

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)

Chapter 14

Sensing the Place: Homemaking among Domestic Migrants in the Cultural Landscape of the Lemko Region

ADAM ŻALIŃSKI

(CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0)

DOI: 10.4324/9781032713786-15

This chapter was funded by the Jagiellonian University.



14 Sensing the Place

Homemaking among Domestic Migrants in the Cultural Landscape of the Lemko Region

Adam Żaliński

Introduction: Study Rationale and Research Methodology

Domesticity is a core human experience in most people's everyday life. The broad inquiry of what is home, and a specific one about senses and homemaking posed from a perspective of migration research, is vital and stimulating when it comes to homes, housing and dwelling arrangements undertaken by migrants (Boccagni and Bonfanti 2023). In this case, the research deals with wooden houses settled by domestic migrants in the mountain landscape of south-eastern Poland. The senses can be engaged in this process of interaction with the landscape where the dwelling is located, as well as when taking into consideration the attention to the use and reshaping of regional heritage in homemaking.

The reflection concerning senses has long been present in social and cultural sciences, but it has only gained prominence in the last few decades (Howes 2024). Still, what is articulated here is a sociocultural approach to this issue that goes beyond reductionistic accounts of senses in psychology and other related disciplines (Howes 2024). Introducing a mobility and migration context can draw closer a number of issues such as the presence and change in sensorial experiences, as well as their uniqueness or prevalence in the specific context of a given landscape characteristic. In simple words, the study aims to reveal what it feels like (in terms of multisensoriality) to move in and establish a living (migrating and homemaking) in a particular place (dwelling) and its surroundings (space – landscape) that has a specific heritage potential. This is understood as an active presence and interacting with the cultural landscape in a very specific situation – homemaking. In this way it is an attempt to build a perspective where sensual perceptions play a part in establishing attitudes and actions within and directed towards a particular space (place) – a dwelling. The process of homemaking of various people on the move has received some attention in the literature, especially in the context of international migrations (e.g. Boccagni and Bonfanti 2023; Boccagni and Hondagneu-Sotelo 2023). Still, this study adheres to the topic of domestic migrants who interact with regional heritage, while taking into consideration various local circumstances and recreating it while establishing a dwelling place in the Lemko region.

DOI: 10.4324/9781032713786-15

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

The Lemko land is a mountainous region covering mainly the Low Beskids range in today's south-eastern Poland, inhabited originally almost entirely by the Lemko (also known as Ruthenian or Carpatho-Ruthenian; Magocsi 2015, 1–14), an ethnic group of East Slavic descent. Due to two forced resettlements in the 1940s, the region lost its dominant ethnic population and faced the destruction of its original culture (Horbal 2010, 419–423, 430–440). However, in the decades to come, it regained only part of its pre-war population, this time composed mainly of Polish settlers. The initial depopulation and gradual influx of new inhabitants changed the ethnic, social, architectural and agricultural characteristics of the region, at the same time forming examples of internal migration and, importantly in this case, changing reinterpretations in the sphere of heritage. Up until today, only a small number of the indigenous Lemko population returned, mainly due to a decades-long policy of restrictions by the central authorities during the communist Polish People's Republic.

Decades after the resettlements, the scarcity of material remnants left in displaced villages is striking in the landscape of the region (today, there are dozens of empty Lemko villages; Horbal 2010, 457). In some cases, the area still serves agricultural functions (e.g. land cultivation and sheep grazing). Places representing the heritage of former settlements are Lemko cemeteries, roadside crosses



Figure 14.1 Landscape of the Lemko region including a traditional *chyza* house
Source: Photo by the Author.

and chapels, and feral orchards (Kłos 2010), many of them forgotten and overgrown with vegetation. An exemption from this dilapidated and deserted view are wooden churches (tserkvas), as well as the traditional dwellings – *chyża* – a long building that originally housed living, farm and livestock parts under one roof, along with a spacious attic that was used as a barn.

To illustrate the topic of homemaking in the cultural landscape of the Lemko region with viable examples, interview data was used. The material presents the experiences of people who migrated into the region and were engaged in homemaking in a new site. Nine individual and group interviews were conducted in Polish, involving 14 people – eight men and six women. The interviewees identified with Polish ethnicity and migrated into the region usually no longer than 10 years before.¹ Among the considerations that bind interviewees is the fact that they currently live in wooden houses, which in most cases have been preserved thanks to their efforts. It needs to be highlighted that the interviewees represent diverse people who gradually moved into the region, but are bound by certain common characteristics, such as seeking a life-changing experience and having a varying degree of involvement in the Lemko heritage. Interestingly, all of them were originally tourists roaming the region in search of solitude and tranquillity. The recorded interviews are accounts of their personal discovery of local heritage, with special



Figure 14.2 A *chyża* house undergoing restoration

Source: Photo by the Author.

attention given to the *chyża* houses and their preservation, understood as a private enterprise, preceded by increasing engrossment in the culture of the Lemkos, their tragic history involving displacement, as well as the natural environment of the region. After migrating into the region, the establishment of ties with former inhabitants is noticeable in many cases. Accounts of personal lifestyle change associated with migrating from a city to countryside complement the picture.

