

**Beate Mitzscherlich: Lusatia as the Homeland in a Globalised World?**

A reconstruction of the history of the term 'homeland' reveals the change in meaning that this term has undergone in German. It is interesting how people, under the conditions of globalised modernity, present the term 'homeland' as a separate comprehensible and socially integrated alternative world to a society characterised by mobility, information and the dissolution of traditional social relationships. Empirical research shows that three dimensions are central to a psychological construction of 'homeland': a sense of community, control and coherence. The combination of spatial, temporal and social dimensions in the concept of 'homeland' establishes people firmly in their community, their region and their culture; it enables them to base their current actions in society on the past and to use it to look to an utopian vision of a 'better world'. Backward-looking ideas of ethnic and religious purity not only ignore the reality of 'homeland', but also the necessary recognition in it of difference and complex identity structures.

**Jens Baumann: Support for Minorities as Regional Support**

This article is concerned with questions relating to the protection and support of minorities. As arguments in favour of the comprehensive protection of minorities it develops in the first part aspects of conflict avoidance, then arguments for the importance of communities and pluralism, further to that the ecological viewpoint and the overcoming of prejudice and historical injustice. In the second part different legal frameworks for achieving the protection of minorities on a European and national level (in this case, Germany and Poland) are discussed. The main concern of the author is however expressed in the third part: the relationship of minority protection to a particular region. The hypothesis here is that regulations relating to the protection of minorities refer primarily to regional, defined areas and are put into practice there. As a corollary, this means that members of a minority not only feel more strongly bound by their traditions, but also bound or attached to their region and settlement area by the spatial limits of the protective regulations (bilingual signage, education, public use of the minority language etc.). Apart from their supposed attachment to a state, this situation also enables members of a minority, and this is the view of the author, to be more strongly engaged with their area, and therefore in the final analysis to provide benefit to the majority population. He finds signs of this in a slightly higher population increase, and also slightly more positive economic statistics, developments, which need to be investigated in greater depth. Support for minorities is therefore at the same time support for the region in a positive sense, and no longer needs to be reduced purely to the maintenance of cultural fixed points. On the contrary, minorities are the driving-force in their own area. A plus for minority support is a plus for the overall population. In the conclusion the author presents a summary of the arguments, in the form of theses, which should be applied throughout states in Europe to provide a generally understood form of protection for minorities.

**Nicole Dolowy-Rybińska: Minority cultures: between folklore and modernity**

The article discusses the attitudes of young people belonging to certain selected European minorities, to their culture, traditions, folklore and modernization. The analysis is

based on participatory observations and semi-structured interviews conducted in 2012 and 2013 with young (aged 16–25) Catholic Upper Sorbs (in Germany), Kashubs (in Poland), Welsh (in the UK) and Bretons (in France). The analysis of the young peoples' statements and the anthropological research shows that a relation with tradition is still important for minority culture participants, although it depends on the way this culture is lived daily. Tradition and the importance of customs is perceived as the most significant in the case of Catholic Upper Sorbs for whom it constitutes one of the most important aspects of their identification with the minority culture. In the case of young Kashubs their attitudes towards folk culture are ambivalent. On the one hand tradition distinguishes Kashubian culture from Polish culture. On the other, after years of folklorization its image is negative in the eyes of young people and they want their culture to modernize. The young Welsh respect traditions and have Eisteddfod as the event of cultural, language and community recognition, but wish Welsh could function in everyday life, not only at an organized level. Young Bretons try to show their culture as modern and interesting although they are conscious of its traditional image which for most people is equivalent to the Breton culture. Anthropological analysis has revealed that this conflict between tradition and modernity is in fact based on the apprehension of the recognition of the distinctiveness of a minority culture against that of the dominant one. Young people rebel against the folklorique image they do not identify with of minority cultures but at the same time they relate strongly to the traditions on which their culture is founded.

**Tadeusz Lewaszkiewicz: Polish-Sorbian Linguistic Contacts from the 10th/11th Century to the Present**

The oldest Polish-Sorbian contacts go back to 1002–1031, when Bolesław Chrobry annexed the area of present-day Upper and Lower Lusatia to his duchy. In the Middle Ages there was indeed intensive Polish-Lower Sorbian linguistic contact between the Neißة and Bober rivers (also sometimes further east), because the Lower Sorbian and Polish populations overlapped. The so-called Polish linguistic elements in the eastern Lower Sorbian texts of the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries could consequently also be elements of a Polish linguistic substratum. Equally, Lower Sorbian elements in a good many Western and Southern Greater Polish dialects are possibly reflexions of a Lower Sorbian substratum. We cannot exclude the possibility that some lexical Germanisms penetrated Old Polish via the Sorbian languages (above all Upper Sorbian), as there were presumably Sorbs amongst settlers from Germany. Polish-Sorbian linguistic contact occurred in the 15th–18th Century between Sorbian and Polish students in Cracow and Leipzig; the Polish lecturers at Leipzig University also had links with Sorbs.

