

1. A symbol of identity

Kraków occupies a remarkable place in the history of Poland. Its role in the shaping, maintaining and transmission of Polish national identity was and remains unique. This city-symbol has a meaning which is deeply anchored in the past of the country and the Polish nation. Capturing the extent of the emotions and associations which accompany this city in the Polish imagination is possible by referring to its remarkable political, cultural and artistic past. Furthermore, and of particular importance from the perspective of reflections upon the multilingual nature of the chosen European cities of Dublin, Kraków and Sofia, the question of the coexistence of many languages in this city has historical roots. Kraków was and is a multicultural and multilingual city. However, it does not mean – and this should be strongly emphasized – that it was home to the same languages and cultures as today. The history of multiculturalism in this city and its multicultural identity has been a stormy one. It has its own intercultural dynamic relation which saw Poles, Jews, Germans, Austrians and Ukrainians live side by side within its borders together with the representatives of many other nations, cultures and religions.

The dynamics of coexistence

From a broader perspective, one may say that the history of Kraków – with the city being a catalyst of Polish national identity – allows us to capture the intricate dynamics of the coexistence of ‘our’ dominant Polish heritage with many others. At the same time, it is the story of the periodic silencing and strengthening of the material and immaterial legacy of the past (including languages) which did not belong to ‘our’ heritage against the backdrop of Kraków. It is a tale of the regaining of the voices of those whose presence one could not have ignored until recently and whose voices had once been heard. In addition, the example of Kraków may help one to ponder about the primacy – and its consequences – of the national heritage and language of the majority, in whose shadow other legacies and languages once lived, and now return in the form of politically postulated multiculturalism and multilingualism.

Following the collapse of the Eastern Bloc and at the turn of the 21st century, ‘foreign’ and ‘difficult’ heritages began to emerge from the shadows in Central Europe – including in Poland. At this moment, the ideological thaw and political openness to the ‘other’ gave not only a voice to the ‘foreign’ heritage but, perhaps more significantly, made its unique nature an attribute, thanks to which a historical city – in our case Kraków – is able to build up its symbolic capital not only around the national heritage of the majority but also thanks and through a recently ‘dormant’ minority heritage (see the example of Jewish and German heritage in Krakow: Murzyn 2006; Murzyn 2008: 314-346; Purchla 2005; see as well Davies, Moorhouse 2002).

As a consequence, in the cultural landscape of Central European cities which were wrestling with the legacy of ‘our’ and ‘yours,’ elements appeared in the 20th and 21st centuries that were previously considered ‘foreign’ and not previously emphasized. It was only then that multiculturalism and multilingualism became good standards which the city authorities wanted to stress and which were considered something worthy of imitation and promotion in Europe. During this period, the monolithic nature of culture in the region noticeably weakened. Thus this ‘strange’ heritage which had been considered ‘foreign’ until recently, became something which today has been ‘adopted’. In addition, this was the era of reflective cosmopolitanism (Meng 2011), in which a problematic heritage was considered ‘ours’ and worth highlighting in the cities of this part of Europe (e.g. Kraków and Wrocław), leading to the creation of their multicultural and multilingual identity and brand.

Concept of heritage and otherness

A sensitivity to ‘foreign’ heritage and ‘foreign’ languages is a symptom of a certain cultural openness which is neither permanent nor fixed and even more illusory is the conviction that the achieved level of this openness to ‘otherness’ cannot be weakened. This stems from the fact that heritage depends on trends which may either open it up to ‘others’ or close it in ‘their’ face. This dynamic is often accompanied by political integration or disintegration processes (at the European level too). They accompany the inclusion or exclusion of ‘others’ and ‘their’ heritage to/from the landscape of the city, society, nation or Europe.