This work is further organised into three main parts. The first part presents the landscape–home(-making) nexus with a focus on the senses that are present in building a relationship with a specific place – a new home. The second part delivers a presentation and analysis of empirical material in the form of interviews conducted among people who settled into the region. The third part reflects on the results of the study in the perspective of theoretical underpinnings.

Landscape–Home(-making) Nexus, and Senses

The power of landscapes in terms of mutual human–landscape relations is reflected by Bender (2002, 136), who claims that “people make landscapes, but also landscapes make them”, as they “are not just ‘views’ but intimate encounters. They are not just about seeing, but about *experiencing* with all the senses”. This is noticeable in the European Landscape Convention, which defines a landscape as “an area, as *perceived* by people, whose character is the result of the action and *interaction* of natural and/or human factors” (Council of Europe 2000, 9; added emphasis). It is worth mentioning that landscapes have been recognised as “a key element of individual and social well-being” (Council of Europe 2000, 8), also because “sensory (visual, auditory, olfactory, tactile, taste) and emotional perception ... of ... [the] environment ... are essential for the respect and safeguarding of the identity of the population itself and for individual enrichment and that of society as a whole” (31). In the broadest terms, behaviours directed towards the environment can transmit symbolic qualities, including those connected to self-identity (Gatersleben and van der Werff 2019). It is now becoming clear that landscape comes to play with factors such as nationality, culture, and religion (Howard 2012). In particular, these are the factors that differentiate one group’s perception of a landscape from another’s. Perception can be understood as a “mental impression of something perceived”, whereas sensation can refer to that “which is felt physiologically” (Dixon and Straughan 2013, 36). “Sense, or *‘the senses’* ... refer to the specific sense modes – touch, smell, taste, sight, hearing and the sense of balance. This is sense as sensation or feeling” (Rodaway 1994, 5). This brings us to the notion of sensory ethnography, which is based on the assumption that knowledge is gained through multisensoriality and intersensoriality, as well as experience and practice (Pink 2009). In addition to traditional modes of representation of the social and material world, this scientific turn takes into consideration the phenomenological and embodied elements. The assumption is that these sources of

ethnographic knowledge are under-explored in ethnographic research, with more attention needed when it comes to their role in people's lives, both on an individual and a socially shared level, as well as ethnographic practice. Rather than the focus on the visual, the multisensory quality of the world perception is highlighted where the interconnectivity of the senses is evident, even to the extent that they are inseparable, suggesting a fusion between vision and other modalities (Pink 2006, 44–48).

Implying mainly a phenomenological approach, it needs to be noted that human perception, usually defined in terms of visual qualities, is crucial in defining what landscape is (Cosgrove 2003; Graumann 2002; Tveit, Ode Sang and Hagerhall 2019, 46). The connections of the landscape with seeing and the sense of sight is evident in many European languages, but other senses like smell and sound are important in establishing relations with a specific place (Cosgrove 2003, 249). As a modality, “[v]ision is very much a taken-for-granted sense, and its true nature and limits are almost hidden by its visibility” (Rodaway 1994, 115). Rodaway points to a paradox connected to vision (and visual geographies): it is very familiar as an experience (at least for most people), but at the same time “we know so little of how it gives us a sense of space [...] and place in conjunction with the rest of our sensory faculties” (115). The phenomenological approach focuses on how each individual assigns personal relevance and interprets one's landscape encounters, and this way can be considered mainly subjective (Daniel and Vining 1983, 72–76). While sight is obviously the primary sense involved when considering a landscape, it is clear that other modalities are also important (Desille and Nikielska-Sekuła 2023), studying sensual experiences, understood as multisensorial and intersensorial, could reveal their place in terms of landscape perception as well as homemaking (an example of a specific place²) of immigrants coming into the region.

