

Izvorni naučni rad
UDK 81'27:655.421(4)

Tomasz KAMUSELLA (St Andrews)

Reader in Modern History

University of St Andrews

tdk2@st-andrews.ac.uk

BETWEEN MACROSOCIOLINGUISTICS AND MICROSOCIOLINGUISTICS THROUGH THE LENS OF BOOKSTORES

Drawing on my quarter-of-a-century-long experience with interdisciplinary research on language politics and the social and political history of languages in Central and Eastern Europe, I sketch examples of macro and micro approaches of how social scientists (including historians) may fruitfully probe into matters linguistics. At the same time, these examples can be also of use to (socio)linguists, who wish to integrate their findings with relevant socio-political, economic and cultural developments of the present moment or from the past. I range from the rarely noticed divide in language politics between Eurasia and the 'Rest' of the world to the politics of the global translation market, ethnolinguistic nationalism, Holocaust denial, and to the politics of script. As the article's title announces, I adopted bookstores in the role of a unifying lens of observation. The physicality of bookstores constitutes a tangible 'crystallization' of technology and power relations in a given society or polity, as expressed through the medium of (or symbolized by) a language or languages.

Keywords: *ethnolinguistic nationalism, Eurocentrism, language politics, politics of script, post/imperial languages, social history of languages*

Introduction¹

Language (*Sprache*, Humanese), or the biological capacity for speech makes humans human. People use language to bind with one another into groups. This is the primary (evolutionary) function of language (Dunbar 1993). Culture(s) and potentially limitless non-face-to-face human groups are imagined (Anderson 1983) into being through language. The same is true of languages (*Einzelsprachen*), or actualizations of the biological capacity for speech (language, *Sprache*). Hence, it is not an overstatement to state that all human activities that entail interaction with other humans are mediated, and even made possible through language. Humans and their groups weave the entire social world around them through language, be it states, languages, religions, nations, or ethnicity. This social reality generated through languages use mediates human perception of themselves and the world (Austin 1962; Berger and Luckmann 1966; Kamusella 2021a: 183–266; Searle 1995).

Yet, the perennial problem of the social sciences is that their practitioners rarely reflect on language and *Einzelsprachen*, leaving the field to linguists, and accepting the latter's findings and claims with little critical analysis. In turn, linguists like to propose – without much evidence mustered for this claim – that their discipline is a natural ('hard') science (cf. Evans 1998). A minimum of social and historical background they need for research, linguists glean from sociological, anthropological or historical monographs, with equally little reflection expanded on the gathered information. Monodisciplinary compartmentalization in academia hampers research on humanity's foundational capacity for speech (language) and its all-important ramifications (especially, *Einzelsprachen*). Social scientists see these as a 'black box' that does not require further analysis, while to linguists history and society appear to be a 'black box,' too (cf. Maxwell 2018: 273).

Fortunately, during the recent decades, linguists (cf. Peersman, Rutten and Vosters 2015) and social scientists (cf. Burke 2004, Zajc 2006) have begun forging an interdisciplinary common ground that has yielded the novel field of historic sociolinguistics, also known as the social and political history of languages. For the sake of simplicity, let us refer to this common ground as 'sociolinguistics,' but without forgetting that in this article the term refers to

¹ I thank Jeroen Darquennes for inspiring me to write this article and Ágoston Berecz for his suggestions. Obviously, it is me alone who is responsible for any infelicities that may remain in the text.

This piece started as an intimation that bookstores could be a common entry point for holistic and interdisciplinary research into the history and politics of language use across the world and in specific states. Hence, initially I considered the following title '(On the Need of an) Ethnography of Language Practices and Politics.' It was too clunky.

this very ground, not just to a mainly 'linguistic' discipline that probes into the functioning of language in human societies.

The main discontent of this interdisciplinary common ground is that historians and other social scientists see linguists' findings as overly schematic, atemporal (too synchronic), and not grounded in facts (evidence) of humans' and their groups' acts and decisions. On the other hand, linguists deem historians' (and other social scientists') research as too anecdotal and not providing any useful 'scientific' generalizations ('laws').

Hence, when a *linguistically minded* sociolinguist writes a history of a language (Einzelsprache), she treats such a language as a 'living organism,' an entity and agent in its own right. Its speakers are often written out of the picture as 'insubstantial.' Diachronic changes in grammar and phonology are proposed to be an 'internal (or even "true") history' of the analyzed language. Such an approach is an anathema to a historian (and any social scientist), who realizes – however vaguely – that it is people (speech communities) alone, who create, maintain and change languages. Yet, a historian or social scientist would have a problem writing a history of a language beyond an overview of official acts that endowed the language in question with a variety of statuses and roles in a polity or polities. It is so, because historians and social scientists rarely have a working command of linguistic mechanisms and how social processes impact on these mechanisms through time and space.

In this article, I aspire to show how this gap in expectations and research approaches between linguistics and social sciences may be bridged. I draw at my own lived experiences as a person, who grew up, was socialized, received education, and came of age in communist Poland. Then, in the social, political and economic confusion of the systemic transition from centrally-planned to free-market economy and from totalitarianism to democracy, I traveled abroad for education and research. First, across Europe and to South Africa. Then across Eurasia, for instance, to Tajikistan or Japan, but also to North America.

During the past decade I have worked as a historian at the University of St Andrews in Scotland. But earlier, due to me formal education as a philologist (linguist) of English, political scientist and a practitioner of cultural studies, I used to teach in departments political science (European studies) and philology (linguistics), especially in the fields of Slavic and translation studies. Under these umbrellas, I was tasked to teach history and politics of Poland and other Central and Eastern European countries. As a result, I have never pledged loyalty to a single discipline, and have used a variety of disciplinary approaches and analytical tools for probing into social reality that humans and their groups produce and reproduce through language.

Bookstores

I believe that my interdisciplinary background and experiences allow me to propose how to break out from the monodisciplinary black boxes when researching the par excellence non-disciplinary but universally all-human experience of language and Einzelsprachen. Given the brevity of this article, my proposal cannot be comprehensive. It is just an example of how a linguist may conduct research on languages with full awareness that they are artifacts of human creativity and ingenuity. In turn, this example aspires to show a historian and sociolinguist how to reflect fruitfully on changes that humans introduce to languages through their own decisions.

I decided to take bookstores as such an example. On the one hand, they are eminently physical places, created through the dynamic interaction of economic, social and political forces, which historians and social scientists excel at researching. Yet, on the other hand, wares offered in bookstores for sale are tangible graphic recordings of Einzelsprachen, in other words, paper books. Typically, a book must be written in a language, which is rendered in a specific writing system. Books may be devoted to various issues and phenomena. They come in a wide array of forms and genres that appeal to a given reading public (social group) in a certain locality at a certain point in time. Yet, the language (Einzelsprache) employed for producing a given book is a complicated and often highly controlled artifact honed through the technology of writing (literacy), which writers and readers spend a decade or more acquiring and discussing in the course of their formal education. In turn, it is the state or regional administration that decides about curriculum, which governs this type of education, which often tends to be compulsory, beginning in the past two centuries. The curriculum, including the rules of how to teach, regulate and enforce literacy in an Einzelsprache are prepared by scholars – linguists and specialists of pedagogy – who have spent their lives researching and arguing about these issues (cf. Vošahlíková 2016). Quarrels about this or that (normative) principle of syntax, pronunciation or spelling have often torn asunder academics operating in the field of a given Einzelsprache into opposed ‘schools.’ Such schools (often of a specific political or ideological leaning) vie for their opinions and solutions to be officially adopted, while disagreements of this type may last for long decades and even centuries (cf. Horst 2008).

What is at stake is power, or the capacity to decide about other people’s lives. This function is not well visible in the case of scholars, but ultimately it is them in conjunction with politicians, who decide whether a literate person would write ‘neighbor’ or ‘neighbour.’ For politicians a language is the channel through which they sway public opinion in the favor, for instance, of

a given party's program or a candidate for an elected post. As a result, books are not neutral objects, but a tangible 'crystallization' or index of power relations in a polity or society. The continuous production and perusal of books in an Einzelsprache helps generating and formalizes it as a language in line with the Western concept of Einzelsprache ('a language') (Kamusella 2016a; Roy 2020a: 47–60, Rooy 2020b: 121–149).

The Global Divide: Eurasia vs the Rest

Obviously, it is possible to produce actualization of language in forms different than that of Einzelsprache. But this western concept, the use of which was initially limited to Europe and the Middle East, was adopted in or imposed on the 'Rest' of the globe through European (Western) colonialism and imperialism (Kamusella 2012a; Stoll 1982). In this process, the non-European practices and ways of 'minting' actualizations of language (*Sprache*) were forgotten or suppressed (Burke 2012: 139–158; Errington 2008). In the second half of the 20th century the colonial empires either collapsed or were defeated by the subjected peoples. Decolonization brought about political and (mostly) economic independence for former colonies, but rarely linguistic and cultural independence. Linguistic and cultural imperialism continues unabated, and largely unnoticed outside Europe, where indigenous (autochthonous) languages tend to be sidelined in favor of post/imperial European languages, be it English, French, Spanish, Portuguese or Russian (Kamusella 2020; Phillipson 1992).

Arabic is an interesting case. On the one hand, it is similar to English or Russian, because it was the Islamic Caliphate (Empire) that spread the use of Arabic from what today is Iraq in the east to Morocco in the west between the seventh and tenth centuries. On the other hand, Arabic is like early modern Europe's Latin, since at present no one speaks the former language as their everyday vernacular; there is no speech community of standard Arabic. Standard Arabic, as presumably steeped in the speech of the Quran, is almost one millennium and a half removed from Arabs' day-to-day vernaculars. Hence, Arabic vernaculars (dialects) are as different from one another like French and Italian. Similarly, the level of incomprehensibility between these two Romance Einzelsprachen and Latin is of the same range as that between standard Arabic and the Arabic vernaculars (Kamusella 2017).

The historical and religious-political prestige invested in Arabic makes it into yet another post/imperial language. This language may be accepted as official in non-Arabic-speaking polities (for instance, Eritrea) or imposed on non-Arabic speaking population in an officially Arabophone polity (for exam-

ple, Sudan's Darfur). In Arab countries, traditional stalls, kiosks and small bookstores with religious and devotional literature offer publications exclusively in Arabic. However, when an Arabic-speaker wants to peruse a novel for pleasure or a non-fiction book for professional needs, he tends to turn to a post/imperial European language with an extensive speech community. Hence, in the Gulf countries or Lebanon, 'modern' (meaning, non-religious) bookstores' choice of Arabic-language books typically amounts to a third of the wares, while books in English or French account for the remaining two-thirds.

I use the unusual qualification 'post/imperial' with a slant (instead of a hyphen) for characterizing the former European colonial languages. With this coinage, first of all, I follow the logic of decolonization that dubs such Einzelsprachen as 'postimperial' or as 'former imperial or colonial languages.' Yet, through the medium of these European languages the erstwhile imperial masters continue to maintain an underhand imperial hold on most former colonies. This unacknowledged influence is packaged as an 'opportunity' that allows former colonial subjects and their descendants to gain a command of a post/imperial European language – now rebranded as a 'world or big' language of wider communication – for the sake of 'progress, worldwide travel and modernity' (cf. Dorren 2018: 147). Indeed, this amounts to a successful PR rescue for *mission civilisatrice*, the name of which must not be uttered. Rarely does anyone point to the fact that linguistic and cultural imperialism devalues indigenous languages and prevents the development of literacy, written culture or literature in non-European Einzelsprachen.