From this perspective, reflections on a selected aspect of heritage – for example on multicultural and multilingual Kraków – may point to processes that go beyond this fragment of cultural reality. They are characterized by wider phenomena, wherein sometimes ‘others’ are included in our differently understood ‘imagined communities’ (cities, societies, nations, Europe), while at others these same ‘neighbours’ are excluded from ‘our’ community of memory. I will emphasize that the processes of opening and closing to diversity and multiplicity in Europe are difficult to analyse in isolation from the processes of political integration and disintegration in Europe. However, this is the subject of other research that has already resulted in separate studies (compare: Kowalski, Törnquist-Plewa 2016). It is obvious that reverse processes – from opening to closing or from a polyphonic to a monolithic message – are of course possible, but Europe has repeatedly suffered in the 20th century as a result of their consequences.

2. An historical overview of the city

The first references to Kraków emerge in the 10th century and its name was mentioned for the first time by Ibrahim ibn Jaqub, a Jewish merchant from the Cordoban Caliphate, who described it as a trade centre in the Slavic territories (Małecki 2007: 20; see as well Worozumski 1992: 24; Ostrowski 1989: 16; Krasnowolski 2007: 122; Dąbrowski 1965: 61). In 1038, Kraków took over from Gniezno the function of the capital of the state and continued as such until 1596, when it lost this honour to Warsaw which has remained the capital to this day. The capital of Kraków advanced significantly as a result of it being accorded Magdeburg rights in 1257 (Niezabitowski 2007: 122).

A cultural and artistic centre

It should be emphasized that it was in Kraków – in the Wawel Cathedral – that the majority of the coronations of Polish kings took place and it is in the same place that they found eternal rest. This national necropolis of Polish kings and pantheon of national heroes, included Józef Piłsudski, the man who won Polish independence in 1918¹. In turn, the Wawel Castle was the home and headquarters of Polish kings and, furthermore, the Jagiellonian University (established in 1364 as the second university in Central Europe after the Charles University of Prague – 1348) helped to make Kraków a remarkable academic, cultural and artistic centre in Central Europe (Małecki 2007: 64). Following its creation, many foreigners flocked to the city seeking an education. In this context it is worth mentioning that already in the 14th century Kraków was home to many Germans, Jews, Hungarians and Italians who found comfortable conditions for growth and development in this place. In turn, the 16th century – known as the Golden Age – saw the further development of Kraków take place at the end of the Jagiellonian dynasty, who then ruled not only the Kingdom of Poland but also the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (on the presence of Italians in the court of the last kings of the Jagiellonian dynasty, see Rożek 1988: 55). Kraków became the capital of one of the largest and most culturally and linguistically diverse powers in the Europe of the time. The end of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, however, was a tragic one with its neighbours – Prussia, Austria and Russia – dividing its territory amongst themselves in the course of three successive partitions (1772, 1793, 1795). Following the last of the partitions, Kraków found itself in Austria which promptly began a process of Germanization of the city. German became the main language of government in the city (Małecki 1994: 10-11) and of instruction in the Jagiellonian University (Małecki 1994: 17-18).

The 19th century and the Napoleonic Wars brought hope to Poles that their independence might be restored yet they in fact had to wait until 1918. This period saw Kraków serving as the arena for the burial of national heroes (such as Prince Józef Poniatowski in 1817) and patriotic ventures (the raising of the Kościuszko Mound in 1820-1823). The city became a symbol of Polishness and a national treasure house, with its precious relics being housed in the National Museum (1883) and protected by the Society of the Lovers of Kraków's History and Monuments from 1897 (*Towarzystwo Miłośników Historii i Zabytków Krakowa*). It shaped the historical-national style in art, whose most famous proponent was the painter Jan Matejko (1838-1893) (Małecki 2007: 178-179). The gradual identification of Kraków as the national *sacrum* gradually became a fact. Between 1918 and 1939, Kraków played a crucial role in strengthening Polish identity following the regaining of independence after 123 years.