Landscape, in particular cultural landscape, can be considered as heritage (Jones 2003). In fact, cultural heritage is embedded in the landscape. This is especially clear when considering the protection of landscapes by UNESCO. In the simplest terms, this form of cultural heritage³ can be considered as expressing a relationship between people and their environment, thus connected to special perception and the evaluation of sites. The origin of this heritage can be debated, for example it can be recreated or performed. On this occasion, cultural heritage will be understood as:

a group of resources inherited from the past which people identify, independently of ownership, as a reflection and expression of their constantly evolving values, beliefs, knowledge and traditions. It includes all aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time.

(Council of Europe 2005, 2)

On this basis, a wide perspective referring to the environment as well as the interaction of people with it and a processual approach of changes occurring

with time are introduced. As a result of the social underpinnings of cultural heritage, the notion of heritage community has now been established. It “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, 2). This refers to a group of people advocating public actions, but also a network of people sharing a common heritage goal. Still, studying individuals who value specific heritage and undertake actions towards it can give insight into the level of general social reference in a given case. This falls beyond the simple utility of a landscape and may involve looking more closely at changing cultural and social motivations of actions undertaken within the landscape (landscape is considered a sociohistorical construct; Rodaway 1994, 127). One of the examples of these cues is the presence of a dwelling place. Potentially, the outcome of a multi-sensorial landscape quality assessment can have a relatively high status when it comes to individual decision-making of immigrants to settle in a particular dwelling place.

Besides (cultural) landscape, the terms place (attachment) and space are among those that can be utilised in the current study. They form a prerequisite when reflecting on homemaking. The concept of place embraces objective as well as subjective views of reality (Williams 2014; Price 2013; Probyn 2003). Price adopts Gieryn’s working definition of place and points to its three elements – “location, material form and meaningfulness” (Price 2013, 118, 119) that come simultaneously. Place attachment is an emotional bond formed with a particular place (Manzo and Devine-Wright 2019); it represents a basic human need (Price 2013, 125) and is associated with various emotions such as love, happiness, belongingness, as well as mixed and negative feelings (Manzo and Devine-Wright 2019, 138, 139). The creation of a place attachment depends, among other things, on sociocultural factors. Its construction is especially visible as an important element in various narratives (Price 2013, 122, 123). This means places can be carved out or plotted in interviews, sometimes in romanticised or defensive ways. Homemaking will be understood as a process of creating a place attachment, but also incorporating the material as well as behavioural aspects of place – the house and the landscape where it is located. The effect of homemaking is the general feeling of being at home while dwelling in a particular place, but also attributing other qualities of home to a particular place. Space and place are usually defined in relation to each other. Price (2013, 119, 120) points that space depicts a broader phenomenon, but they are interrelated, though places are produced socially. Spaces are “abstract, smooth, [and of] limitless quality” (Price 2013, 120). The result is that “places can be approached as pauses of sorts in what would otherwise be an overwhelming, meaningless flow of space-time” (Price 2013, 120).

Framing it straightforwardly, home can be analysed as an example of space, though not inevitably a fixed one (Douglas 1991, 289). Architectural accounts of homemaking and space, as well as ideas and assumptions about



Figure 14.3 Besides being a home, dwellings serve various purposes including a tourist shelter

Source: Photo by the Author.

their social relations, are not tangled (Walker 2002). Among other things, housing can reflect wide sociocultural dynamics, climate, the availability of building materials, as well as worldviews (Rapoport 1969). In general, the primitive and vernacular buildings studied by Rapoport (1969, 13) are the result of interaction between human (e.g. aspirations, needs and attitude to nature) and nature (e.g. climate, materials, site and landscape), in many cases with an emphasis on the latter. On the one hand, dwelling in a specific place or making a decision to settle raises the question of the emergence of sense of home that plays an important role in grounding people to a particular place, especially in the context of migration (Ralph and Staeheli 2011, 518). On the other hand, at least two forms of landscape characteristics can affect the buildings there, namely the physical characteristics of the site as well as the symbolic, religious or cultural values embedded in it (Rapoport 1969, 74–78).

Presentation of Results: Sensing, Landscape and the Homemaking Process

The subject of this research concerns the sensual experiences of the cultural landscape of the Lemko region in an attempt to understand its initial role in

the decision to migrate into the region. Further, these experiences will be presented, although bearing in mind the initial assumption that exact sensorial descriptions sometimes create a challenge for the interviewees: “I think it requires a lot of talent for poetry to describe [these impressions] ” [Int_7b 13m57s]. What is clear is that visual accounts of sensorial experiences connected to the landscape and homemaking are common, with other possibilities involving various modalities and their interconnection being introduced spontaneously: “I think it is best to describe it as a synthesis, a sum of everything that accompanies us” [Int_7b 14m10s]. It also should be noted here, and will be reintroduced further, that the respondents’ experiences associated with landscape and home often mingled, making it challenging to separate these streams of notions and establish them into coherent parts. This is interesting on its own, but could also be considered a characteristic of embodied senses as opposed to the more traditional accounts of senses described earlier (e.g. psychology).

