Abstand language (from German Abstand “distance,” formed from standen “to stand” and ab “apart”) — a contrastive category for classifying Einzelsprachen from the perspective of mutual (in)comprehensibility. Two languages or speech varieties that do not allow any mutual comprehensibility are seen as Abstand languages, for instance, English and Chinese, Polish and Turkish, or French and Arabic. Typically, Abstand languages come from different dialect continua. However, if speakers of languages from different dialect continua interact with one another for centuries or even millennia the phenomenon of linguistic area may override such separation and generate a considerable degree of mutual comprehensibility. This is perhaps the case of some dialects of the Chinese language, which originally may have been Abstand languages.

The term Abstand language and its opposite, Ausbau language, were introduced in the early 1960s by the German linguist Heinz Kloss (1967). During World War Two, in the Third Reich, he was a high ranking official and scholar responsible for designing and implementing language policy (to a degree, also for linguistic engineering) for a variety of ethnic groups (minorities) in the occupied territories (Hutton 1999: 154, 185).

See also roofing language (Dachsprache).

accent (Neo-Latin term accentus “speaking tone,” formed from ad “to” and cantus “a singing”; translation of the Greek term προσωπίδα prosōpida “song sung to music; pronunciation of a syllable”) — in linguistics (phonetics) the stress used to emphasize the relative prominence of a syllable in a word. But in popular English usage a neutral or disparaging synonym for a speech variety (dialect) or for a Germanic Einzelsprache (language) closely related to English (for instance, Scots).

acrolect — see prestige.

glossary: agency (seventeenth-century neologism from Neo-Latin agentia, in turn derived from agere “to act, to do, to manage”) — the capacity of an autonomous being (“agent”) to make independent choices, to act, create, maintain, destroy, change (social) reality and its elements. Social reality, as we know it, is fully generated by humans and their groups, and as such entirely dependent on human will. Hence, in relation to this social reality, only humans are agents, not any elements of the aforesaid social reality, such as languages (Einzelsprachen), speech varieties, dialects, states, or nations. It is important to stress this point, due to the popular but erroneous view that a language may “do” something on its own, “live,” “give birth to offspring languages,” or even “die.” These are confusing metaphors. It is humans alone and their groups who create and do things with languages, as they see fit. In the majority of cases they do such things with languages rather unreflectively, but when they act in this regard with a clear intention, then human actions constitute what amounts to language politics or even language engineering.

anti-Semitism (from the 1870s German neologism Anti-Semitismus, formed from the prefix “anti-” and the exonym “Semite.” The former stems from Greek ἀντί “against.” “Semite” is an exonym for Jews and other Semitic-speaking peoples, coined in the eighteenth century at the University of Göttingen from the biblical name of שֵם Shem, or one of Noah’s sons [Baasten 2003: §8]) — anti-Jewish (anti-Judaist) sentiment, prejudice, especially widespread in Central Europe, where the majority of Jews lived for centuries until the Holocaust. See also discrimination, racism.

anti-Tsiganism (also anti-Gypsism, because the English exonym Gypsy is a translation of the Slavic, or more broadly Central European term, for example, Cigan in Croatian, Cikán in Czech, Zigeuner in German, Гръцкиς Gřïkos in Greek, Zigano in Italian, Cigány in Hungarian, Cygan in Polish, Ῥιγάς in Romanian, Циган Tsygan in Russian, Циган Cigan in Serbian, or Ukrainian Циган Tšyban)—anti-Roma (anti-Gypsy) sentiment and prejudice; a formal or informal policy of structural discrimination observed in the past and present in all the states and regions where Roma communities reside. Most reports on acts of anti-Tsiganism come from Central Europe due to the fact that the majority of Roma have lived in the region since the early modern period. But this in no way means that anti-Tsiganism is less acute elsewhere in the world where Roma and their communities live. Actually, due to centuries-long coexistence, many Central European gadjos (non-Roma) tend to be more tolerant and accepting than gadjos in other parts of the world. Nonetheless, during World War Two, it was in Central Europe that Roma suffered the Samudaripen, or the Roma Genocide at the hands of Nazi Germany and its allies.