The Second World War and the Holocaust

In September 1939, Kraków surrendered to the Germans without a fight and became the capital of the General Government. Wawel became the seat of Hans Frank, the Governor General, and in this place began a battle for the symbolic takeover of the city. The Germans destroyed all traces of Polishness, with their victims including the statue of Adam Mickiewicz in the Main Square and Tadeusz Kościuszko at the foot of Wawel. The systematic plundering of works of art also began (for example, the altar carved by Wit Stwosz in St Mary's Basilica). Streets were renamed (the Main Square became Adolf Hitler Platz) and German cultural institutions were created (Chwalba 2002: 25-26). German became the language of government and, following the *Sonderaktion Krakau* (where nearly 180 professors and employees of the university were arrested on the 6th of November 1939), the Jagiellonian University was closed. Kraków was meant to be a German city, a Nuremberg of the East and, as a result of this, there were Nazi plans to rebuild the entire city (see Purchla 2005).

¹The last funeral in Wawel took place on the 18th of April 2010, when President Lech Kaczyński was laid to rest in the crypt together with his wife Maria following their deaths in the Smoleńsk air disaster of the 10th April.

Whilst the wartime events largely spared the architecture of Kraków, the German occupation dramatically changed the demographic makeup of the city, as almost the entire Jewish population fell victim to the Holocaust (Jews made up 25% of the pre-war population of the city). The creation of a ghetto within Kraków (1941-1943) served only as a staging post towards a tragic end in KL Płaszów and KL Auschwitz-Birkenau (Chwalba 2005: 223). The Holocaust claimed, together with its victims, a culture and language which had been present since the 14th century. The German language remained in the consciousness of Poles as a language of invaders and occupiers and the trauma experienced by Poland and Kraków during the Second World War endured for several postwar decades.

Europe and a new multilingualism

The new 'opening up' of Kraków took place following Poland's entry into the European Union in 2004 and which the city has been able to utilise to great effect in appealing to its historic potential. Currently Kraków – in a similar manner to Wrocław – belongs to those cities in Poland which have been able to exploit their clear multicultural and multilingual potential. The historical capital of Poland is becoming an international centre of business, science and culture in the second decade of the 21st century. Furthermore, Kraków has also become one of the cities where its inhabitants can enjoy the highest quality of life and it has also enjoyed tremendous interest on the part of tourists, something only strengthened by its place on the UNESCO World Heritage List (1978). Multiculturalism and multilingualism are once again an everyday feature of daily life in the city. Multiculturalism and multilingualism have returned to Kraków.

3. Attitudes to multilingualism – the Q-sort

As in all three of the cities taking part in the research aiming to assess the different attitudes to the presence of many languages, 64 statements were prepared as the basis of a Q-sort analysis. Amongst them, 56 were identical for all three cities. They were supplemented by 8 statements which were specific to the given city. The common statements can be seen in Appendix 1. The statements which only featured in the research conducted in Kraków were as below (Table 1). It should be noted that the statements presented in the tables in Appendix 1 and below are in English but the research conducted in Kraków was conducted in Polish.

Table 1. Statements specific to Kraków

K. 57	Kraków is the capital of good Polish language
K. 58	The definition of a Pole is a person who can speak good Polish
K. 59	Speaking minority (np. German) or regional (Silesian, Górale, Kaszubian) languages opens up new horizons.
K. 60	A regional or minority accent is not well regarded in the public sphere (transport, cafes etc.)
K. 61	People who speak with a minority or regional accent have a smaller chance of finding good jobs in public administration
K. 62	Minority and regional languages should be spoken only in the places where they come from (German language in Lower Silesian, mountain dialect in Podhale region)
K. 63	Radio programs in regional languages disintegrate the Polish nation.
K. 64	Parents should not transmit regional languages to their children because they are useless

Results of the data processing

In Kraków we had 63 respondents. The processing of 63 individual Q-sorts with PQMethod software allowed 2 different discourses to be isolated (see Table 2) which were attributed to 39 respondents (discourse 1) and 24 (discourse 2).