The decision process leading to establishing a dwelling place could be associated with past tourist experiences, as with some respondents, or even childhood memories where the memories of home or other houses are sourced. “Place is deeply felt in childhood” (Price 2013, 125), still, an attachment to a place deepens as time passes and as experience accumulates, so places become important in individual biographies. It is evident that they serve self-identity processes, marking certain episodes in life as an anchor for referencing to them, as well as a deterrent when associated with unpleasant feelings. In some interviewees, childhood memories are clearly sensorial and have their reference in the imaginary:

This decision [to buy a house] is deeply rooted in my childhood. As a child when I visited old churches or houses in open-air museums I adored to smell wood simply and I even like the smell of tar used to impregnate. The dream to live in a wooden house accompanied me always. This is the source of the very idea [to buy an old wooden house]. However, the decision [...] was simple and straightforward [and a consequence of past experiences].

[Int_5 1m10s]

Nevertheless, the decision to move to the Lemko region and buy a Lemko house is usually a deliberate one [Int_5 18m45]. In the case of one of the informants it was tested in practice, because the interviewee rented a similar house for a longer period of time. The intention was to get to know the experience of living in a house without modern facilities in a remote region [Int_5 21m30s]. The initial experience of living in a traditional house was spontaneously associated with a specific multisensorial experience, and was praised with satisfaction: “The silence, the stillness, the smell and the sight of the blazing fire in the stove ... and the smell of a house made of wood is so important for me for long time now. These compensate for the shortcomings”

[Int_5 22m56s]. It is clear that numerous sensorial experiences come simultaneously, although the sense of smell could be highlighted instantly. Namely, living in an old Lemko house means fulfilling a dream of experiencing the “adorable smell” of wood and tar of old churches and houses [Int_5 41m19s]. However, are there any other qualities associated with wood? What is special for wood as a building material? “The lack of bad smell [even for a such an old house]” [Int_9b 14m50s]. “Wood is a warm material, and it soothes the senses. [What does it mean a ‘warm material’?] It is a material [...] that makes you feel good [...], comfortable. It also suppresses external stimuli. The smell [...] of linseed oil and varnish” [Int_9a 15m08s]. In the last excerpt, the interviewee creates a clear connection between various modalities with a conclusion in which he returns to the olfactory experience. Moreover, the experience of “warmth” has a direct consequence for the well-being, as it is described as eliminating strain in the sensuous apparatus.

Living in harmony with nature, understood as a broad space, is another issue mentioned, and one that stimulates sensual experiences:

The natural landscape is an immanent part of our daily life here. We live in the rhythm of the day and of the year of nature. We breath it in and it has a great impact of what and how we do things [...]. Every day is almost a liturgical experience that allows a deep contact with the nature. I think we succeeded in living in harmony with the surroundings.

[Int_7b 2m33s]

Encountering nature is almost considered a privilege of experiencing the sacred here, opening up the possibility to experience more in terms of senses: “Can you imagine that at night the Milky Way is visible? [It is not possible to see it today in our cities.] Our nearest neighbours are beavers and wolves, which we can observe through the window” [Int_7b 3m44s]. The accounts of vast space as a broader context are also identifiable, as well as being referenced as an important pull factor: “Here [in the Low Beskids] there always has been emptiness, large-scale State Agricultural Farms were shut down, which meant space. This attracts people who need this space” [Int_8 5m22s]. This could also mean a chance, that migration could be possible and bring opportunities in life, promising a shift of lifestyle, including a new economic outlook:

The Low Beskids gave so much space, we are talking about the first half of the 1990s, that it was possible to create something of your own, to build a part of your own world according to your own rules [...] Well, maybe let us not exaggerate with ‘own rules’, but it was more possible than in other places.

[Int_8 6m34s]

In this case, apart from building a house, the interviewee established a new sustainable business, partly enrooted in local farming traditions.

Highlighting a possibility to rearrange life after immigrating into the region was considered unequivocally by almost all the interviewees. Moving in marked a change to lifestyle and, in some cases, occupation and corresponds to certain attitudes towards heritage as discussed further. This probably helped to establish a strong landmark point within the lives of the newcomers.