In 1980 the Kenyan writer of the Kikuyu ethnic group, Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o, took the conscious decision to abandon the post/colonial English and compose further books in his native language of Kikuyu, spoken in the Central Province (Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o 1980). He hoped to create a stand-alone literature and literate culture for the now about 8 million-strong Kikuyu speech community. His example was intended to inspire Kenya's speech communities of the Einzelsprachen of Gusii, Dhoulo, Kalenjin, Kamba, Luhya, Masai or Meru, each with several million speakers, to create their own literatures and literate cultures. But to no avail. Few followed into the writer's footsteps. He persists in his choice but needs to self-translate his new novels into English for publication. No Kikuyu or Dhoulo monolingual bookstores emerged in Kenya. English books dominate the market with a smattering of Swahili publications, especially textbooks and comics.

Non-European indigenous languages, especially outside Eurasia, tend to be denigrated as 'tribal, backward, ethnic, traditional, *unwritten*, not modern, unsuitable for technology,' and the like. As a result, outside Eurasia exclusively post/imperial European Einzelsprachen (alongside Arabic) function

in written and administrative use. A certain exception to this trend is observed in Ethiopia, Somalia and Tanzania, where the indigenous Einzelsprachen of Amharic, Somali and Swahili, respectively, are in preferred official use. But de facto English dominates in these countries as the default language of education, publishing and central administration. English is the sole medium of instruction at the universities in Ethiopia, Kenya and Tanzania. These three countries' elites are better at writing and reading in English than in the official indigenous languages. However, as a rule of thumb, such elites speak their indigenous languages better than English.

The situation is similar to early modern Europe. At that time, local literati (usually, nobles and clergy) might be able to write and read in an official indigenous language – be it German, Polish, Ruthenian (Belarusian / Ukrainian), Swedish, or Tuscanian (Italian) – yet they preferred to converse, read and write be it in Latin, or later, in French (Almási and Šubarić 2015; Fumaroli 2011; Offord, Rjéoutski and Argent 2018). In Ethiopia, little is published and most books are imported from abroad. When I visited Addis Ababa and Bahir Dar in 2016, the vast majority of book titles in the bookstores were in English. Books in Amharic and Ethiopia's other official languages were typically confined to a single shelf. The situation was different in the case of street vendors, who might offer a bigger proportion of books and periodicals in Amharic, Oromo or Tigrinya – depending on a region – than in English (cf. Asnake Kefale, Kamusella and Van der Beken 2021: 69–73). Not surprisingly, the majority of titles in indigenous languages were textbooks. In the case of kiosks with devotional material, Christian ones are stocked with prayer books in Ge'ez (or the Latin-style language of the sixth-century Ethiopic translation of the Bible), while their Muslim counterparts with Arabic-language publications.

In apartheid South Africa Afrikaans and English were the country's two official languages. Many propose that the Germanic Einzelsprache of Afrikaans is an African language, because it was developed by descendants of originally Dutch-speaking European colonizers. But given Afrikaans' origin and mutual comprehensibility with Dutch, Afrikaans appears to be a special case of a small post/imperial language. In 1980 Belgium and the Netherlands contracted a language union (*Taalunie*) for their respective official languages of Flemish and Dutch. Both languages are construed as two equal varieties of the common Einzelsprache of Netherlandish (Taalunie 2021). South Africa does not plan to join this union, but Afrikaans appears to be an unacknowledged member of this pluricentric European language of Netherlandish.

After 1994, when apartheid was dismantled, in addition nine indigenous languages were recognized as official in South Africa (that is, isiNdebele, isiXhosa, isiZulu, Sepedi, Sesotho, Setswana, siSwati, Tshivenda and Xitsonga).

Yet, the situation remains largely, unchanged from what I observed in 1991 when I studied in this country at the University of Potchefstroom (now a part of the North-West University). South African readers enjoy numerous bookstores that offer Afrikaans or English publications, or a mixture of titles in both post/imperial languages. Apart from public signage in the official indigenous languages, few books are published in them, with the exception of school textbooks (*South African* 1998: 27–28, 42–43; Tshotsho 2013). To my knowledge, there are no bookstores stocked predominantly with books in these indigenous languages. At most, publications in such languages amount to a mere bookshelf or two in an Afrikaans or English monolingual bookstore, even in regions where this or that indigenous language is the predominant medium of day-to-day communication. Like Ethiopians, indigenous South Africans prefer education and books in the European Einzelsprache of English. The situation is exactly the same in New Zealand, despite the fact that the indigenous Austronesian Einzelsprache of Māori was made into the country's co-official language in 1987 (Maori Language Act 1987). Dedicated online bookstores may tilt the balance more in favor of indigenous languages, as for instance in the case of the Maori Huia Bookshop. Yet, among the establishment's almost 300 titles in the catalog, a mere third (80) are in Māori (Huia 2021).

Any use of indigenous languages in education, let alone in official capacity, is scant across the two Americas. In 1999 I attended a conference at Kansas University. The State of Kansas used to have a significant indigenous population composed of more than 30 ethnic groups (American Indians 2021). This university offers degrees in indigenous studies. However, the norm is that the bookstores stock publications exclusively in English. It appears what defines bookstores as 'indigenous' in North America is the fact that they have indigenous owners and stock English-language books on indigenous issues (cf. Homen 2020). Symptomatically, not only have my US students never thought about acquiring an indigenous American language, but they do not even know names of these languages, such as Cherokee (ᏍᏏᏉᏏ ᏌᏍᏏᏉᏏ *Tsalagi Gawonihisdi*), Navajo (*Diné bizaad*) or Sioux (*Dakḥóta, Lakḥóta*). Yet, with the increasing number of Hispanics (that is, Spanish-speakers) in the US population, for instance, at the turn of the 21st century Random House began to publish books in Spanish (Spanish Language Fiction 2021) and in many US bookstores Spanish titles may add up to a third or more of the wares for sale. Book production in the Americas may switch from one language to another or diversify to include book titles in other languages, but it is post/imperial non-indigenous *European* languages that remain the sole medium of the publishing industry.

Post/Imperial Politics of Book Translation

Nowadays, almost 8,000 Einzelsprachen are recognized worldwide (ISO 639 Code Tables 2021), including over half a thousand defunct languages (List of Extinct 2021). The question arises of how many of them are employed on a regular basis in the publishing industry. Any traveler enamored of bookstores has a gut feeling that books are regularly written and printed only in a handful of languages, most of them being European Einzelsprachen. This is the steep and rarely noticed extent of cultural and linguistic imperialism in the present-day world. Speakers of the vast majority of humanity's languages are by de fault excluded from modernity and its practices that hinge on literacy, unless they have had a chance and made an effort to acquire, at best, a post/imperial European language (cf. Kornai 2013). As mentioned above, the divide between Eurasia and the Rest sketches the spatial extent of this enormous, yet unacknowledged, global gap.

European state languages	European regional languages	Varieties of European state languages	Asian state languages	Varieties of Asian state languages
Afrikaans Albanian Azerbaijani Bosnian Bulgarian Croatian Czech Danish Dutch Estonian Finnish French Georgian German Greek Hungarian Icelandic Italian Latvian Lithuanian Macedonian Montenegrin Norwegian Polish Portuguese Romanian Russian Serbian Slovak Slovenian Spanish Swedish Ukrainian [33]	Basque Catalan Faroese [3]	Portuguese (Brazilian) Serbian (Latin) Spanish (Latin American) Spanish (Rio-platense) [4]	Arabic Bengali Chinese Hebrew Hindi Indonesian Japanese Korean Malay Marathi Persian Sinhala Thai Turkish Vietnamese [15]	Chinese (Traditional) [1]

Table 1. The languages into which the entire *Harry Potter* book series was translated (*Harry Potter in Translation* 2021)

It is not, however, the whole story of this phenomenon. Translations constitute an important segment of the global book market, especially in the case of *non*-post/imperial European languages (such as Bulgarian, Estonian or Romanian). But does the book translation market foster the use of non-Eurasian languages in this function or rather strengthens the dominance of Eurasian (especially European) languages in this field? I believe the latter. To check this hypothesis, I propose to cast a glimpse at the run-away global publishing phenomenon from the turn of the 21st century, namely, J. K. Rowling's fantasy book series *Harry Potter* (1997-2007) (*Harry Potter* 2021). By early 2021, at least the series' initial volume has been translated into 82 languages (*Harry Potter* in Translation 2021²). So, it is available in 83 Einzelsprachen, including English, or the book series' original language. All these languages are indigenous exclusively to Eurasia, unless one wishes to treat Afrikaans as an African language.

An even better index of the relentlessly Eurocentric character of the global book market is languages into which the entire *Harry Potter* book series was translated, that is, 51 in total. Let us bear in mind that it is just a bit over half a percent of all the world's recognized languages. Thirty-six, or 71 percent of these 'translation languages' are European, while 15 (29 percent) are indigenous to Asia. In general, this means that speakers of Europe's almost *all* state languages and some regional (non-state) languages enjoy extensive book production in their indigenous Einzelsprachen. The same is true only of some Asian state languages and few regional languages with the largest speech communities that actually dwarf each single European language's number of speakers on the continent. On the other hand, almost *no* book production of this kind exists in the indigenous languages of Africa, the Americas, Australia or Oceania. European colonizers so thoroughly suppressed and wrote out of history the use of the Australian languages (cf. Lindqvist 2005), that in the 1960s a leading scholar of these Einzelsprachen was reduced to literally searching for them in the field (Dixon 1984).

From the spatial perspective, book production and consumption outside Eurasia continues in the post/imperial European languages of English, French, Spanish and Portuguese, alongside the post/imperial Asian language of Arabic. The phenomenon is acutely illustrated by the map of the most popular

² The Wikipedia list of translations of *Harry Potter* excludes those into Bosnian, Montenegrin and Valencian. This list proposes that the first two languages are varieties of Croatian and Serbian, respectively, while Valencian is seen as a variety of Catalan. I prefer to treat all three as Einzelsprachen in their own right, in line with these languages' speakers' wishes and in acceptance of the ISO 639 registration of Bosnian, Montenegrin and Valencian as recognized languages in their own right.

language editions of Wikipedia by country (Most Popular Edition 2021). The same map illustrates the dominance in this function of the post/imperial *European* language of Russian across the post-Soviet Northern Asia, including North Korea. In turn, it is English in Southern Asia and in the Gulf countries. Not surprisingly, the post/imperial *Asian* Einzelsprachen of Arabic and Chinese predominate, respectively, in the Arabian Peninsula and China (including Hong Kong and Taiwan).

Global book production and consumption is conducted in the post/imperial European languages, with some walk-on roles reserved for their Asian counterparts. The latter, however, are largely limited to their ethno-civilizational centers of China and the Arab countries. In practice this means the overwhelmingly unidirectional translation of books from the post/imperial European languages to the other (exclusively Eurasian) ‘translation Einzelsprachen,’ including these two post/imperial Asian languages. In general, the use of the post/imperial Einzelsprachen for official, educational and publishing purposes in numerous states across the world by default makes into polycentric languages. (Curiously, this development continues to be denied in the case of Russian [Kamusella 2018a].) The fact is reflected in the rise of continent-wide and country-specific varieties of these languages, entailing the rise of publishing companies that specialize in the book market in a given variety of a post/imperial language. In the case of the English original of *Harry Potter*, the book series was published separately in the regional varieties of this post/imperial European language for Africa (South Africa), North America (but separately in Canada and the US), Southeast Asia (Hong Kong, Malaysia, Philippines and Singapore), Southern Asia (India), Europe (Britain and Ireland), and Oceania (Australia and New Zealand) (*Harry Potter in Translation* 2021).