The term anti-Tsiganism was coined by Aleksandr German in 1928, who, a year later, teamed up with Grigorii Lebedev, and together published an analytical article on this phenomenon in the Soviet newspaper Komsomol’skaia Pravda. In 1931, the former Chairman of the All-Soviet Union of Gypsies (Roma), Andrei Taranov, appealed for a sustained “struggle against anti-Gyp-

aphasia (late 1860s Neo-Latin term, formed from Greek ἀ a “without,” and φαινον phonai “to speak”)—literally “speechlessness,” that is a specialist term for the medical condition of not being able to produce or comprehend Ø language, due to brain damage or another neurological (or medical) condition.

articulation (from Latin articulare, meaning literally “to separate into joints” and metaphorically “to utter distinctly”)—production of an Einzelsprache’s phonemes in an act of speech.

assimilation (from Neo-Latin assimilátus “likened to, made like,” that is, as- “toward,” simil “similar,” and -átus “verb ending”)—the quest in ethnic nation-states for ethnolinguistic (ethnoreligious) homogeneity as prescribed by the principle of the normative isomorphism of language, nation and state, whereby minorities are coaxed to abandon their languages (and religions) and adopt the language (and religion) of the nation-state of their residence. A given minority’s “home” nation-state may seek to prevent this outcome by supporting education in the minority’s language and the minority’s organizations in the country of their residence. Assimilation usually takes place “naturally” under the influence of the overbearing and ubiquitous normative use of the nation-state’s language in all spheres of public life. Some authoritarian-leaning ethnolinguistic nation-states—especially if prevented by international treaties from availing themselves of population transfers (ethnic cleansing)—may adopt a policy to accelerate the process of assimilation through administrative coercive (punitive) measures, resulting in the phenomenon of forced assimilation. See also integration, population (demographic) engineering.

atheism (from the sixteenth-century French neologism athéisme, derived from Greek ἀ a “without,” and θεός theos “deity, god”)—not professing or practicing any religion, disbelief in the existence of any deity or supernatural forces.

Ausbau language (from German Ausbau “expansion,” etymologically construed as bauen “to build” and aus “away”)—a contrastive category for classifying Einzelsprachen from the perspective of mutual (in)comprehensibility. Two mutually comprehensible languages or speech varieties are seen as Ausbau languages, for instance, Bulgarian and Macedonian, Moldovan and Romanian; or the post-Serbo-Croatian languages of Bosnian, Croatian, Montenegrin, and Serbian. The term Ausbau language comments on the process of standardization, which focuses on singling out extant differences and fortifying them to make the Ausbau languages in question less similar, less mutually comprehensible, ideally, more Abstand-like. The construction of the post-Serbo-Croatian languages of Bosnian, Croatian, Montenegrin, and

Serbian during the past two decades is the prime example of the Ausbau standardizing process in practice. See also roofing language (Dachsprache).

authoritarianism (from the adjective “authoritarian” for “favoring imposed order over freedom,” derived from Latin auctoritas “invention, advice, opinion, command,” in turn from autor “master, leader, author,” ultimately from Greek αὐτόκρατος autokratōs, “sovereign, autocrat,” formed from ἄφω toto “self” and κρατία kratía “rule,” the latter stemming from κράτος kratos “power”)—a political system characterized by limited political and individual freedoms and a strong central government, usually led by a single—almost invariably male—dictator, which rules the polity and its citizenry (nation) in quite an arbitrary manner. Laws and principles of governance are established and changed in line with the dictator’s will. See also totalitarianism, tyranny.

basilect—see prestige.

bidialecticm (multidialecticm) (etymology: see bilingualism, dialect)—the equally full command of two or more dialects, that is, Einzelsprachen, which typically for political reasons are not recognized as “languages.” See also language politics.

bilingualism (multilingualism, polyglotism) (1870s neologism, formed from Latin bi- “two” and lingua “language”)—the equally full command of two or more Einzelsprachen. This ideal is rarely achieved, usually a person has a varied (unequal) command of language varieties and/or Einzelsprachen and uses them for different functions and in different spheres of life. Hence, in the vast majority of cases, bilingualism (multilingualism) actually means diglossia (polyglossia). Bilingualism (multilingualism) is the bogyman of ethnolinguistic nationalists. In line with this ideology, they believe that a person may “truly” or “naturally” have only one national language (or mother tongue). People speaking and writing multiple languages are seen as “traitors” of these nations whose languages they employ. See also suprastandard bilingualism.