As mentioned before, the sensuous returns spontaneously to the consciousness of the interviewees, even when describing other topics like quality of life. While describing the landscape, sensuous experiences can easily alter into mental states of other qualities with particular consequences: “These curves heal the eyes. [...] Here I have a distance to grasp [a space from one slope to the other], and the angles formed by the hills that are coming down makes my brain relaxed” [Int_8 10m37s]. This is another example⁴ of the healing quality of a particular place, as perceived through the senses, being a social determinant of health and well-being (Sunderland et al. 2012). Still, sometimes vivid descriptions of the natural landscape dominate the perceptions of cultural heritage.

[I perceive the space] holistically... I remember my fantasy from the time I was spending a lot of time in the mountains. It was about living all the seasons of the year in a flash. It all speaks to you, it is different in spring, in November ... I am multisensorial when it comes to the way it affects me.

[Int_8 16m47s]

This interviewee worked in the arts, besides being involved in other income-generating ventures. His sensibility clearly influenced his interview statements, with a particular example of mentioning time change that is also considered as a sensorial experience. Further, he named a number of detailed and vivid descriptions. Are there any prototypical sensory experiences for this place/landscape?

“They are, like blackthorn in bloom in late April/early May. It is such an intellectual-artistic f***. It is a ritual that repeats itself every year, and for me this indicates the turn of the year [...]. It is a very characteristic moment [in addition to blackthorn bloom] of time, smell, sounds... when birds sing during the end of winter... late April/early May it is an apogee, it is madness what happens”.

[Int_8 17m24s]

The intensity of sensual motives can lead to a profound state of personal happiness and a straightforward evaluation of place (home):

In general, being here bombards me, creates pressure with good stimuli. No matter where I am, like in the meadow, it hums somehow, in the forest, the beeches hum somehow. It all speaks to me in a very rich way.

It is happening there. [...] It is an experience, in every weather it is different, in every season it is different. All the time it makes me happy. I am going out of my home and I think to myself that this is an awesome place. The best place in the world!

[Int_8 18m33s]

The plethora of sensuous experiences adds to a splendid description, again involving well-being outcomes mentioned by the interviewee. In addition, some examples of his narratives of homemaking in the context of heritage will be presented further.

Dwelling places, as studied examples of heritage, are referred to in diverse possible utilisations. These include, as was described earlier, characteristics of primitive and vernacular buildings, and how they relate to nature and landscape. One of the notions is reusability – the elements of an old house (such as the doors and beams) can be recycled as parts of a new building: “Wooden houses live without end. All the elements that are part of the house can get new life” [Int_6 1m12s]. Certain qualities of heritage buildings can be addressed in a metaphorical way: “The aesthetics of old houses are unique and inimitable [...], they have a soul” [Int_6 2m51s]. Reuse is a natural part of a wooden house due to its ways of production and links to the natural environment: “Wooden houses have an ecological value. People were building them from things that were at hand, that were near, stones from the river, wood from the forest nearby. Thanks to this, the circulation of matter [...] is natural and [...] continuous” [Int_6 7m35s]. What is especially striking is that wooden buildings are considered as an example of regional heritage that is organic, which in this case means that the whole genesis of the village settlement was connected to its natural surroundings, including various materials, such as stone, extracted from nearby streams, wood supplied from local forests as well as clay and other natural materials [Int_1 36m25s]. Assessing these qualities connects the dwelling place in a profound and lasting relation with the surroundings. Still, even building a new house was considered by the interviewees as a process deeply enrooted in the landscape.

When my wife and I designed our house, where to plan things, what angles ... We were thinking about the space around. All winter we trampled different outlines in the snow, where to put the hall, the windows to introduce the outside [...] to the inside. To let it be a kind of complementing part. That the house we were planning to build did not conflict with what was outside [the landscape].

[Int_8 12m47s]

Highlighting this process of interconnecting the future place (home) with the landscape certainly requires a sense of carefulness as well as imagination, including sensuous work in a given landscape. How, then, does one support these complementary surroundings–house relationship?

The most simple solutions are needed. Like wood of instance. Simple solutions rarely fail. We have not invented anything. We gathered and used solutions that are here, simply. The body of the house, the roof angles ... everything is copied from a Lemko *chyża*. Proportions, you now, the building is bigger and L-shaped, but in general, the proportions, the walls, the roof. All the things are taken from here and they fit. [...] You walk around these villages and you see that they cannot be confused with any other. [...] It is no [sophisticated] philosophy, but it requires time and humbleness [to recognise and acknowledge the heritage of a Lemko *chyża*, and quality of the landscape].