Ethnolinguistic Nationalism

The map of the most popular language editions of Wikipedia by country in indigenous (and typically monocentric) state languages, as opposed to the Wikipedias in the post/imperial Einzelsprachen, usefully sketches the area where, on the scale of the globe, ethnolinguistic nationalism is employed for statehood creation, legitimation and maintenance (Most Popular Edition... with the Exclusion 2021). In a nutshell, proponents of ethnolinguistic nationalism propose that all the speakers (speech community) of an Einzelsprache constitute a nation. In turn, when a territory is compactly inhabited by members of the nation (speech community) in question, this fact – in line with the right of national self-determination – enables such a nation to make this area into the nation’s own nation-state. Hence, the observed practices of imple-

menting the goals of ethnolinguistic nationalism yield the following schematic – but foundational – equation of this ideology, namely, Language = Nation = State. As a result, in ethnolinguistic nation-states language equates politics. The way in which language is perceived and assessed by politicians and population at large conditions the shape of such a polity and its domestic relations. Interestingly, in this normative configuration under the egis of ethnolinguistic nationalism, the state is of tertiary importance, unlike in non-ethnolinguistic nation-states, where it is the state that is primary (that is, State = Nation) (Kamusella 2018b). In civic (state-based) nation-states, often no legally enshrined status is earmarked for any language, which de facto opens the public space for the spread post/imperial languages to the rapid marginalization (often accompanied by denigration) of their indigenous (especially non-European) counterparts.

On the aforementioned map, the ethnolinguistic nation-states constitute two clusters, one in Central Europe, and the other in Southeast Asia. The former extends in the form of a territorially continuous band from Scandinavia (Finland, Norway and Sweden) to the Baltic states, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia, and to Bulgaria, Greece, Serbia and Turkey in the Balkans. A bit to the west the Netherlands and Italy pop up as outliers, or ‘honorary Central Europeans.’ Meanwhile, this continuous band stretches across Turkey to the Caucasus (Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia). Apart from a couple of exceptions, bookstores in these countries are monolingual in a given state (national) language. Hence, predictably Swedish books are sold in Sweden’s bookstores, Czech books in the Czech Republic’s bookstores, or Turkish books in Turkey’s bookstores.

Unexpectedly, this continuous ethnolinguistic band extends even further east, covering Iran and Afghanistan. On the one hand, this is a legacy of Persian as an early modern post/imperial language. At the turn of the 18th century, this Einzelsprache was in official use from what today is Armenia and Azerbaijan in the west to present-day Bangladesh, or across the Persian and Mughal empires of the early modern period. In addition, further west, Persian used to be the leading language of elegance and cultural pursuits among the Muslim elite throughout the Ottoman Empire. It must be also remembered that Persian functioned as a leading medium of Sufism across the entire world of Islam. In the first half of the 20th century, modern Persia’s Pahlavi dynasty made Persian into the national language of this country, subsequently, renamed as Iran and remodeled as a western-style ethnolinguistic nation-state. However, not more than half of Iran’s citizens speak Persian as their first language (Zonis 1976: 179). In reaction to this burgeoning Persian (Iranian) ethnolinguistic nationalism, in 1964 Afghanistan’s royal government decided

to rename the country's official language of Persian as 'Dari' (دري), meaning the 'language of the court.' Kabul wanted to prevent Tehran from forwarding claims, formulated on an ethnolinguistic basis, that supposedly Afghanistan be an 'unredeemed eastern section' of Iran (Secret Documents 2017).

Because of the ongoing war in Afghanistan triggered decades ago by the Soviet invasion in 1979, the country's elite have had no time or capacity for such 'trivia' as a Dari-language Wikipedia. Yet, in recognition of differences between Dari and Persian (Hooshamnd 2020), in 2010 they managed to have Dari recognized as a language in its own right under the ISO 639 standard (639 Identifier 2010). In the de facto multiethnic Iran, monolingual Persian-language bookshops are the norm, following the deepening of this polity's growing ethnolinguistic unity, also on the religious (Shia) basis in the wake of the Iranian Revolution of 1979. Due to the US military intervention (2001-2021), the situation in Afghanistan now follows that in Pakistan or India, where English-language publications constitute a quarter to a third of wares in a regular bookstore (cf. Saádat 2021).

The other cluster of ethnolinguistic nation-states, located in Southeast Asia, covers Indonesia, Thailand and Vietnam, alongside the East Asian outliers of Japan and South Korea. Respectively, the Wikipedias in the eponymous Einzelsprachen of Indonesian, Thai, Vietnamese, Japanese and Korean are most popular in these countries. Likewise, bookstores in the polities are monolingual in the aforementioned national languages. The neighboring countries of Burma, Cambodia, Laos, Malaysia or the Philippines also champion, respectively, their unique national and monocentric Einzelsprachen of Burmese, Khmer, Lao (Laotian), Malay or Pilipino (Tagalog). However, due to political or economic choices or problems, the post/imperial languages of English and, sometimes, of French remain there of much significance. As a result, English and French books compete with those in the national languages for the pride of place in these countries' bookstores.

From the temporal perspective, the Central European cluster of ethnolinguistic nation-states began emerging with the founding of Bulgaria, Germany, Greece, Italy or Romania in the 19th century. In the last third of this century ethnolinguistic nationalism was adopted as the leading progressive ideology of the near future (Labbé 2019: 53-62). After the Great War, US President Woodrow Wilson and the Allies broke up or territorially curtailed Central Europe's multiethnic empires in accordance with the logic of ethnolinguistic nationalism. As a ready reference for this mammoth experiment in state making and destruction (that also entailed mass ethnic cleansing), they employed the Ottoman (Armenian) émigré US scholar and diplomat, Leon Dominian's, now largely forgotten monograph *The Frontiers of Language and*

Nationality in Europe (Dominian 1917). Independently, the brand-new communist polity of Soviet Union adopted radical ethnolinguistic nationalism for endowing with literacy over one hundred languages with an eye to empowering (and ‘civilizing’) their speech communities (ethnic groups). These speech communities were redefined as ‘nationalities,’ meaning that they were entitled to ethnoterritorial and cultural autonomy, but *not* to independence, because this right was reserved for ‘full-fledged’ nations only (Martin 2001). After 1938 this Soviet experiment was turned back in favor of communist unity underpinned by Russian, posed as the country’s ‘communist language of interethnic communication’ (Sinitsyn 2018). Robust bilingualism in an indigenous language and the post/imperial Einzelsprache of Russian was maintained only in the Soviet Unions’s union republics. Beijing adopted from the Soviet Union this limited model of ethnolinguistic autonomy for several selected regions in communist China (Bernstein and Li 2010; Mullaney 2011).

During the Soviet times, in the country’s union republics Russian-language books gradually usurped shelf space in the bookstores at the expense of books in Estonian, Kazakh or Ukrainian, among others. After the 1991 breakup of the SU, this tendency was reverted in favor of the official (national) indigenous languages of the newly independent post-Soviet nation-states. The sole exception is Belarus, where Russian-language books locally produced and imported from Russia squeezed the market share of Belarusian-language publications to less than 10 percent (Kamusella 2021b). Prior to the 2014 Revolution of Dignity, the situation was developing similarly in Ukraine, but then it was decisively reverted (Kamusella 2019a). While in today’s Belarus there are no monolingual Belarusian bookstores, and usually the selection of Belarusian books is smaller than the foreign shelf with English and German publications, now in Ukraine monolingual Ukrainian bookstores predominate. Russian books are consigned to a section with foreign books, and usually they are not more numerous than their counterparts in French or English.

Obviously, due to the past dominance of Russian on the Ukrainian book market in the 19th and 20th centuries, street vendors and stalls in Ukrainian cities’ markets may still offer more titles in Russian than Ukrainian. The same is true even of bookstores in the eastern areas and the capitals of Estonia and Latvia with Russophone majorities or pluralities. Russian books, mostly imported from Russia, are on offer there in exclusively Russian-language bookstores, or account for large sections in Estonian- and Latvian-language bookstores. The situation continues, though the authorities support the broadening of use of Estonian and Latvian, and withhold the status of minority language from Russian, on the understanding that by definition a post/imperial Einzelsprache *cannot* be a minority language. Economic, cultural and political

power that a post/imperial language confers on a speaker is so vast vis-à-vis a national language spoken in a single nation-state by a couple of million people that it nullifies any minority status of the post/imperial Einzelsprache in question (Kamusella 2021c).

How this dynamic plays out between a hardly supported regional indigenous language and a post/imperial Einzelsprache can be observed in the autonomous ethnic republics of present-day China and Russia. The situation is most similar to what can be seen in Belarus. Monolingual bookstores in the respective post/imperial language are the norm in these autonomous republics. Publications in the republican indigenous languages rarely amount to more than half a shelf in a Chinese or Russian bookstores located in such republics. Speakers of the republican languages are pressed hard to abandon them in favor of the post/imperial Einzelsprachen for the sake of ‘progress and civilization’ (Wang 2021; Yusupova 2018). The Udmurt activist and scholar, Albert Razin, saw the entailed decline of his native language of Udmurt in Russia’s autonomous Republic of Udmurtia as a tragedy. In protest he committed suicide in 2019. Yet, Russia’s language policy has remained unchanged in this regard (Eckel 2019).

Be it in Russia or China, monolingual bookstores with publications in a republican indigenous language are a rarity. In 2014 I attended a conference in Hohhot, or the bustling capital of China’s Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region. The organizers had to take a couple of hours off their busy schedule to lead me to a monolingual Mongolian-language bookstore, hidden out of view at the second floor of a non-descript building in the labyrinth of alleys in the central market. It stocked mostly textbooks and did not import any Mongolian books from the independent nation-state of Mongolia. These are easy to spot by a non-speaker because in Mongolia Cyrillic is employed for publishing in Mongolian, while in China the distinctive traditional Mongolian script. The latter features in bilingual signage across Inner Mongolia. But Mongolian letters are much smaller than their Chinese counterparts, and as such in most cases rather illegible. Unless one is still eagle-eyed, this type of signage compels Mongolian-speakers to avail themselves of shop signs in Chinese.

The Soviet Union and communist China dabbled in ethnolinguistic nationalism for a variety of ideologically motivated purposes. As a result, and perhaps unintentionally, Moscow and Beijing spread the know-how of this ideology first to communist movements and then to communist polities in Southeast Asia and East Asia. At present, in this area, the ethnolinguistic nation-states of Laos, North Korea and Vietnam remain loyal to communism. Japan was another source of ethnolinguistic nationalism in the region. This non-European polity’s elite in search of an appropriate model of Western-style

modernization, to prevent any colonization of Japan by the West, set their sights on the ethnolinguistic nation-state of Germany in the late 19th century (Lee 2010). In the interwar period Japan supported anticolonial movements in France's Indochina, the United States' Philippines, or Britain's India and Burma. Independent Siam followed Japan's example and remodeled itself into an ethnolinguistic nation-state in 1939, when it was symbolically renamed Thailand to reflect appropriately the name of the country's official language and people, namely, 'Thai' (Reynolds 1993). Subsequently, at the close of World War II in Asia, Japan encouraged unilateral declarations of independence for the ethnolinguistically defined nation-states under Japanese occupation. Hence, the Southeast Asian cluster of ethnolinguistic nation-states emerged after World War II. In the course of the postwar decolonization, these polities drew directly or indirectly on the experience of Central Europe's counterparts during the latter half of the 1940s and in the 1950s (Kamusella 2016b).