These discourses were later characterised as

- 1 cosmopolitan and pragmatic and
- 2 nationalist and pragmatic.

These descriptions and the reasons for them are discussed further below.

Table 2. Number of respondents in discourse

Discourse	Number of respondents
1. cosmopolitan and pragmatic	39
2. nationalist and pragmatic	24
	Total 63

It should be remembered that respondents made their sorts using a scale from 'fully disagree' to 'fully agree', which in the Q sort results in a scale from -5 to +5 where -5 means 'fully disagree' and +5 means 'fully agree'. However in the Q-sort using the PQMethod to isolate specific discourses, only those statements which had different values were considered for further analysis. In other words, it takes into account only those statements which differ in isolated discourse and not those which have the same values.

As a result, the collection of statements divided into discourse 1 and discourse 2 (Appendix 4) do not contain statements which have identical values. Furthermore, the grouping in the second table in Appendix 4 shows the decreasing values assigned to the statements in discourse 1 and against their backdrop there emerges the different set of value statements which constitutes discourse 2.

4. Profile of the respondents

The research was conducted with 63 respondents who were identified as young professionals and future leaders. Between discourse 1 and discourse 2, there were certain differences in terms of age, gender, level of education, employment and knowledge of foreign languages.

Table 3. Profile of the respondents by discourse²

Discourse PQMethod – number of respondents	Average age	Gender		Maximum level of education achieved				Current occupation achieved			
		M	F	Sec	Cert	BA	MA+	Stud	Emp	SE	LfJ
Discourse 1 – 39	24.0	13	26	17	1	9	12	25	13	1	0
Discourse 2 – 24	23.5	12	12	12	0	5	7	15	5	2	2
Total 63	23.8	25	38	29	1	14	19	40	18	3	2

²Under 'current occupation', full time interns are counted as 'employed' N= 1+1.

The mean **age** for both discourses is basically the same and amounts to 23.92 for discourse 1 and 23.58 for discourse 2.

In terms of **gender** the difference is more significant since in discourse 1 there are more women (26 women = 66,7%). The participation of men and women in discourse 2, however, is identical (50% women and 50 % men).

There are some differences in the **levels of education achieved** since in discourse 1 more respondents have a BA degree. There are 17 respondents with a high school diploma in discourse 1 and 12 in discourse 2. The situation is similar for those with an undergraduate degree as 9 have done so in discourse 1 and 5 in discourse 2. In terms of those with an MA, discourse 1 predominates with 12 respondents and with discourse 2, only 7 having a postgraduate degree.

In terms of **occupation** there are also some differences since in discourse 1 there are more students (25) than in discourse 2 (15). Those employed, including two interns, number 13 respondents in discourse 1 and only 5 in discourse 2.

With respect to **declared knowledge of foreign languages** (see Table 4) there are also variations, with a knowledge of 2 or 3 languages including Polish being declared by 24 respondents in discourse 1 and 20 in discourse 2, the main foreign language being English. When those who claim knowledge of English plus 2 other languages is included then the difference is even more marked 34 (discourse 1) – 21 (discourse 2).

Table 4. Languages spoken in correlation with discourse 1 and discourse 2

Number of respondents	Polish only	English	English plus 1	English plus 2	English plus 3	English plus 4
Discourse 1 – 39	2	17	7	10	2	1
Discourse 2 – 24	1	8	12	1	1	1
Total 63	3	25	2	11	3	2

Overall it might be said that the respondents in discourse 1 were generally educated to a higher level than those in discourse 2 and included more students and greater levels of multilingual competence. However, given the small size of the sample one should be cautious in drawing any conclusions. The cohort as a whole does not show significant variations between the two discourses.