[Int_8 13m35s]

This gives an informative case of a complex process of (unprofessional) design, where the senses as well as the psychological traits of migrants (e.g. sensitivity) add to a significant physical and mental outcome in a form of dwelling embedded in landscape as well as in heritage, as is presented further.

Besides being a natural part of the landscape, the region's local heritage and its evaluations and memories played a crucial part in another case. Even if the house is a modern one, it is vital that it resembles the patterns of design of local origin, as well as that it is made from wood: "Of course it is important that it needs to be taken into consideration for one's own aesthetic impressions and local culture. Otherwise we would be feeling bad in a house that is out of context. [...] The house has some elements of a Lemko *chyża* as well as local small-town housing" [Int_7b 8m34s]. The latter means that, besides being orthodox when it comes to many other issues mentioned here, some blending with other traditions, like small-town architecture, was considered possible. Erecting a new building has certain other consequences, when the interviewees spontaneously reintroduce one of the main topics of the interview, reiterate it along with other already mentioned themes, in this case in a remarkably associative way:

There is certainly no smell of an old *chyża* in this house, this is a new house. But the experience of senses is a combination of various factors ... I would say that this house is a combination of our past experiences connected with our explorations of the region. Like wooden houses we had a chance to know during our mountain trekking in the region. It is hard to point to just one experience. It is the mix of olfactory experiences, like the smell of wood or the impregnating agent used here, food prepared in the kitchen, or things from the outside. These are the scents of a meadow in bloom, the scent of the beechwood forest, the smell of the mountain wind (it does have its smell, doesn't it?) and a whole host of such elements.

[Int_7b 12m23s]

It could be concluded that the last excerpt is a display of deeply contextual and embodied experience, where sensorial accounts of homemaking and



Figure 14.4 Ornaments of the main entrance door
Source: Photo by the Author.

landscape come together in a vivid example. The relation with memory, this time not from childhood, but past tourist experiences as a source of reference to landscape and heritage involvement in the sensuous homemaking. In most cases, newcomers establish a personal sensuous relation with Lemko heritage and treat it with care and passion. In addition, the need for accuracy in restoration is clear, as are the limits of further usage, which could be identified.

Sensuous Engaging with the Landscape and Homemaking of Newcomers

As human–landscape “intimate encounters” (Bender 2002, 136) unfold, it becomes obvious that the sensuous encounter brings newcomers various enrichments in experience and practice (Pink 2009). The study dealt with sensuous homemaking in the landscape of a heritage-retained space. Past displacements partly destroyed the connections between people – the original ethnic inhabitants – and place. Immigrating into the region recreated this connection, even though this time it was not the rightful owners who were dealing with the heritage. Moreover, the fact of immigrating (re)established

the bond with the landscape, with close attention to nature. Place and place attachments are also apparent as an identity formation context, with homemaking being a specific case here where “[p]laces are made through human interaction over time with a locale and its elements; in turn, identities both individual and collective are solidified through human relationships to place” (Price 2013, 122). Place attachment is an emotional bond that resembles one of the basic environmental experiences and is dynamic and socially produced, with various multisensorial experiences playing an identifiable role within this process. Moreover, they are potentially important in the adaptation of immigrants, as well as their well-being that manifests in specific sensorial emanations and interchanges into health-related inner experiences. It also needs to be highlighted that the interviewees displayed a strong awareness and need to consider the place as one’s own, with a good deal of respect for local heritage that had been neglected due to historical events. Many of their past sensorial experiences were connected to landscape and the home, and these preceded actions such as the decision to migrate.

In the studied case, the sensorial supremacy of vision in landscape perception and homemaking is not clear and should not be taken for granted. Other experiences, such as sounds, time, smells and tactile surfaces are included as interrelations within the various modalities that exist when experiencing places. To some extent, this contrasts with (Western) geographical epistemology, that tends to assume that the domination of the visual is evident (Rodaway 1994, 116, 131; Low 2012). In addition, landscapes are examples of concepts and tools, as well as visual strategies typical for seeing and thinking visually (Rodaway 1994, 126). This is culture specific, and “reduce[s] the complex multisensual experience to features represented visually and organise, compose or synthesise these into ‘scene’ or meaningful whole” (Rodaway 1994, 126). On the other hand, various modalities need to be considered (Bender 2002), and these are straightforward here. Other interesting functions of these multimodal sensorial experiences is their work with imaginary (sometimes altered memory of childhood, or previous trips to the region), as well as having a creative capability in light of the present, and supposedly a (re)creative potential for the future. It may also be that, over the passage of time, new inhabitants will incorporate these migration episodes into their life and family stories, together with appropriated and recreated heritage of the former Lemko settlements. This means that the studied architectural heritage can be treated as an affordance for people who rely on these possibilities.