In ethnolinguistic nation-states, monolingual bookstores tend *not* to stock books in the national languages of a given polity's neighboring states, unless such an Einzelsprache happens to be a post/imperial language, that is, German or Russian in the case of Central Europe. Hence, in Polish bookstores a reader may find German and Russian books, but not publications in Belarusian, Czech, Lithuanian, Slovak or Ukrainian. Not even in the areas and localities where the Belarusian, Lithuanian, Slovak or Ukrainian minorities exist in today's Poland. Members of these minorities are compelled to go to Belarus, Lithuania, Slovakia and Ukraine to buy books in their native languages. Some school textbooks published in Poland in these minority languages are distributed through the respective minority organizations or schools, but never appear in regular bookstores.

However, transcending the ideological rigidity of ethnolinguistic nationalism's insistence on monolingualism is possible. In the Slovak capital of Bratislava located close to Vienna and Budapest, monolingual bookstores stock numerous Czech-language books that may add even to half of the wares. It is a lasting legacy of officially bilingual Czechoslovakia (dissolved in 1993), where the practice of 'suprastandard bilingualism' developed. Both Einzelsprachen were used equitably in a single press title, radio or television program, with no translation provided. Czechoslovak citizens acquired the skill to read in both languages. When a Czech and Slovak conversed they stuck to speaking in their respective languages, and communicated successfully. In many ways this phenomenon of suprastandard bilingualism continues to this day, but mostly in Slovakia, since in the Czech Republic monolingualism set in, and this country's bookstores do not reciprocate by offering Slovak publications. The question of Hungarian minority in southern Slovakia remains a

contentious issue, but some Slovak publishers (mainly, the Bratislava-based publishing house Kalligram) bring out Hungarian-language books. What is more, bookstores in the capital or in the minority region have substantial sections with publications in Hungarian that may even add to a quarter of all the wares. Yet, the vast majority of such Hungarian books are imported from Hungary.

Another interesting case of how official monolingualism may be overcome is offered by bookstores in North Macedonia. Importantly, thanks to the recent spate of reforms that get the country ready for membership in the European Union, in 2019 Albanian was made into a co-official language, alongside the national Einzelsprache of Macedonian (Macedonia's 2019). In North Macedonia, most bookstores offer Macedonian-language books. Yet, in officially multilingual Yugoslavia, Serbo-Croatian books were a permanent fixture on the shelves in the then Socialist Republic of Macedonia's bookstores, before this federation violently split into ethnolinguistic nation-states between 1991 and 2008. Like Yugoslavia, also Serbo-Croatian was broken up, yielding the four successor national Einzelsprachen of Bosnian, Croatian, Montenegrin and Serbian (Greenberg 2004). However, North Macedonia's booksellers still stock publications in Croatian and Serbian, the former invariably in Latin letters, while the latter both in Cyrillic and Latin script. These books may add up even to half of the wares in a typical Macedonian-language bookstore.

Albanian and Bulgarian books constitute a resounding absence in such bookstores. North Macedonia's Albanian-language bookstores tend to be fully monolingual, with next to nothing in Macedonian on offer. On the other hand, Muslim religious kiosks in bazaars tend to stock an interesting mixture of devotional and Islam-themed books in Albanian and Bosnian. What visibly separates North Macedonia's Albanian and Macedonian bookstores is script, the former stocking publications in Latin letters, while the latter mostly in Cyrillic. On the other hand, the shared Cyrillic and full mutual comprehensibility between Bulgarian and Macedonian should allow for free flow of books between Bulgaria and North Macedonia. Yet, as a matter of principle Bulgaria's bookstores do not offer Macedonian books, while North Macedonia's bookstores reciprocate by not stocking any Bulgarian publications. This stalemate is caused by Bulgaria's decades-long non-recognition of Macedonian as a language. In 2019 Sofia upped the ante by blocking the commencement of EU accession negotiations with North Macedonia, until Skopje 'admits' that Macedonian is a form (standard, dialect) of Bulgarian (Kamusella 2021d; Nikolov 2020). Worryingly, Brussels continues to humor Bulgaria, instead of stating the obvious that observing the niceties of the Bulgarian national master narrative is not a precondition of EU membership.

Holocaust Denial

The de-historicization of the erasure of Yiddish from the midst of 20th-century Europe constitutes a curious but largely unnoticed case of Holocaust denial. Next to no reflection is extended to the fact, while even researchers of modern Central European history do not avail themselves of documents and literature in Yiddish (cf. Kamusella 2021e). Sadly, a precursor and early practitioner of sociolinguistics, Heinz Kloss, strongly contributed to this phenomenon. Nowadays, he is remembered as the creator of the useful and interrelated sociolinguistic concepts of *Abstandsprache*, *Aufbausprache* and *Dachsprache*. Yet, in his younger incarnation, during the time of nazism,³ Kloss was a main ideologue-cum-scholar of language and ethnicity with an eye to building ‘racially pure Aryan’ Germandom by ‘cleansing’ Europe of Jews (Hutton 1999: 144–187, 376–377). In his postwar handbook on the socio-political history of the Germanic languages, Kloss covers Yiddish. Yet, typically for nazis after the war, he employs vague language and euphemisms to ‘explain’ (that is, obfuscate) how and why Yiddish ‘disappeared’ in the course of World War II. This former high-flying nazi functionary of *Rassenkunde* (‘science of race’) devotes only two brief paragraphs to this issue. In the first one, he regrets that during the ‘nazi period’ (*NZ-Zeit*) the international position and spatial spread of German – including the ‘closely related’ (*nächstverwandte*) Yiddish – was ‘weakened’ (*geschwächt*) (Kloss 1978: 95). Then, he adds that during World War II, the majority of Yiddish-speakers were ‘murdered’ (*ermordert*) and their speech community was ‘eradicated’ (*ausgerottet*) (Kloss 1978: 97). Kloss carefully avoids such terms as ‘final solution’ (*Endlösung*), ‘genocide’ (*Völkermord*) or ‘extermination’ (*Vernichtung*), which are typically employed in German to talk about the wartime Holocaust of Jews. Of course, he does not dwell on his role in the Holocaust at all. Instead, Kloss speaks at length in the clearly written and logically constructed four paragraphs on the 1930s and postwar suppression of Yiddish and Jewish cultural life in the Soviet Union (Kloss 1978: 96-98). As though it were the Soviets who bore responsibility for the destruction of Europe’s Jews and their main language of Yiddish. Nowhere does Kloss clearly state that it was the Christian German-speakers (Germans) of Germany and Austria (then part of wartime Germany) who planned and carried out the Holocaust, and thus destroyed Yiddish and Europe’s Jewish culture (cf. Fishman 2017: 25–133).

³ I do not capitalize the terms ‘nazism and ‘nazi,’ because I prefer not to capitalize the names of ideologies and doctrines (eg. democracy, liberalism), even if they may stem from personal names or names of organizations (eg. marxism, nazism). I follow this usage in the case of the names of proponents of ideologies and doctrines.

In the interwar period numerous monolingual Yiddish bookstores, market kiosks and peddlers operated across Central and Eastern Europe (which is rightly equated with the ethnolinguistically defined Yiddishland ײִדישלאַנד). Trade in Yiddish publications also bloomed on other continents, where Yiddish-speakers migrated for better life and to escape antisemitic discrimination and pogroms. This trade mainly concentrated in the big cities on the Eastern Coast of the United States, in South Africa and numerous countries of Latin America. At times, these outlets added to their offer devotional books in Hebrew and other publications in the national or official language of a country where a Yiddish bookseller operated. The world's Yiddish speech community numbering 8 to 7 million was equal to the then population of the Netherlands (Kamusella 2021e). Yet, Yiddish-speakers (mostly, Ashkenazim) were much more worldly and polyglot than an average Dutch person. Interwar maps depicting the geographic area of the use of the German language in Europe for communication purposes – from eastern France to the Volga, and from southern Scandinavia to the Danube (Böttcher 1930: map 24) – did not comment on the fact that in three-quarters this vast area tacitly subsumed Yiddish-speakers as notional users of German. Thanks to the widespread diaspora of its speech community, Yiddish was recognized as a ‘world language’ of globe-wide communication (alongside English, French, German, Italian, Spanish and Swedish) in the oft-reprinted and –updated popular postwar reference *Britannica World Language Dictionary* (Preble 1954). Meanwhile, the destruction of Yiddish libraries, publishing houses and cultural institutions continued across the Soviet bloc unabated (cf. Fishman 2017: 137–256).

In the West, the post-Holocaust young generations of Ashkenazim gave Yiddish up predominantly for post/imperial languages. Yiddish libraries of their parents and grandparents were binned or sold as scrap paper. Many of the over 40,000 Yiddish book titles published between 1900 and 1970 (Kloss 1978: 94) could be irretrievably lost, had it not been for a group of concerned university students who rescued abandoned Yiddish books. In 1980 they founded a (National) Yiddish Book Center in Amherst, Massachusetts (Lansky 2004). Why not in Europe, the very home of Yiddish language and civilization? Yiddish and its Hebrew script-based alphabet are not official either in the European Union or any country in present-day Europe. Even more curiously, in an unacknowledged but visibly antisemitic manner the overwhelming majority of Europe's university departments of Germanic languages shun Yiddish, almost invariably relegated to centers of Jewish studies (Kamusella 2019b).

In military terms nazi Germany lost the war, but unfortunately won the racist victory on the ideological grounds of antisemitic *Rassenkunde*, which Kloss used to practice. Nowadays, not a single Yiddish-speaking or even

Jewish locality or city quarter remains in Yiddishland (cf. Tsanin 1952). In a colonial-like fashion this once vibrant European Einzelsprache of book production, education and multifaceted literacy was reduced to the religiously motivated vernacular put to use in everyday life among several hundred thousand Hassidim in Israel, New York, London, Amsterdam, Antwerp and Paris (Kamusella 2019c; Wodziński and Spallek 2019: 216–217). No more books are regularly written or published in Yiddish, translated from or into this language. If an entire modern European culture and body of publications in a ‘Christian’ Einzelsprache – be it Dutch, Greek, Italian, Norwegian, or Polish – had been obliterated through genocide in half a decade, I am sure that the other Europeans would not be silent as they continue to be on the destruction of Yiddish language and culture. This deafening silence is an unacknowledged but ‘acceptable’ form of Holocaust denial in present-day Europe and the West.

Genocide and ethnic cleansing, as the Western instruments of ‘population engineering’ were invented, trialed and put to use on a vast scale enabled through bureaucracy, first, in the colonies, especially outside Eurasia (Churchill 1997; Crosby 1986). Languages and cultures of colonized peoples were suppressed, destroyed and replaced with imperial European Einzelsprachen to disempower and write these peoples out of human history (Mühlhäusler 1996; Wolf 1982). When European colonizers decided to take note of indigenous languages outside Europe, they re-fashioned them as it suited their needs the better subjugate the colonized and the swifter destroy their cultures and languages (cf. Errington 2008: 117–122). During World War II this colonial know-how of demographic engineering was applied directly in Europe. The Europeans of the Jewish religion were othered and dehumanized as ‘barbaric foreigners’ who did not belong to this continent. The same measures were also applied to the Roma whom racists saw as another ‘uncivilized foreign people’ amid Europe.