When Samuel B. Linde included Pan-Slav “neologisms” in his dictionary he took into account Sorbian vocabulary as well. There are more than 300 lexical Polonisms in Upper Sorbian dictionaries and works on Sorbian studies, of which around 50 were for a time present in Upper Sorbian, but today there are at the most 20 lexemes of Polish origin in common use. Only a few Polonisms came into Lower Sorbian – via Upper Sorbian.

### **Walter Wenzel: The Personal Name *Častolov* and Czech Influence on Sorbian**

In Upper Lusatian sources from the Middle Ages there repeatedly appears a personal name, which G. Schlimpert reconstructs as Old Sorbian \**Častoslav*. An exact analysis of historical documents as well as the comparison with other Slavonic languages shows that this is not an Old Sorbian name, but rather an Old Czech name. It is likewise not a question of an old Slavonic full name, but of a more recent nickname to which the initial form \**Častolov* is applied, which refers to an avid, successful hunter. This name was used by many Czech noblemen of the House of Hronovice, who had estates in Upper Lusatia and held important administrative offices by appointment of the Bohemian king.

### **Walter Wenzel: The Upper Sorbian Surnames *Ryčer* and *Rjek* from the Perspective of Linguistic Geography**

The present article was inspired by an investigation undertaken by H. Jenc into the origin and meaning of the Upper Sorbian words *ryčer* and *rjek*. The occurrence of *ryčer* and *rjek* in the function of surnames was not taken into consideration. In the case of *rjek* the author assumed that it was borrowed from Czech at the time of the Sorbian renaissance and that the surname *Rjek* was supposed to be based on a Sorbian version of the German surname *Reck*. We were able to trace the history of *Ryčer* and *Rjek* back into the 16<sup>th</sup> Century using the work “Studies of Sorbian Personal Names” to prove that the appellatives on which they were based were borrowed from German. The map included in the article shows that *Ryčer* and *Rjek* appear in two clearly delineated areas, which can be arranged into larger areas with anthroponomastic connections.

### **Karlheinz Hengst: Further Observations on the name *Potsdam***

The place name *Potsdam* was treated to a detailed investigation by the author in 2013. The changes in the name were analysed over a period of more than a thousand years of Slav–German linguistic contact. The history of the linguistic development of the toponym and the etymological clarification of the initial Old Polabian form are only briefly cited here as a final result. Further to this the article represents a critical view of an attempt published in *Lětopis* in 1999 to provide an etymological analysis of the name *Potsdam*. The views expressed at that time from the point of view of a Slavist, which attempted to provide a possible interpretation of the term *Poztupimi*, contained in a document from 993, are given a separate critical analysis. Here objections to the individual lines of argument are based on linguistic use over time citing examples from the Slavonic languages. The reader is made aware of the present state of research.

### **Ladislav Futtera: Mužský Hill, on 5 July 1933. The Story of a Demonstration.**

This paper deals with the preparations for, and the course and assessment of the demonstration “For the Cultural Freedom of the Lusatian Sorbs” which was held on Mužský Hill near the town of Mnichovo Hradiště on 5 July 1933, on the festival of the Slav apostles, Cyril and Method. It presents it as a reaction to the persecution of the Lusatian

Sorbs after Hitler's seizure of power (*Machtergreifung*) in Germany on 30 January 1933. The demonstration is viewed in Czech-Sorbian studies as the biggest gathering in support of the Lusatian Sorbs in the period between the World Wars. The material for this article is taken primarily from the press published in Mladá Boleslav, illustrating the regional nature of the demonstration. Emphasis is also put on the link between this demonstration and the memoranda of the Society of Friends of Lusatia (*Společnost přátel Lužice*), which were sent to the League of Nations in Geneva. However, the League of Nations rejected these memoranda, and this was perceived in the region of Mladá Boleslav and Mnichovo Hradiště as a failure of the demonstration. This resulted in a reduction in active interest in the Lusatian Sorbs in this region out of sense of disappointment and disillusionment. The friends of the Sorbs, both from Prague and from Mladá Boleslav, afterwards searched for further significance of the demonstration, which fascinated a number of participants. Later interpretations of the demonstration highlighted Czech national and political unity, stressing its democratic basis and the fact that it represented an uncompromising rebuff to the Hitler regime.