5. Analysis of the results

Looking at the values given to the statements in the discourses, one might say that both discourses (1 and 2) are almost equally pragmatic. However, the fundamental difference between them is the attitude towards the Polish language as considered as the core element of Polish culture, identity and – one might say – the relation to the past and tradition. In the discourse 1, the position of the Polish language is quite weak with a very strong position of linguistic pragmatism (the more languages you speak, the better your position will be in the economic market which does not have national limits). This is the reason why we have called it ‘cosmopolitan and pragmatic’.

In the second discourse, the position of the Polish language is the highest possible (+5), making of it the core of Polish identity construction and self-esteem (speaking Polish, makes you Polish and it is via this language you keep links with the tradition which as a result allows you maintain high self-esteem). However, it is necessary to note that the nationalist nature of this discourse does not exclude the very pragmatic attitudes multilingualism of individuals as it – multilingualism – visibly takes the second position on the scale of values attributed to statements characteristic for the discourse 2. This is why we have called this discourse ‘nationalist and pragmatic’.

Discourse 1 – cosmopolitan and pragmatic

Statement 56 obtained the highest position in discourse 1 (+5 / G. 56: Young people need to learn other languages, not just English, if they want to be competitive in the job market). The necessity of learning languages and joining multilingual organizations was highly emphasised in order to guarantee better prospects. It is worth noting that this statement indicates that multilingualism is a desired competence which contributes towards individual success.

Table 5. Discourse 1 – ‘cosmopolitan and pragmatic’ main positive values

No.	Statement	Value
G 56	Young people need to learn other languages, not just English, if they want to be competitive in the job market.	5
G 12	English is now a necessity: it is no longer just an advantage as a second language, but it is a must.	4
G 7	Children should start learning foreign languages from the earliest possible age, from Junior Infants onwards.	4
G 3	A wide choice of languages, both European and non-European, should be offered in schools in Krakow.	3
G 22	It is good practice for a city to provide multilingual information centres for residents and visitors.	3
G 28	Knowing foreign languages opens us up to new ways of thinking.	3
G 44	The multilingual environment here turns our city into an attractive destination for investment.	3

Languages a basis for success

The conviction about the role of languages in education as the basis for future success found confirmation in the values of statement 7 (+4/G. 7: *Children should start learning foreign languages from the earliest possible age, from kindergarten onwards*). This stressed strongly the need to build linguistic competencies. The particularly pragmatic character of discourse 1 is also indicated by the very high position of statement 12 (+4/G. 12: *English is now a necessity: it is no longer just an advantage as a second language, but it is a must*). In other words, English represents a basic competence for individuals which in the contemporary globalized world is beyond dispute. The severity of market requirements in relation to the linguistic competence of the individual is strong here. In other words, it is the market that determines the competences that an individual should have in order to succeed.

It is not insignificant that in discourse 1 statement 3 (+3/G. 3: *A wide choice of languages, both European and non-European, should be offered in schools in Kraków*) also enjoys a strong position. This shows that it is not just the English level of the individual which is responsible for success but other languages (including non-European ones) which may provide added-value for the individual in the job market. An identical value to G. 3 (+3) in discourse 1 may be found in statements 28, 22, and 44. They differ slightly in terms of the stress played on the universal character of linguistic competence (G. 28), or the city in which the multilingual competence is to be attained and utilized (G. 22 and G. 44). Statement 28, in turn, (+3/G. 28: *Knowing foreign languages opens us up to new ways of thinking*) has more of a general character. G. 22 and G. 44, on the other hand, stress the role of the city: G. 22 (+3 / *It is good practice for a city to provide multilingual information centres for residents and visitors*) and G. 44 (+3 / *The multilingual environment here turns our city into an attractive destination for investment*). This emphasis, I think, is significant here, since language competence is embedded in a certain frame of reference and it is the city itself (not the national community), followed by the globalized market.

An urban and global frame of reference

In other words, individuals in discourse 1 placed themselves firmly in the urban and global frames of reference ; the national community and its identity, culture and past does not play a prominent role in this discourse. This is rather subsumed by the market and the achievement of individual success (as shown by the relatively weak values for: +1 / G. 54: *When we lose our Polish, we lose part of our identity, our culture and origins* +1 / G. 55: *When you maintain your mother tongue, it helps with your self-esteem*).