In the presented cases, the heritage is reclaimed, recreated and established as a powerful tool in building a sense of place. The process involves particular resources from the past, such as the physical elements of the cottages, organic references to the natural and cultural elements of the landscape. This fulfils important personal needs, accompanying and facilitating life and lifestyle changes and serving as self-identity expression. In particular, attitudes and values like a slow life, ecologism and aesthetics are all identifiable. Various sensuous experiences reflected here correspond with these phenomena, leading

to a vibrant account and revealing a personal understanding of their power in migration and homemaking. Numerous sensorial references were found in the case of wood, a material abundant in the region and used for building purposes, a sort of cornerstone of housing heritage. It was mentioned in the context of personal past experiences, pleasant sensations and a clear marker of how dwellings are embedded in the landscape. At the same time, it represents an example of usability as well as a hallmark of the interconnectedness of various homemaking issues present in the experience of migrants.

Further explorations of the presented examples or similar ones could involve affective and related embodied experiences while creating a more coherent example. Moreover, in this study, as in many other cases, home can be described as a refuge or a haven (Mallett 2004, 70–73) where the need to escape from the outside world can be fulfilled, without being exclusively private or restricted places, for example providing a place to meet with others. It can also be argued that a clear demarcation between the inside and outside of a home, delimiting space, cannot be simply drawn. A dwelling place can also be an identity or expression of subjectivity, or more broadly a space that fulfils these needs. Home can extend into “an emotional environment”, “a culture”, “a geographical location” or “a historical time and place”, to list just a few possibilities (Tucker 1994, 184, quoted in Mallett 2004, 82, 83). The context of migration can possibly reinforce some of these notions among newcomers. The issues worth examining include the co-occurrence of specific emotions in the context of place-making and undertaking actions. In general, answering the question of affect is important in a way that it could add an understanding of the human condition and experience. Affect can be used to portray other concepts that are important here, namely the multiplicity of space, especially taking into consideration its characteristics as “non-cognized, non-symbolic, sensuous, rhythmic interplay between person and environment” (Dixon and Straughan 2013, 36). This perspective would further enrich the sensuous as well as introducing a more comprehensive understanding of the homemaking process from a point of embodied emotions.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to the editors of this volume, as well as Noel Salazar and Kelvin E.Y. Low for their useful comments on an earlier version of the manuscript.

References

- Bender, B. 2002. Contested landscapes. In *The Material Culture Reader*, edited by V. Buchli, 135–140. Oxford: Berg.
- Boccagni, P. and P. Hondagneu-Sotelo. 2023. Integration and the struggle to turn space into “our” place: Homemaking as a way beyond the stalemate of