During the Holocaust, nazi Germany intended to obliterate only the Jews and the Roma in their entirety as peoples (ethnic groups, nations, speech communities). The Germans and Austrians (wartime ‘Germans’) – alongside helpers from other European nations – killed about half of Europe’s Roma (Genocide of European Roma 2021). (West) Germany refused to accept the reality of this genocide until the 1980s, while the majority of Europeans are still unaware of the Roma Holocaust (Sridhar 2006). Unlike Jewish Holocaust survivors after the war, Roma had no option of leaving Europe for their own nation-state or for North America. They stayed put in Europe, and at present constitute the most excluded and marginalized ethnic group on this continent. Yet, at 10 to 12 million the Roma are Europe’s largest stateless ethnic minority, as populous as all of the Czech Republic, Greece or Sweden. Unfor-

tunately, to my knowledge not a single Romani-language bookstore exists in Europe or elsewhere in the world. This language is not used for writing, education or publishing in any regular manner. At best, Romani is taught as a subject in a handful of schools attended by Roma students, typically in an ad hoc extracurricular manner. This astounding unavailability of education in their own language compels Romani-speaking children to acquire the official language of a state of their residence, which the more hampers their social advancement, unless they happen to become fluent in this official Einzelsprache to the level displayed by their native-speaking non-Roma co-citizens (cf. Bořkovcová 2007). From the perspective of language use, this situation suffered by the Roma in Europe is like that of any indigenous ethnic group outside Eurasia, where education and public life are channeled exclusively through a non-indigenous post/imperial European Einzelsprache.

Politics of Script

When Western scholars discuss about language politics and Einzelsprachen as such, next to no attention is paid to the matter of script. This curious blindness is perhaps caused by the fact that with the lone exception of Russian, all the post/imperial languages that stem from Europe are written in the Latin alphabet. And exclusively these Latin script-based languages are employed in official capacity outside Eurasia (cf. World 2021). Hence, from a Western perspective, polyscriptalism is of no concern, because it is contained to the ‘non-Western’ Eastern Europe and to Asia. Yet, the monoscriptalism of today’s Western and Central Europe is quite a recent development (Kamusella 2012b). For instance, until the mid-20th century another variety of the Latin alphabet, Fraktur (Black Letter, Gothic) was in regular use from Scandinavia to Switzerland. In 1941 nazi Germany denigrated Fraktur as ‘Swabian-Jewish letters’ and banned it in favor of the monoscriptal use of Antiqua, officially dubbed the ‘Normal Alphabet’ (*Normal-Schrift*) in the Third Reich (Bunčić 2016: 297; Nazi Font 2020).

The Hebrew alphabet of Yiddish was yet another script that used to be in widespread employment across Europe, from France to the Soviet Union and from Scandinavia to the Balkans. In addition, Spanyol-speaking Sephardim used this writing system across North Africa and the Middle East, or from Morocco to Iraq and Iran. The Holocaust did away with the Hebrew script in Europe. The Soviet suppression of the remaining Jews removed this script from public use in the Soviet bloc. Furthermore, following the founding of Israel in 1948, repressions against Jews became acute in North Africa and the Middle East, leading to their mass emigration or ethnic cleansing, so at pre-

sent no Jewish communities remain in these regions. As a result, the official employment of Hebrew letters became limited to the tiny territory of Israel. However, uniquely for today's Europe and the Middle East, this Jewish State preserves the Ottoman tradition of accepting multiple scripts and languages in public life. Hebrew and Arabic are Israel's official languages, while de facto English enjoys the same status. Due to the existence of substantial communities of Russophone and Amharic-speaking Jews in Israel, both Einzelsprachen are employed in public life (Spolsky and Shohamy 1999). Each of these aforementioned five languages comes with its own respective script, namely, Hebrew, Arabic, Latin, Cyrillic and Ethiopic (Kamusella 2021f). Obviously, this situation yields a highly multiscriptal and polyglot choice of publications on offer in Israel's bookstores.

On the other hand, at present Western and Central Europe's monoscriptalism spreads eastward. In 2002 the Duma decided that Russia's all official (republican, regional) languages must be written exclusively in Cyrillic. This move was to foil Tatarstan's plan to replace Cyrillic with the Latin alphabet for the republic's official language of Tatar. In addition, closer to St Petersburg, this decision also stopped the introduction of the Latin script-based Karelian language as official in the Republic of Karelia (Moore 2002). In Belarus, provisionally integrated with Russia in their Union State (founded in 1999), an interesting development took place in this drive for scriptal homogeneity in Cyrillic. The use of the minority language of Polish for ecclesiastical purposes is permitted across western Belarus, but Polish-language devotional books are executed in Cyrillic. Obviously, Polish as the national and official language of Poland is written exclusively in Latin letters (Kamusella 2019d). Yet, the current repressive regime in Belarus does its best to limit official uses of the Latin alphabet. This policy is in synch with that of present-day Russia's monoscriptalism. Yet, historically speaking, Belarusian is similar to Serbo-Croatian in the fact that Belarusian-speakers use two alphabets for writing and reading in their language. Catholic Belarusians prefer Latin letters, while their Orthodox counterparts stick to Cyrillic, which makes both scripts into Belarus's two national alphabets (Kamusella 2021g).

A similarly politicized tendency for monoscriptalization can be observed across the post-Yugoslav countries with the post-Serbo-Croatian national languages. Ironically, all these Einzelsprachen stem from the former biscriptal Einzelsprache of Serbo-Croatian. Bosnia's and Croatia's respective languages of Bosnian and Croatian are written only in Latin letters. On the other hand, exclusively Cyrillic is official in the case of Serbia's Serbian, but de facto the Yugoslav tradition of biscriptalism continues in this country to this day. Publishers and bookstores offer half of their monolingual wares in Cyrillic and half

in Latin letters. By the law this tradition is still a norm in Montenegro, where the national language of Montenegrin enjoys two official scripts, Cyrillic and Latin. For all practical reasons, the offer of this country's bookstores is biscriptal like that in Serbia, but in addition it is bilingual, both in Montenegrin and Serbian. But with the exception of specialists, most readers are unable to immediately discriminate whether a given book is Montenegrin or Serbian.

In Croatia bookstores are monolingual in the country's national language of Croatian and monscriptal in the Latin alphabet. The situation is more complicated in Bosnia, which is a federation consisting of two entities, namely, the Bosniak-Croatian one (or the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina) and the Serbian one (or the Republika Srpska). The former is bilingual with Bosnian and Croatian as its official languages, yet monoscriptal, because both languages are written in Latin letters. Similarly, the Republika Srpska is monoscriptal in Cyrillic, unlike Serbia itself, where both Cyrillic and Latin script are used in equal measure. In this Serbian entity bookstores do not stock any Bosnian or Croatian titles in Latin letters. Latin script-based books in Serbian published in Serbia also are shunned. Bookstores in Bosnia's Bosniak-Croatian entity reciprocate in kind and do not offer any Serbian or Montenegrin book titles in Cyrillic. An exception is sometimes made for Serbian-language books in Latin letters.

As mentioned above, both Macedonian and Albanian are now official in North Macedonia, making it a biscriptal country, because the former Einzelsprache is written in Cyrillic, while the latter in the Latin alphabet. One would expect the same biscriptal pattern in bilingual Kosovo, where Albanian and Serbian are official. Yet, the vast majority of Serbian-language signage is executed in Latin letters, which actually reinforces the country's monoscriptal character. To an uninitiated outsider, Kosovo's official Latin script-based Serbian looks more like Bosnian or Croatian. The choice of a script for a language is not a trivial issue, as proved by the case of post-Soviet Moldova. In 1989, when the Soviet Union still existed, this language's Cyrillic writing system was replaced with the Latin alphabet, which for all practical reasons made Moldovan identical with Romanian. Two years later, Moldovan was even renamed as 'Romanian.' This, among other difference, led to a war (1990–1992) in the country's east between pro-Russian and pro-Moldovan forces, the former fearing a union with Romania and supported by a Russian army stationed there. As a result, Transnistria separated from Moldova as a de facto polity (King 1994). In 1994 Chişinău backpedaled a bit seeking consensus and reunification. As a result, the name of 'Moldovan' was returned to the country's official language. Yet, the Latin alphabet was retained for writing and publishing in Moldovan (Lobjakas and Vitu 2008).

Given the fact that Moldovan and Romanian are identical and the four post-Serbo-Croatian languages nearly identical (cf. Bugarski 2018), deciding in which language a book was published may become a cataloger's nightmare. When I worked in the Library of Congress in 2004, I learned how the librarians deal with this challenge. First of all, the country of publication counts most. The language of exactly the same novel by the same author published in Moldova is classified as Moldovan, though on the other hand it is Romanian when the book happened to be produced in Romania. The same approach is employed for books in Bosnian, Croatian, Montenegrin and Serbian. The place of publication is decisive, not of printing. For instance, a Bosnian book published in Sarajevo could be actually manufactured in Croatia. However, Cyrillic is often taken as a signal that a given book may be in Serbian, despite its country of publication being Croatia or Bosnia (Guidelines 2021). On this account, during the wars of Yugoslav succession in the 1990s, Croatia's libraries were thoroughly 'cleansed' of Serbo-Croatian publications in Cyrillic. This script 'defined' them as Serbian, entailing retributive pulping (Lešaja 2012).

In Central and Eastern Europe's formerly polyscriptal areas ethnolinguistic nation-states enforce or strive for monoscriptalism in the writing system of the national language. On the ideological plane such scriptal homogeneity corresponds to the now highly prized ideal of ethnolinguistic 'purity.' However, at present, the choice of scripts for this purpose in the region amounts to a mere three, namely, Cyrillic, Greek and Latin. This paucity of scripts stands in contrast to the ethnolinguistic nation-states in Southeast and East Asia. They modified Central Europe's ideological 'equation' of ethnolinguistic nationalism (Language = Nation = State) by adding script to it (Script = Language = Nation = State). In this Asian cluster of nation-states it is the script that makes (delineates) the national language, before its speakers can define themselves as a nation and win a nation-state for themselves. As a result, almost each Asian ethnolinguistic nation-state enjoys its own unique and unshared script. Only four countries (Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines and Vietnam) are an exception to this principle, because they adopted the European (Western) colonial Latin script for writing and publishing in their national languages.

Nation-state	Script	Language
Burma	Burmese	Burmese
Cambodia	Khmer	Khmer
Japan	Japanese	Japanese
Korea	Korean	Korean
Laos	Lao	Lao
Thailand	Thai	Thai
Indonesia	Latin	Indonesian
Malaysia		Malay
Philippines		Filipino
Vietnam		Vietnamese

Table 2. Scripts and languages in the ethnolinguistic nation-states of Southeast and East Asia

With the examples presented in this article I attempt to show how interdisciplinary approach can be implemented for research on matters linguistic, be it from the disciplinary perspective of (socio)linguistics or that of the social sciences (including history). At most I use the tangible case of ‘brick-and-mortar’ bookstores⁴ to illustrate how social, political (ideological) and economic choices and needs impact on book production in the case of language and script choice. The discussion ranges from the plane of the entire globe and its continents to the level of specific countries and their groups. I mostly avoided delving into cases of regional, sub-state or minority languages due to the word limit. When it comes to ideological vantages of observation, I limited myself to imperialism (colonialism) and ethnolinguistic nationalism. In some cases intersections of these spatial, disciplinary (methodological) and ideological (political) approaches are also enriched with the temporal dimension, as a bow to history.

