E. Von Savigny, eds. 2005. *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*. London: Routledge.
- Council of Europe. 2005. Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (Faro Convention, 2005) Culture and Cultural Heritage. www.coe.int/en/web/culture-and-heritage/faro-convention.

- Cresswell, Tim. 2010. Towards a politics of mobility. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 28 (1): 17–31. doi:10.1068/d11407.
- Crouch, David. 2010. Culture, heritage and representation: Perspectives on visibility and the past. In *Culture, Heritage and Representation: Perspectives on Visibility and the Past*, edited by Emma Waterton and Steve Watson, 57–69. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Di Giovine, Michael A. 2009. *The Heritage-Scape: UNESCO, World Heritage, and Tourism*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Firat, Hasan Baran. 2021. Acoustics as tangible heritage: Re-embodying the sensory heritage in the boundless reign of sight. *Preservation, Digital Technology & Culture*, 50 (1): 3–14. doi:10.1515/pdtc-2020-0028.
- Haldrup, Michael and Jørgen Ole Bærenholdt. 2015. Heritage as performance. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research*, edited by Emma Waterton and Steve Watson, 52–68. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Hall, Stuart. 2023. Whose heritage? Un-settling “the Heritage”, re-imagining the post-nation. In *Whose Heritage? Challenging Race and Identity in Stuart Hall’s Post-Nation Britain*, edited by Susan L.T. Ashley and Degna Stone, 13–25. London: Routledge. doi:10.4324/9781003092735-3.
- Hardy, D. 1998. Historical geography and heritage studies. *Area*, 20 (4): 333–338.
- Harrison, Rodney. 2015. Heritage and globalization. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research*, edited by Emma Waterton and Steve Watson, 297–312. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Harrison, Rodney. 2013. *Heritage: Critical Approaches*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Harvey, D.C. 2001. Heritage pasts and heritage presents: Temporality, meaning and the scope of heritage studies. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 7 (4): 319–338. doi:10.1080/13581650120105534.
- Hewison, Robert. 1987. *The Heritage Industry*. London: Methuen.
- Howes, D. 1991. *The Varieties of Sensory Experience: A Sourcebook in the Anthropology of the Senses*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Howes, D. 2003. *Sensual Relations: Engaging the Senses in Culture and Social Theory*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Howes, D. 2022. Quali (a) tative methods: Sense-based research in the social sciences and humanities. *Qualitative Sociology Review*, 18 (4), 18–37.
- Ingold, T. and T. Kurttila. 2000. Perceiving the environment in Finnish Lapland. *Body & Society*, 6 (3–4): 183–196.
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara. 1998. *Destination Culture: Tourism, Museums, and Heritage*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Labadi, Sophia. 2022. *Rethinking Heritage for Sustainable Development*. London: UCL Press.
- Lefebvre, H. 1991. *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Macdonald, Sharon. 2013. *Memorylands: Heritage and Identity in Europe Today*. London: Routledge.
- Massey, D. 1994. *Space, Place and Gender*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Nikielska-Sekula, K. 2019. Migrating heritage? Recreating ancestral and new homeland heritage in the practices of immigrant minorities. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 25 (11): 1113–1127. doi:10.1080/13527258.2019.1570543.
- Pink, S. 2013. *Doing Visual Ethnography* (3rd ed.). California: Sage.
- Pink, S. 2019. *Doing Sensory Ethnography* (2nd ed.). California: Sage.
- Salazar, Noel B. and Kiran Jayaram. 2018. *Keywords of Mobility: Critical Engagements*. New York: Berghahn Books.

- Salazar, Noel B. and Nina Glick Schiller. 2016. *Regimes of Mobility*. London: Routledge.
- Salazar, Noel B. 2020. *Momentous Mobilities: Anthropological Musings on the Meanings of Travel*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Schewel, Kerilyn. 2019. Understanding Immobility: Moving beyond the Mobility Bias in Migration Studies. *International Migration Review*, 54 (2): 328–355. doi:10.1177/0197918319831952.
- Seremetakis, Nadia. 1996. *Senses Still: Perception and Memory as Material Culture in Modernity*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Seremetakis, Nadia. 2019. *Sensing the Everyday: Dialogues from Austerity Greece*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Smith, Laurajane. 2006. *Uses of Heritage*. London: Routledge.
- Smith, Laurajane. 2021. *Emotional Heritage Visitor Engagement at Museums and Heritage Sites*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Smith, Laurajane, Paul A. Shackel and Gary Campbell, eds. 2011. *Heritage, Labour and the Working Classes*. London: Routledge.
- Stoller, P. 1989. *The Taste of Ethnographic Things: The Senses in Anthropology*. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania Press.
- Toce, B. and E. Dourou. 2020. Culture without borders: Cultural heritage management for local and regional development (Report). Congress of Local and Regional Authorities. Retrieved from <https://rm.coe.int/cg-cur-2020-15-03-en-cultural-heritage/16809f9fbd>.
- Tunbridge, J.E. and G.J. Ashworth. 1997. *Dissonant Heritage: The Management of the Past as a Resource in Conflict*. Chichester: J. Wiley.
- Urry, John. 2000. *Sociology beyond Societies: Mobilities for the Twenty First Century*. London: Routledge.
- Vered, Amit and Noel B. Salazar. 2020. *Pacing Mobilities: Timing, Intensity, Tempo and Duration of Human Movements*. New York: Berghahn.
- Waterton, Emma and Laurajane Smith. 2010. The recognition and misrecognition of community heritage. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 16 (1–2): 4–15. doi:10.1080/13527250903441671.
- Waterton, Emma and Steve Watson, eds. 2015. *The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Watson, Steve and Emma Waterton. 2010. Heritage and community engagement. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 16 (1–2): 1–3. doi:10.1080/13527250903441655.