- assimilationism vs transnationalism. *International Migration* 61 (1): 154–167. doi:10.1111/imig.12846.
- Boccagni, P. and S. Bonfanti. 2023. Introduction: Stranger, guest, researcher – A case for domestic ethnography in migration studies. In: *Migration and Domestic Space. Ethnographies of Home in the Making*, edited by P. Boccagni and S. Bonfanti, 1–19. IMISCOE Research Series. Cham: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-23125-4_1.
- Cosgrove, D. 2003. Landscape and the European sense of sight – Eyeing nature. In *Handbook of Cultural Geography*, edited by K. Anderson, M. Domosh, S. Pile and N. Thrift, 249–268. London: SAGE Publications. doi:10.4135/9781848608252.n17.
- Council of Europe. 2000. *Presentation of the European Landscape Convention*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Council of Europe. 2005. *Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society*. Faro: Council of Europe.
- Daniel, T.C. and J. Vining. 1983. Methodological issues in the assessment of landscape quality. In: *Behavior and the Natural Environment*, edited by I. Altman and J.F. Wohlwill, 39–84. New York: Plenum Press.
- Desille, A. and K. Nikielska-Sekuła. 2023. Multisensory approaches in migration research: Reflections and pathways. *Visual Studies*. doi:10.1080/1472586X.2023.2234874.
- Douglas, M. 1991. The idea of a home: A kind of space. *Social Research*, 58 (1): 287–307.
- Dixon, D. and E.R. Straughan. 2013. Affect. In *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Cultural Geography*, edited by N.C. Johnson, R.H. Schein and J. Winders, 36–38. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell. doi:10.1002/9781118384466.ch6.
- Gatersleben, B. and E. van der Werff. 2019. Symbolic aspects of environmental behaviour. In *Environmental Psychology: An Introduction* (2nd ed.), edited by L. Steg and J.I.M. de Groot, 198–206. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons. doi:10.1002/9781119241072.ch20.
- Graumann, C. F. 2002. The phenomenological approach to people-environment studies. In *Handbook of Environmental Psychology*, edited by R.B. Bechtel and A. Churchman, 95–113. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Howard, P. 2012. Perceptual lenses. In *The Routledge Companion to Landscape Studies*, edited by P. Howard, I. Thompson and E. Waterton, 43–53. Abingdon: Routledge. doi:10.4324/9780203096925.ch3.
- Howes, D. 2024. The rise of sense-based social inquiry. A genealogy of sensory ethnography. In *The Routledge International Handbook of Sensory Ethnography*, edited by P. Vannini, 23–31. Abingdon: Routledge. doi:10.4324/9781003317111-3.
- Horbál, B. 2010. *Lemko Studies: A Handbook*. New York: The Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center.
- Jones, M. 2003. The concept of cultural landscape: Discourse and narratives. In *Landscape Interfaces: Cultural Heritage in Changing Landscapes*, edited by H. Palang and G. Fry, 21–51. Dordrecht: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-94-017-0189-1_3.
- Kłós, S. 2010. *Krajobrazy nieistniejących wsi*. Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo LIBRA.
- Low, K. E. Y. 2012. The social life of the senses: Charting directions. *Sociology Compass*, 6: 271–282. doi:10.1111/j.1751-9020.2011.00451.x.
- Magocsi, P. R. 2015. *With Their Backs to the Mountains. A History of Carpathian Rus' and Carpatho-Rusyns*. Budapest: Central European University Press.
- Mallett, S. 2004. Understanding home: A critical review of the literature. *The Sociological Review*, 52: 62–89. doi:10.1111/j.1467-954X.2004.00442.x.

- Manzo, L. C., and P. Devine-Wright. 2019. Place attachment. In *Environmental Psychology: An Introduction*, Second Edition, edited by L. Steg and J.I.M. de Groot, 135–143. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons. doi:10.1002/9781119241072.ch14.
- Pink, S. 2006. *The Future of Visual Anthropology. Engaging the Senses*. New York: Routledge.
- Pink, S. 2009. *Doing Sensory Ethnography*. London: SAGE Publications. doi:10.4135/9781446249383.
- Price, P.L. 2013. Place. In *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Cultural Geography*, edited by N.C. Johnson, R.H. Schein and J. Winders, 118–129. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell. doi:10.1002/9781118384466.ch13.
- Probyn, E. 2003. The spatial imperative of subjectivity. In *Handbook of Cultural Geography*, edited by K. Anderson, M. Domosh, S. Pile and N. Thrift, 290–299. London: SAGE Publications. doi:10.4135/9781848608252.n14.
- Ralph, D. and L.A. Staeheli. 2011. Home and migration: Mobilities, belongings and identities. *Geography Compass* 5: 517–530. doi:10.1111/j.1749-8198.2011.00434.x.
- Rapoport, A. 1969. *House Form and Culture*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Rodaway, P. 1994. *Sensuous Geographies. Body, Sense and Place*. London: Routledge.
- Sunderland, N., H. Bristed, O. Gudes, J. Boddy and M. Da Silva. 2012. What does it feel like to live here? Exploring sensory ethnography as a collaborative methodology for investigating social determinants of health in place. *Health & Place*, 18 (5): 1056–1067. doi:10.1016/j.healthplace.2012.05.007.
- Tucker, A. 1994. In search of home. *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 11 (2): 181–187.
- Tveit, M.S., Å. Ode Sang and C.M. Hagerhall. 2019. Scenic beauty: Visual landscape assessment and human landscape perception. In *Environmental Psychology: An Introduction*, Second Edition, edited by L. Steg and J.I.M. de Groot, 46–54. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons. doi:10.1002/9781119241072.ch5.
- van Mansvelt, J.D. and B. Pedroli. 2003. Landscape – A matter of identity and integrity. In *Landscape Interfaces: Cultural Heritage in Changing Landscapes*, edited by H. Palang and G. Fry, 375–394. Dordrecht: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-94-017-0189-1_19.
- Walker, L. 2002. Home making: An architectural perspective. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 27 (3): 823–835.
- Williams, D.R. 2014. Making sense of “place”: Reflections on pluralism and positionality in place research. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 131: 74–82. doi:10.1016/j.landurbplan.2014.08.002.