⁴ Obviously, this useful example of bookstores now seems to be coming with an expiration date. When my love story with books and bookstores began in my childhood way back during the 1970s in communist Poland, no one would predict that in the early 21st century the erstwhile centuries-long dominance of paper books would be breached by the rapid rise of the e-book. E-books are accessed and distributed online, which has also spelled the swift decline of traditional bookstores (especially in the West). As a result, bookstores increasingly cease to be a reliable index of language politics in some Western countries – such as Norway – where most purchase paper books online or avail themselves of e-books. I also suspect that the internet-enabled rise of book production in previously neglected Eurasian Einzelsprachen and some non-Eurasian languages may never translate into bookstores. Hence, new examples will need to be identified to serve as indexical of this or that phenomenon typical of language politics. (I thank Ágoston Berecz for drawing my attention to this issue.)

The basic message is that languages (Einzelsprachen) as actualizations of the biological (evolutionary) capacity for speech (Sprache, language, Humanese) are products of human ingenuity and choices. Languages are *not* organisms, do *not* mate or propagate, are *unable* to exist on their own, and have no agency. Hence, the terms ‘family of languages,’ ‘parent language,’ ‘sister language’ or ‘language death’ are misnomers, or at best misleading metaphors. It is humans and their groups who invent, use, maintain, alter, split, merge, or abandon Einzelsprachen. Yet, language (Sprache) and its actualizations (Einzelsprachen) constitute the foundation of what it means to be human. They are indispensable for humans to bond into groups and generate social reality in the ‘space’ of which all human artifacts (states, nations, religions, Einzelsprachen, economy, culture or politics) are created, communicated, maintained, overhauled and abandoned. This realization necessitates that the realities and functioning of language and Einzelsprachen be probed into holistically, that is, in an open-ended and interdisciplinary manner.

Hence, the (socio)linguistic study of diachronic alterations in a language should also take note of who, in the terms of individuals and human groups, when and why effected these changes. Likewise, the synchronic study of speech differentiation in a speech community’s Einzelsprache ought to investigate the origins and political dynamics of the community’s socio-economic and spatial stratification, including the changing mosaic of the polities inhabited by the speakers of the Einzelsprache in question. This is what I mean under the concept of the political and social history of languages at its most basic. Likewise, historians and social scientists need to do their bit by stopping to misperceive languages as unitary, immutable and neutral entities (‘billiard balls’) and media of communication. Einzelsprachen as actualizations of the biological capacity for speech constitute the very ‘bricks and mortar’ of the human world (social reality), which in turn is the subject matter of research for scholars working in history and the social sciences (including the humanities).

In light of what I have just said, the reader now can ask what interesting or important topics may be out there for research in such a way. I believe that the foundational task is to recover and learn more about non-Western concepts and manners of creating actualizations of Sprache (or the human capacity for speech). Einzelsprache is one concept of this kind among many. Lost knowledges of other non-European and European concepts of this type hold a promise of surprises and useful discoveries. In this context and bearing in mind the persisting post/imperial division between Eurasia and the Rest of the globe, the social and political history of the colonial (European) creation and subsequent suppression of indigenous Einzelsprachen is a must (cf. Roxo Mexía y Ocón 1648). This story should be contrasted and completed

with a probe into the pre- and non-colonial indigenous practices of language making and maintenance. Sociolinguistics, like global language politics, is in dire need of genuine decolonization and de-provincialization. The relentlessly Eurocentric focus excludes nine-tenths of the world's population and their languages from purview (Kamusella and Ndhlovu 2018; Ndhlovu 2021; Ndhlovu and Kamusella 2018).

Beyond these general research postulates many other topics remain that need tackling. Obviously, it is my own experience and interests that yield the following selection. Above all, this does not cease to astound me that practically no research has been done on the Jewish Holocaust's effects on the use of Yiddish (and German) and its speech community in wartime and postwar Europe. Surprisingly little scrutiny has been expanded on the role and participation of scholars (including linguists and social scientists) in the Holocaust and their postwar whitewashing and denial of what they did during the war. The same is true in relation to the Roma Holocaust and the colonial-like situation of the Roma and their culture (including Romani) in present-day Europe.

Apart from this moral outrage of our times, cases of abandoned projects of Einzelsprachen are quite interesting, be it Karelian (Austin 1992), the Gheg-based Kosovan (Kamusella 2016c), or the Romance Einzelsprache of Moldovan molded into a Slavic language (Burchis 1982: 71–115). Although during the last decades much attention has been lavished on the split of Serbo-Croatian and the rise of the post-Serbo-Croatian languages of Bosnian, Croatian, Montenegrin and Serbian, strangely the subject of interwar Yugoslavia's official and national language of Serbocroatoslovenian has been left untouched. After the war, this composite Einzelsprache yielded federal Yugoslavia's main languages of Macedonian, Serbo-Croatian and Slovenian. This tripartite Serbocroatoslovenian emulated the interwar bipartite Einzelsprache of Czechoslovak, on which only little research exists (cf. Kamusella 2007). However, as to my knowledge, no one has probed into how the bipartite model of Norwegian language influenced the rise of Czechoslovak. Despite its monopartite name, Norwegian consists of two different and separate varieties (Bokmål and Nynorsk) that differ at least as much from each other as Czech from Slovak.

In a Norwegian bookstore, publications in both varieties are not separated into sections of their own. This indiscriminate mixing of Bokmål and Nynorsk books in a typical Norwegian bookstore instills in readers the ideologically beneficial belief in the essential unity of the Norwegian language. It was the lack of such a generalized belief that entailed the breakups of Czechoslovak, Serbo-Croatian and Serbocroatoslovenian. Yet, to publish or read a book in Norwegian one needs to decide on a single variety. So, in school

students use extensive Bokmål-Nynorsk dictionaries to be able to acquire both varieties and be able to discriminate between them (cf. Lindh 2015). Recently, this practice of keeping Bokmål and Nynorsk separate from each other necessitated the creation of two Norwegian Wikipedias, one in Bokmål and the other in Nynorsk.

The initially deterritorialized and unregulated cyberspace increasingly becomes ‘geolocalized’ (spatialized), privatized and put under tightening state control (or even subjected to outright censorship). The sheer amount of time people now spend surfing the web, tweeting or using Facebook through the medium of numerous languages and scripts (the majority of them of European provenance) emphasizes the urgent need of research into the politics of language practices observed on the internet. For instance, the facility of converters among different scripts used for writing the same language was recently implemented for a handful of Wikipedias. The Serbian Wikipedia can now be read both in Cyrillic and Latin letters, while users of the Kazakh Wikipedia are free switch between the Arabic, Cyrillic and Latin scripts for perusal and to contribute to this resource (Wikipedias 2021).

Without a command of relevant non-European languages or without any realistic prospects to secure funding for field research in far-flung corners of the planet, I have several questions that bother me and I am unable to find material on them. For example, the official indigenous languages of Rwanda and Burundi – Kinyarwanda and Kirundi – are mutually comprehensible, like Croatian and Serbian. In the mid-20th century an eventually failed effort was undertaken to meld them into a single Kinyarwanda-Kirundi language (Barakana 1952). Hence, recently two separate Wikipedias were created, one in Kinyarwanda and the other Kirundi. I wonder whether books in Kinyarwanda are available as a matter of course in Burundi, and Kirundi-language ones in Rwanda.

In 1998–2001 the Ethiopian authorities embarked on the Soviet-style quest to endow ‘unwritten languages’ in the south of this country with writing systems. De facto it was a colonial-style heavy-handed imposition from above, also known as ‘linguistic engineering’ in the Soviet Union. For the sake of ‘efficiency,’ it was decided to meld the four North Omotic languages of Dawro, Gamo, Gofa and Wolayita into a single composite Einzelsprache of WoGaGoDa. Subsequently, Wogagoda was made into a medium of education and administration in this area, much to the Wolayitas’ outrage who felt robbed of their agency, tradition and literacy. On the other hand, the Dawros, Gamos and Gofas saw this ‘merger’ as an affront to and attack on the identities of their ethnic groups. Protests and clashes with the police followed, leaving in their wake seven casualties and over 1,000 people under arrest. Eventu-

ally, the authorities relented and nowadays all the four pre-Wogagoda languages are in educational and administrative use (Data Dea 2005-2006; Guidi 2012; Hirut Woldemariam 2014). Information on the events is scant and hard to obtain, though it is an excellent non-European example for a comparison with the rise and fall of Serbo-Croatian. Interestingly, after 1995 Ethiopia was made into an ethnolinguistic federation, like communist Yugoslavia.

I have some colleagues stemming from India and doing research on the country's history. Bengali (Bangla) with the speech community of over a quarter of a billion is one of the world's largest languages, for sure ahead of Russian, Portuguese or German. It is the national and official language of Bangladesh and the regional language of India's state of West Bengal. Apart from the state frontier, it is religion that separates Hindu Bengali-speakers in West Bengal from their Muslim counterparts in Bangladesh. I am aware of some orthographic differences in the Bangladeshi and West Bengali varieties of this language, though both continue to be written in the same shared Bengali (Bangla) script (বাংলা বর্ণমালা *Bangla bôrnômalā*). However, no one could tell me whether Bengali-language books circulate freely between Bangladesh and West Bengal or not. Some would say, a trivial issue, but I disagree. Isolation or integration conducted with the use of language may lead to politically and culturally different outcomes as the afore-discussed cases of Yugoslavia's Serbo-Croatian and Norway's language of Norwegian clearly indicate.

So many questions – so few answers, but such a rich field for investigation.

August & November 2021 and October 2024

References

- “639 Identifier Documentation: prs”. (2010). SIL. <https://iso639-3.sil.org/code/prs>. Accessed: Aug 4, 2021.
- Almási, G. and Šubarić, L. (eds) (2015). *Latin at the Crossroads of Identity. The Evolution of Linguistic Nationalism in the Kingdom of Hungary*. Leiden: Brill.
- American Indians in Kansas. (2021). *Kansapedia*. <https://www.kshs.org/kansapedia/american-indians-in-kansas/17881>. Accessed: Aug 2, 2021.
- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Asnake Kefale; Kamusella, T. and Van der Beken, C. (2021). *Eurasian Empires as Blueprints for Ethiopia*. London: Routledge.