Also relatively strong are the positions enjoyed by statements which show the relations between an individual and the state and its administration. Here one may detect a strong rejection (-3) in discourse 1 tackles of statement 37 (G. 37: *People who don't speak Polish should lose their entitlement to state benefits*), 38 (G. 38: *Public services, documents and so forth, should only be provided in Polish*) and 41 (G. 41: *Teachers should tell the children of migrants to stop speaking their own language at home, as it has a negative impact on children's ability to learn Polish*). In other words, the state should not limit individuals who work in Kraków but do not speak Polish. Furthermore, it is not correct to believe that the administration should only use Polish nor is it the role of the teacher to negatively influence the student to not learn the language of his parents if it is different to Polish. To express this thought in a positive way, it can be said that representatives of the state (public services and teachers) should play the role of a positive catalyst for the individual decisions that language learners make. Thanks to this, Kraków will become part of a global economy where individual success will be possible by leveraging the potential of a multilingual city supported by the state administration.

The strongest rejection in discourse 1 is to be found in the statement that English and or other languages represent a threat to Polish. The -4 value was also attained by statement 14 (G. 14: *English spells the doom of other languages*) and 29 (G. 29: *Learning two languages simultaneously has a negative impact on the child*).

In conclusion, one can say that discourse 1 is deeply individualistic and puts the individual acting primarily on the global market at its heart while still being anchored locally (in the city). National (community) reference frameworks are weak, and the role of government (local and state) is reduced to a level that is intended to support language policies at city and/or state level.

Discourse 2 – nationalist and pragmatic

Statement 54 enjoyed the highest level in discourse 2 (+5 / G. 54: *When we lose our Polish, we lose part of our identity, our culture and origins*). At the same time, very strong emphasis was placed on the role of Polish as a constituent element of Polish national identity.

The central role of community identity

This clearly shifts the stress placed on the issue in discourse 1, which is organized around the individual who is the axis of the whole discourse (the pragmatic use of languages by individuals for the purposes of individual success).

Here in the case of discourse 2 – the highest value (+5) is ascribed to the community, which is a clearly defined frame of reference for the unit. As a result, the loss of Polish means the weakening of identity and relationships with culture and the past. This clearly national dimension is additionally strengthened and reinforced by the relatively high value (+3) given to the native language, which becomes something of a sacrum, something to be protected at all costs (+3 / G. 55: *The Polish language is our most sacred tradition and should be preserved at all costs*). In addition, using Polish is seen as a key element of self-esteem (+3 / G. 55: *When you keep up your mother tongue, it helps your self-esteem*).

Table 6. Discourse 2 – ‘nationalist and pragmatic’ main positive values

No.	Statement	Value
G 54	When we lose our Polish, we lose part of our identity, our culture and origins.	5
G 28	Knowing foreign languages opens us up to new ways of thinking.	4
G 56	Young people need to learn other languages, not just English, if they want to be competitive in the job market.	4
G 42	The Polish language is a kind of 'sacred tradition' and should be protected at all costs.	3
G 55	When you maintain your mother tongue, it helps with your self-esteem.	3
G 52	We should learn languages when we are young. It is too difficult later.	2

A pragmatic approach to other languages

It should be strongly stressed that aside from the strongly accentuated dimension of identity present in discourse 2, one may notice another pillar, namely the pragmatic approach to languages by individuals and the presence of languages (regional and foreign) in the backdrop to multilingual cities. Hence the value of +4 is given to statement G. 56 (+4 / *Young people need to learn other languages, not just English, if they want to be competitive in the job market*), and G. 28 (+4 / *Knowing foreign languages opens us up to new ways of thinking*). The pragmatic dimension is reinforced by the value of +2 ascribed to statement G. 7 (+2 / *Children should start learning foreign languages from the earliest possible age, from kindergarten onwards*), G. 12 (+2 / *English is now a necessity: it is no longer just an advantage as a second language, but it is a must*) and G. 22 (+2 / *It is good practice for a city to provide multilingual information centres for residents and visitors*).