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words* (Ser: William James Lectures, delivered in 1955) [edited by J. O. Urmson]. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Austin, P. M. (1992). “Soviet Karelian: The Language that Failed”. *Slavic Review*, Vol. 51, No. 1, pp. 16–35.
- Barakana, G. (1952). “L’unification des langues au Ruanda-Urundi”. *Civilisations*. Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 67–78.
- Berger, P. L. and Luckmann, T. (1966). *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Garden City NY: Doubleday.
- Bernstein, T. P. and Li, H. (eds). (2010). *China Learns from the Soviet Union, 1949-Present*. Lanham MD: Lexington Books.
- Bořkovicová, M. (2007). *Romský etnolekt češtiny. Případová studie*. Prague: Signeta.
- Böttcher, E. (1930). *Teubners Geschichtsatlas*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Bugarski, R. (2018). *Govorite li zajednički? Kako je nastala i kako je primljena Deklaracija o zajedničkom jeziku*. Belgrade: Biblioteka XX vek.
- Bunčić, D. (2016). *Biscriptality: A Sociolinguistic Typology* [Edited by Daniel Bunčić, Sandra L. Lippert, Achim Rabus] (Ser: Akademiekonferenzen, Vol. 24). Heidelberg: Winter.
- Burchis, M. (1982). *One Step Back, Two Steps Forward: On the Language Policy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the National Republics: Moldavian, a Look Back, a Survey, and Perspectives, 1924–1980* (Ser: East European Monographs, Vol. 109). Boulder CO: East European Monographs (distributed by Columbia University Press, New York).
- Burke, P. (2004). *Languages and Communities in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burke, P. (2012). *A Social History of Knowledge II: From the Encyclopaedia to Wikipedia*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Churchill, W. (1997). *A Little Matter of Genocide: Holocaust and Denial In The Americas 1492 To The Present*. San Francisco CA: City Lights Books.
- Crosby, A. W. (1986). *Ecological Imperialism: The Biological Expansion of Europe, 900-1900*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Data Dea. (2005-2006). “Enduring Issues in State-Society Relations in Ethiopia: A Case Study of the WoGaGoDa Conflict in Wolaita, Southern Ethiopia”. *International Journal of Ethiopian Studies*. Vol. 2, No. 1–2, pp. 141–159.
- Dixon, R. M. W. (1984). *Searching for Aboriginal Languages: Memoirs of a Field Worker*. St Lucia: University of Queensland Press.

- Dominian, L. (1917). *The Frontiers of Language and Nationality in Europe*. London: Constable and New York: Henry Holt.
- Dorren, G. (2018). *Babel: Around the World in Twenty Languages*. London: Profile Books.
- Dunbar, R. I. M. 1993. “Coevolution of Neocortical Size, Group Size and Language in Humans”. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*. Vol. 16, No. 4, pp. 681–735.
- Eckel, M. (2019). “A Language Scholar's Suicide Draws Official Disdain – And Brings Hope to Russia's Minority Groups”. *RFE/RL*. 3 Oct. <https://www.rferl.org/a/a-language-scholar-s-suicide-draws-official-disdain---and-brings-hope-to-russia-s-minority-groups/30197171.html>. Accessed: Aug 5, 2021.
- Errington, J. (2008). *Linguistics in a Colonial World: A Story of Language, Meaning, and Power*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Evans, R. J. W. (1998). *The Language of History and the History of Language: An Inaugural Lecture Delivered Before the University of Oxford on 11 May*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Fishman, D. E. (2017). *The Book Smugglers: Partisans, Poets, and the Race to Save Jewish Treasures from the Nazis*. Lebanon NH: ForeEdge, an imprint of University Press of New England.
- Fumaroli, M. (2011). *When the World Spoke French* [translated from the French by Richard Howard]. New York: New York Review Books.
- “Genocide of European Roma (Gypsies), 1939–1945”. (2021). *Holocaust Encyclopedia*. Washington DC: United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. <https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/genocide-of-european-roma-gypsies-1939-1945>. Accessed: Aug 6, 2021.
- Greenberg, R. D. (2004). *Language and Identity in the Balkans: Serbo-Croatian and Its Disintegration*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- “Guidelines for the Identification of Serbian, Croatian, and Bosnian”. (2021). Washington DC: Library of Congress. <https://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpsd/serb.html>. Accessed: Nov 21, 2021.
- Guidi, P. (2012). “Les enfants du Wolaitta n’apprendront pas en wogagoda. Les enjeux linguistiques et politiques d’un conflit scolaire en Éthiopie (1999–2000)”. *Cahiers de la recherche sur l’éducation et les savoirs*. Vol. 11 (Mélanges et variations), pp. 129–148.
- “Harry Potter”. (2021). *Wikipedia*. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Harry_Potter. Accessed: Aug 2, 2021.
- “Harry Potter in Translation”. (2021). *Wikipedia*. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Harry_Potter_in_Translation. Accessed: Aug 2, 2021.

- Hirut Woldemariam. (2014). “Writing Both Difference and Similarity: Towards a More Unifying and Adequate Orthography for the Newly Written Languages of Ethiopia: The Case of Wolaitta, Gamo, Gofa and Dawuro”. *Journal of Languages and Cultures*. Vol. 5. No. 3, pp. 44–53.
- Homen, J. (2020). “Indigenous-Owned Bookstores in the USA and Canada”. Libro.fm 2 Nov. <https://blog.libro.fm/indigenous-owned-bookstores/>. Accessed: Aug 2, 2021.
- Hooshmand, D. (2020). “Farsi vs Dari: Major Similarities and Differences”. *Discover Discomfort*. 20 Nov. <https://discoverdiscomfort.com/farsi-vs-dari-similarities-differences/>. Accessed: Aug 4, 2021.
- Horst, J. van der. (2008). *Het einde van de standaardtaal. Een wisseling van Europese taalcultuur*. Amsterdam: Meulenhoff.
- Huia Bookshop. (2021). <https://huia.co.nz/huia-bookshop/bookshop/>. Accessed: Aug 2, 2021.
- Hutton, C. (1999). *Linguistics and the Third Reich: Mother-tongue Fascism, Race, and the Science of Language* (Ser: Routledge Studies in the History of Linguistics, Vol. 1). London: Routledge.
- “ISO 639 Code Tables”. (2021). SIL International. https://iso639-3.sil.org/code_tables/639/data. Accessed: Aug 2, 2021.
- Kamusella, T. (2007). “The Political Expediency of Language-Making in Central Europe: The Case of Czechoslovak”. *Studia Slavica / Slovenské Studie* (Yearbook, ed. by Jana Raclavská and Aleksandra Wieczorek). Vol. 11, pp. 217–222. Opole: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Opolskiego and Ostrava: Ostravská univerzita.
- Kamusella, T. (2012a). “The Global Regime of Language Recognition”. 2012. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. Vol. 218, pp. 59–86.
- Kamusella, T. (2012b). “Scripts and Politics in Modern Central Europe”. *Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Geographischen Gesellschaft*. Vol. 154, No. 1, pp. 9–42
- Kamusella, T. (2016a). “The History of the Normative Opposition of ‘Language versus Dialect.’ From Its Graeco-Latin Origin to Central Europe’s Ethnolinguistic Nation-States”. *Colloquia Humanistica*. Vol. 5, pp. 165–188.
- Kamusella, T. (2016b). “Are Central Europe, and East and Southeast Asia Alike?: The Normative Isomorphism of Language, Nation and State”. In: Hara, K. and Heinrich, P. (eds). *Standard Norms in Written Languages: Historical and Comparative Studies Between East and West*. Tokyo: Joshibi University of Art and Design, pp. 13–78.

- Kamusella, T. (2016c). “The Idea of a Kosovan Language in Yugoslavia's Language Politics”. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. Vol. 242, pp. 217–237.
- Kamusella, T. (2017). “The Arabic Language: A Latin of Modernity?”. *Journal of Nationalism, Memory and Language Politics*. Vol. 11, No. 2, pp. 117–145.
- Kamusella, T. (2018a). “Russian: A Monocentric or Pluricentric Language?”. *Colloquia Humanistica*. Vol 7, pp. 153–196.
- Kamusella, T. (2018b). “Nationalism and National Languages”. In: Tollefson, J. W. and Pérez-Milans, M. (eds). *The Oxford Handbook of Language Policy and Planning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 163–182.
- Kamusella, T. (2019a). “What's Next after Ukraine's New Language Law?”. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*. <https://www.husj.harvard.edu/news/opinion-whats-next-after-ukraines-new-language-law>. Accessed: Aug 4, 2021.
- Kamusella, T. (2019b). “Banishing Yiddish: On Tacit Antisemitism in Academia”. *New Eastern Europe*. 5 Jul. <https://neweasterneurope.eu/2019/07/05/banishing-yiddish/>. Accessed: Aug 6, 2021.
- Kamusella, T. (2019c). “Yiddish-German: From Central Europe to the Holocaust and back?”. *New Eastern Europe*. 16 Jan. <https://neweasterneurope.eu/2019/01/16/yiddish-german-from-central-europe-to-the-holocaust-and-back/>. Accessed: Aug 6, 2021.
- Kamusella, T. (2019d). The New Polish Cyrillic in Independent Belarus. *Colloquia Humanistica*. Vol 8, pp. 79–112.
- Kamusella, T. (2020). “Global Language Politics: Eurasia versus the Rest”. *Journal of Nationalism, Memory and Language Politics*. Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 117–151.
- Kamusella, T. (2021a). *Politics and the Slavic Languages*. London: Routledge.
- Kamusella, T. (2021b). “Belarusian: An Extremist Language?”. *Wachtyrz*. 22 Jun. <https://wachtyrz.eu/belarusian-an-extremist-language/>. Accessed: Aug 4, 2021.
- Kamusella, T. (2021c). “Russian and English: Minority Languages in Europe?”. *Slavica Wratislaviensia* (edited by H. Jaroszewicz). Vol. 174, pp. 137–150.
- Kamusella, T. (2021d). “Bulgaria's Secret Empire: An Ultimatum to North Macedonia”. *Journal of Balkan and Black Sea Studies*. No. 6, pp. 155–212.
- Kamusella, T. (2021e). “Yiddish, or Jewish German? The Holocaust, the Goethe-Institut, and Germany's Neglected Obligation to Peace and the Common European Cultural Heritage”. *Śląskie Studia Polonistyczne*. No. 2 (18), pp. 1–18.

- Kamusella, T. (2021f). “Israel: The Last Ottoman State”. *New Eastern Europe*. 2 Jun. <https://neweasterneurope.eu/2021/06/02/israel-the-last-ottoman-state/>. Accessed: Aug 6, 2021.
- Kamusella, T. (2021g). “Who is Afraid of the Letter Ł? Łacinka and the Belarusian Dictator”. *New Eastern Europe*. 11 Apr. <https://neweasterneurope.eu/2021/04/11/who-is-afraid-of-the-letter-l-lacinka-and-the-belarusian-dictator/>. Accessed: Aug 9, 2021.
- Kamusella, T. and Ndhlovu, F. (2018). “Introduction: Linguistic and Cultural Imperialism, Alas”. In: Kamusella, T. and Ndhlovu, F. (eds). *The Social and Political History of Southern Africa's Languages*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 1–11.
- King, C. (1994). “Moldovan Identity and the Politics of Pan-Romanianism”. *Slavic Review*. Vol. 53, No. 2, pp. 345–368.
- Kloss, H. (1978). *Die Entwicklung neuer germanischer Kultursprachen seit 1800* (Ser: Sprache der Gegenwart, Vol. 37). Düsseldorf: Pädagogischer Verlag Schwann.
- Kornai, A. (2013). “Digital Language Death”. *Plos One*. 22 Oct. <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0077056>. Accessed: Aug 9, 2021.
- Labbé, M. (2019). *La nationalité, une histoire de chiffres. Politique et statistiques en Europe centrale (1848-1919)*. Paris: SciencesPo les presses.
- Lansky, A. (2004). *Outwitting History: How a Young Man Rescued a Million Books and Saved a Vanishing Civilization*. Chapel Hill NC: Algonquin Books.
- Lee, Y. (2010). *The Ideology of Kokugo: Nationalizing Language in Modern Japan* [translated from the Japanese by Maki Harano Hubbard]. Honolulu HI: University of Hawai’i Press.
- Lešaja, A. (2012). *Knjigocid. Uništavanje knjiga u Hrvatskoj 1990-ih*. Zagreb: Profil and Srpsko narodno vijeće.
- Lindh, K. (2015). *Bokmål-nynorsk ordbok*. Oslo: Cappelen Damm.
- Lindqvist, S. (2005). *Terra nullius. En resa genom ingens land*. Stockholm: Bonnier.
- “List of Extinct Languages”. (2021). Linguist List. <http://linguistlist.org/forms/langs/get-extinct.cfm>. Accessed: Aug 2, 2021.
- Lobjakas, A. and Vitu, V. (2008). “Romania/Moldova: Divided by a Common Language”. *RFE/RL*. 21 Feb. <https://www.rferl.org/a/1079514.html>. Accessed: Aug 7, 2021.
- “Macedonia's Albanian-Language Bill Becomes Law”. (2019). *RFE/RL*. 15 Jan. <https://www.rferl.org/a/macedonia-s-albanian-language-bill-becomes-law/29711502.html>. Accessed: Aug 5, 2021.

- “Maori Language Act 1987 (1987 No 176)”. (1987). New Zealand Acts as Enacted. www.nzlii.org/nz/legis/hist_act/mla19871987n176159/. Accessed: Aug 2, 2021.
- Martin, T. (2001). *The Affirmative Action Empire: Nations and Nationalism in the Soviet Union, 1923–1939*. Ithaca NY Cornell University Press.
- Maxwell, A. (2018). “When Theory is a Joke: The Weinreich Witticism in Linguistics”. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft*. Vol. 28, No. 2, pp. 263–292.
- Moore, C. (2002). “Russia: Cyrillic Law Ruffles Feathers in Republics”. *RFE/RL*. 5 Dec. <https://www.rferl.org/a/1101584.html>. Accessed: Aug 6, 2021.
- “Most Popular Edition of Wikipedia by Country”. (2021). *Wikimedia Commons*. https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Most_popular_edition_of_Wikipedia_by_country.svg. Accessed: Aug 2, 2021.
- “Most Popular Edition of Wikipedia by Country (with the Exclusion of Wikipedias in ‘World Languages’)”. (2021). *Wikimedia Commons*. [https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Most_popular_edition_of_Wikipedia_by_country_\(with_the_exclusion_of_Wikipedias_in_‘world_languages’\).png](https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Most_popular_edition_of_Wikipedia_by_country_(with_the_exclusion_of_Wikipedias_in_‘world_languages’).png). Accessed: Aug 2, 2021.
- Mühlhäusler, P. (1996). *Linguistic Ecology: Language Change and Linguistic Imperialism in the Pacific Region* (Ser: The Politics of Language). London: Routledge.
- Mullaney, T. S. (2011). *Coming to Terms with the Nation: Ethnic Classification in Modern China* (Ser: Asia: Local Studies / Global Themes, Vol. 18). Berkeley CA: University of California Press.
- “Nazi Font Banned by Nazis: Fraktur and Its Legacy”. (2020). *typeroom*. 21 Feb. <https://www.typeroom.eu/a-nazi-font-banned-by-nazis-fraktur-legacy-must-listen-design-podcast>. Accessed: Aug 6, 2021.
- Ndhlovu, F. (2021). “Decolonising Sociolinguistics Research: Methodological Turn-around Next?”. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. Vols 267–268.
- Ndhlovu, F. and Kamusella, T. (2018). “Challenging Intellectual Colonialism: The Rarely Noticed Question of Methodological Tribalism in Language Research”. In: Kamusella, T. and Ndhlovu, F. (eds). *The Social and Political History of Southern Africa's Languages*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 347–364.
- Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o. (1980). *Caitani mũtharaba-Inĩ*. Nairobi: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Nikolov, V. (ed.). (2020). *On the Official Language of the Republic of North Macedonia*. Sofia: Prof. Marin Drinov Publishing House of the Bulgarian

- Academy of Sciences. <https://www.bas.bg/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/Za-oficialnia-ezik-na-RSM-EN-Online-Version.pdf>. Accessed: Aug 6, 2021.
- Offord, D.; Rjéoutski, V. and Argent, G. (2018). *The French Language in Russia: A Social, Political, Cultural, and Literary History*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
 - Peersman, C.; Rutten, G. and Vosters, R. (eds). (2015). *Past, Present and Future of a Language Border Germanic-Romance Encounters in the Low Countries* (Ser: Language and Social Life, Vol. 1). Berlin: De Gruyter.
 - Preble, R. C. (1954). *Britannica World Language Dictionary*. Chicago IL: Encyclopaedia Britannica.
 - Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 - Reynolds, C. J. (ed.). (1993). *National Identity and Its Defenders: Thailand, 1939-1989*. Chiang Mai: Silkworm Books.
 - Rooy, R. van. (2020a). *Language or Dialect?: The History of a Conceptual Pair*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 - Rooy, R. van. (2020b). *Greece's Labyrinth of Language: A Study in the Early Modern Discovery of Dialect Diversity* (Ser: History and Philosophy of the Language Sciences, Vol. 2). Berlin: Language Science Press.
 - Roxo Mexía y Ocón, J. (1648). *Arte de la lengua general de los Indios del Peru*. Lima: J. López de Herrera.
 - Saádat Book Store, Kabul: Photographs. (2021). Google Maps. https://www.google.co.uk/maps/place/Saádat+Book+Store/@34.5324988,69.1507028,3a,75y,90t/data=!3m8!1e2!3m6!1sAF1QipOpKYcj9u84XUju-p9k0-_vYx5obdhXNPhB4qvD!2e10!3e12!6shhttps:%2F%2F1h5.googleusercontent.com%2Fp%2FAF1QipOpKYcj9u84XUju-p9k0-_vYx5obdhXNPhB4qvD%3Dw397-h298-k-no!7i3264!8i2448!4m1!1m2!2m1!1skabul+bookshop!3m7!1s0x38d16edbfd531fa9:0xc72e6f98a4171d70!8m2!3d34.5324988!4d69.1507028!14m1!1BCgIYEg!15sCg5rYWJ-1bCBib29rc2hvcFoQIg5rYWJ1bCBib29rc2hvcJIBCmJvb2tfc3Rv-cmWaASRDaGREU1VoTk1HOW5TMFZKUTBGblNVUkxiRFJsUmp-CblJSQUI?hl=en&authuser=0. Accessed: Aug 4, 2021.
 - Searle, J. (1995). *The Construction of Social Reality*. New York: Free Press.
 - “Secret Documents Reveal Afghan Language Policy”. (2017). Tajikam. http://tajikam.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=13. Accessed: Aug 4, 2021.
 - Sinitsyn, F. (2018). *Sovetskaia naciia i voina. Natsional'nyi vopros v SSSR 1933-1945*. Moscow: Tsentropoligraf.

- “Spanish Language Fiction”. (2021). Penguin Random House. <https://www.penguinrandomhouse.com/books/spanish-language-fiction>. Accessed: Aug 2, 2021.
- Spolsky, B. and Shohamy, E. (1999). *The Languages of Israel: Policy Ideology and Practice* (Ser: Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, Vol. 17). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Stoll, D. (1982). *Fishers of Men or Founders of Empire?: The Wycliffe Bible Translators in Latin America*. London: Zed Press and Cambridge MA: Cultural Survival.
- *South African Publishing Industry, The*. 1998. Cultural Industries Growth Strategy (CIGS). https://www.gov.za/sites/default/files/gcis_document/201409/publishingreport0.pdf. Accessed: Aug 4, 2021.
- Sridhar, C. R. (2006). “Historical Amnesia: The Romani Holocaust”. *Economic and Political Weekly*. Vol. 41, No. 33, pp. 3569–3571.
- “Taalunie - Union for the Dutch Language”. (2021). Taalunie: 40. <https://taalunie.org/informatie/112/taalunie-union-for-the-dutch-language>. Accessed: Aug 3, 2021.
- Tsanin, M. (1952). *Iber shteyn un shtok. A rayze iber hundred horuv-gevarene kehilos*. Tel-Aviv: Farlag Letste Naves.
- Tshotsho, B. P. (2013). “Mother Tongue Debate and Language Policy in South Africa”. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*. Vol. 3, No. 13, pp. 39–44.
- Vošahlíková, P. (2016). *Rákoska v dílně lidskosti. Česká škola v 19. století očima účastníků*. Prague: Academia.
- Wang, M. (2021). China Signals Roll-Back on Minority Languages: Growing Constraints on Mother-Tongue Education. *HRW*. 28 Jan. <https://www.hrw.org/news/2021/01/28/china-signals-roll-back-minority-languages>. Accessed: Aug 5, 2021.
- “Wikipedias in Multiple Writing Systems”. (2021). *Wikimedia: Meta-Wiki*. https://meta.wikimedia.org/wiki/Wikipedias_in_multiple_writing_systems. Accessed: Aug 9, 2021.
- Wodziński, M. and Spallek, W. (2019). *Chasydyzm. Atlas historyczny*. Cracow: Austeria.
- Wolf, E. R. (1982). *Europe and the People Without History*. Berkeley CA: University of California Press.
- “World Alphabet Distribution”. (2021) [map]. *Wikimedia Commons*. 17 Feb. https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:World_alphabet_distribution.png. Accessed: Aug 7, 2021.

- Yusupova, G. (2018). “Russia is Cracking Down on Minority Languages – But a Resistance Movement is Growing”. *The Conversation*. 11 Sept. <https://theconversation.com/russia-is-cracking-down-on-minority-languages-but-a-resistance-movement-is-growing-101493>. Accessed: Aug 5, 2021.
- Zajc, M. (2006). *Kje se slovensko neha in hrvaško začne. Slovensko-hrvaška meja v 19. in na začetku 20. stoletja*. Ljubljana: Modrijan.
- Zonis, M. (1976). *Political Elite of Iran*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.

Tomasz KAMUSELLA

IZMEĐU MAKROSOCIOLINGVISTIKE I MIKROSOCIOLINGVISTIKE KROZ PRIZMU KNJIŽARA

Oslanjajući se na svoje četvrtvjekovno iskustvo s interdisciplinarnim istraživanjem jezičke politike i društvene i političke istorije jezika u centralnoj i istočnoj Evropi, autor u ovome radu skicira primjere makro i mikro pristupa načinu na koji naučnici u domenu društvenih nauka (uključujući istoričare) mogu plodno istraživati lingvistička pitanja. Istovremeno, ovi primjeri mogu biti od koristi i (socio)lingvistima koji žele da svoje nalaze integrišu s relevantnim društveno-političkim, ekonomskim i kulturnim dešavanjima sadašnjosti ili prošlosti. Autor se kreće na liniji od rijetko isticane podjele u jezičkoj politici između Euroazije i „ostatka“ svijeta do politike globalnog prevodilačkog tržišta, etnolingvističkog nacionalizma, poricanja holokausta i politike pisma. Kao što se najavljuje i samim naslovom rada, knjižare se posmatraju kroz objedinjujuću prizmu, pri čemu fizička svojstva knjižara čine opipljivom „kristalizaciju“ tehnologije i odnosa moći u datom društvu ili političkom sistemu, a sve to izraženo posredstvom jezika ili simbolizovano na taj način.

Ključne riječi: *etnolingvistički nacionalizam, eurocentrizam, jezička politika, politika pisma, (post)imperijalni jezici, društvena istorija jezika*