Discourse 2, in comparison with discourse 1, clearly roots the individual in a cultural community whose determinants are languages (both minority and immigrant). This fact is clearly displayed (-4) by the rejection of those statements which suggest that there is limited sense in using and transmitting regional languages to children as well as their native tongue (-4 / G. 64: *Parents should not transmit regional languages to their children because they are useless* / -4 / G. 41: *Teachers should tell pupils to stop speaking their own language at home, as it has a negative impact on children's ability to learn Polish*). In other words, parents should teach children regional languages and immigrants should protect their own languages. Furthermore, there is no negative impact in learning foreign languages on the acquisition of a child's mother tongue.

Discourse 2 relatively strongly (-3) rejected the validity of the statement of the unspecified danger or threat posed by 'others' and 'their' languages to Kraków (-3 / G. 33: *Non-English-speaking workers are seen as intruders in Kraków*).

The role of the state and administration of the city in protecting Polish attracted far greater support in discourse 2 than in discourse 1. Thus the value of + 2 was received by statement 9 (G. 9: *Educational institutions should protect the purity of our language*)³, but statement 37 (G. 37: *People who don't speak Polish should lose any entitlement to state benefits*)⁴ met with a weaker rejection than in discourse 1 and gained a value of -2. In this context, the state should care for Polish as it represents a 'holy tradition' and the rejection of state support from the state towards foreigners who did not learn Polish was met with less opposition in discourse 2 than in discourse 1.

In summary, one may say that the axis of discourse 2 is not the individual *tout court*, but an individual strongly anchored in a linguistic, cultural and national community. Furthermore, discourse 2 accepts different cultural belongings and strives to help them endure whilst retaining a privileged role for Polish and ensuring the protection of its rights. Finally, and this must not be overlooked, discourse 2 is also pragmatic beyond its identity dimension since linguistic competence is meant to serve the attainment of success on the part of individuals in the global arena.

6. Conclusion

The research conducted on the multilingualism of the young professionals and future leaders of Kraków relates to a certain fragment of the complex cultural and historical reality of the city. These are all the more limited in that the study was conducted in 2016 and only for the young and educated residents of the capital of Małopolska (i.e. from amongst its future leaders). In addition, Poland's accession to the European Union (2004) and the growing migration crisis, which marked the EU's internal and external policies in 2015-2017, are an important context for the research.

In other words, the revival of heritage and the positive value placed on Kraków's multiculturalism and multilingualism are contextual. This city is like a vernacular arena, where European or even global trends predominate. Their symptoms – I believe – were captured in the study conducted and the case of Kraków allows for two visions of the presence of 'foreign' languages in Kraków's landscape to be identified. The axes of the first vision are free individuals, and the second axis is a competing vision – I believe – of the community. The first vision – I think – has a clearly open character. In the second, there are shades of the preeminent status which the Polish language should enjoy in a city which is a symbol of Polish national identity. Behind this position may be hidden a far from *explicit* closing or rejection of anything 'foreign' yet this remains only my presumption.

In conclusion, the actors of discourse 1 are individuals while the actors of discourse 2 are individuals who are strongly anchored in their national communities. From an even broader perspective it can be said that this study carried out in 2016 in Kraków allowed us to grasp the basic opposition that is drawn between two visions of the future of Europe. It will be an arena where individuals or entire imagined communities will struggle and compete for success. If the vision of a future Europe in which communities would compete for victory was to become stronger, the processes of closing and excluding the 'other' heritage from the 'landscape' of 'our' cities might be a worrying and very real prospect. The friendly openness to 'other' legacies and languages is – apparently – weakening (2017), even though in Central Europe the 'closure' to the 'foreign' has been responsible for the tragedy of individuals, cities and entire nations. However, this phenomenon should be described in another comparative study.

³U Value in discourse 1 = 0

⁴Value in discourse 1 = -3

Bibliography

- Chwalba Andrzej, *Kraków w latach 1939-1945*, *Dzieje Krakowa*, t. 5, Joanna Bieniarzówna, Jan Marian Małecki (eds.), Wydawnictwo Literackie, Kraków 2002.
- Chwalba Andrzej, *Kraków – doświadczenie totalitaryzmów. 1939-1945* [in:] Jacek Purchla (ed.), *Kraków i Norymbergia w cywilizacji europejskiej*, Międzynarodowe Centrum Kultury, Kraków 2005, p. 219-255.
- Davies Norman, Moorhouse Roger, *Microcosm: portrait of a Central European city*, Jonathan Cape, London 2002.
- Dąbrowski Jan, *Kraków lokacyjny* [in:] Jan Dąbrowski (ed.), *Kraków jego dzieje i sztuka*, Arkady, Warszawa 1965, p. 53-70.
- Kowalski Krzysztof, Törnquist-Plewa Barbara, (eds.), *The Europeanization of Heritage and Memories in Poland and Sweden*, Jagiellonian University Press, Kraków 2016.
- Krasnowolski Bogusław, *Mediaeval Settlement Urban Designs in Małopolska* [in:] Anna Biedrzycka, Agnieszka Kutylak-Hapanowicz (eds.), *European Cities of Magdeburg Law. Tradition, Heritage, Identity*, Muzeum Historyczne Miasta Krakowa, Kraków 2007, p. 118-128.
- Małecki Jan Marian, *Historia Krakowa dla każdego*, Wydawnictwo Literackie, Kraków 2007.
- Małecki Jan Marian, *Pod rządami austriackimi i w Księstwie Warszawskim (1796-1815)* [in:] Joanna Bieniarzówna, Jan Marian Małecki, *Kraków w latach 1796-1918*, *Dzieje Krakowa*, t. 3, Joanna Bieniarzówna, Jan Marian Małecki, J. Mitkowski (eds.), Wydawnictwo Literackie, Kraków 1994, p. 7-37.
- Meng Michael, *Shattered Spaces: Encountering Jewish Ruins in Postwar Germany and Poland*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA 2011.
- Murzyn Monika, *Kazimierz: środkowoeuropejskie doświadczenie rewitalizacji/The Central European experience of urban regeneration*, Międzynarodowe Centrum Kultury, Kraków, 2006.
- Murzyn Monika, *Heritage transformation in Central Europe* [in:] Graham Brian, Howard Peter (eds.), *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity*, Ashgate, Aldershot 2008, p. 314-346.
- Niezabitowski Michał, *The Influence of Magdeburg Law on the Construction of Kraków's Cultural Identity, or Why We Should Celebrate the 750th Anniversary of Kraków under Magdeburg Law* [in:] Anna Biedrzycka, Agnieszka Kutylak-Hapanowicz (eds.), *European Cities of Magdeburg Law. Tradition, Heritage, Identity*, Muzeum Historyczne Miasta Krakowa, Kraków 2007, p. 98-104.
- Ostrowski Jan K., *Kraków*, Wydawnictwa Artystyczne i Filmowe, Warszawa 1989.
- Purchla Jacek, (ed.), *Kraków i Norymbergia w cywilizacji europejskiej*, Międzynarodowe Centrum Kultury, Kraków 2005.
- Rożek Michał, *Kraków. Skarbiec kultury i sztuki*, Interpress, Warszawa 1988.
- Wyrozumski Jerzy, *Kraków do schyłku Średniowiecza*, *Dzieje Krakowa*, t. 1, Joanna Bieniarzówna, Jan Marian Małecki (eds.), Wydawnictwo Literackie, Kraków 1992, p. 314-535.