biosphere (late nineteenth-century neologism from German Biosphäre; formed from Greek βίος bios “life,” and from Latin sphaera “ball, globe, celestial sphere,” in turn from Greek σφαίρα sphaira “ball, globe”)—the space where biological (DNA-based) life takes place. Within the biosphere the noosphere (semiosphere) is located, where people and their groups live, meaning they use Ø language for generating social reality. These parts of the biosphere where there are no humans belong to the extrascientific sphere, or where no social reality is generated through the use of Ø language.

bisciprality (from Latin bi- “two” and scriptum, that is, a form of the verb scribere “to write”)—the normative or de facto use of two writing systems for writing a single language (Einzelsprache) (for example, Montenegrin is officially written in both Cyrillic and Latin letters), or for writing official languages, each in a different script in a state (for instance, Serbian in Cyrillic, while
Bosnian and Croatian in Latin letters in today’s Bosnia). See also monoscriptalism and multiscritpalism.

blasphemy (from Latin blasphemare, in turn from Greek βλασφημῶν v blasphēmōn “to blaspheme,” coined from βλέπω v ἐλάπτο “harm, injury,” and φήμη fīmē “rumor, hearsay”)—impious utterance or insulting action concerning a religion’s deity or supernatural force, until the turn of the twentieth century widely criminalized in countries with monotheistic religions. The ultimate act of blasphemy is atheism. The perceived crime of blasphemy contributed to the formulation of a similar crime of lèse-majesté, transformed in ethnolinguistic nation-states into a popular accusation “traitor of one’s nation,” typically levelled against a person who does not blindly believe in and follow a given national master narrative.

Bloodlands—a concept developed by the United States Historian, Timothy Snyder, in his 2010 eponymous monograph (Snyder 2010). It defines Central Europe functionally through the lens of the spatial occurrence of genocide and ethnic cleansing during World War Two, or more broadly, in the short twentieth century (1913/1914–1989/1991). Most repressions, deportations, expulsions, mass incarceration in concentration camps, or extermination through administratively-induced famine, extermination camps or death squads were carried out by ethnic Germans (Austrians) and ethnic Russians, and were directed at ethnically non-German and non-Russian populations living between interwar Germany and the interwar Soviet Union’s Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic. From the perspective of the Great War, the Bloodlands may be seen as the non-German-speaking parts of Austria-Hungary, alongside the territories occupied by the Central Powers from the Baltic to the Caucasus, and from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean. In terms of World War Two, the Bloodlands were demarcated by the easternmost extent of wartime Germany’s occupation (almost up to the gates of Moscow), and the Soviet Union’s westernmost extent of occupation, which after 1945 coalesced into a Soviet bloc, with neutral Finland and Sweden in the north and the maverick communist states of Albania and Yugoslavia in the south. A concept similar to the Bloodlands, namely the “Lands Between,” was proposed in the same year of 2010 by another United States historian, Alexander Prusin (2010), in his monograph The Lands Between: Conflict in the East European Borderlands, 1870–1992. Prusin’s collocation is derived from the 1830s German term Zwischeneuropa for Central Europe (that is, the areas between the German Confederation and the ethnic [Orthodox] core of the Russian Empire), which became popularized in English-language literature as “in-between Europe” during the 1990s.

bureaucracy (1810s Gallicism, from French bureaucratie, coined from French bureau “desk, office,” and Greek κράτος kra-tōs “power, rule”)—the manner of ruling a polity through administration (state offices, civil service), whose work is done through the medium of writing in a given Einzelsprache, with the use of a specific script. This is the main method of creating and maintaining non-face-to-face statehood. The difference between pre-modern and modern statehood is quite clearly marked by indirect bureaucracy in the former case and direct bureaucracy in the latter. In pre-modern polities only the literate elite (that is, male members of the estates) were in direct contact with the non-face-to-face state bureaucracy (administration), and thus mediated between the state and the vast majority of the overwhelmingly illiterate population, then mostly composed of peasantry (serfs), and living in face-to-face communities (Gemeinschaften, micro-ethnic groups). In modern states that observe or practice the ideal of political equality for all citizens, bureaucracy is direct, ubiquitous, and intensive, meaning that each citizen is in continual contact with the state administration (civil service). Obviously, this is only possible due to compulsory universal elementary education, which ensures full literacy and numeracy.

A change in the official (national) language and writing system when a new nation-state has been founded may overnight make a previously privileged stratum illiterate, innumerate, and disenfranchised, especially in an ethnolinguistic nation-state where access to citizenship is dependent on one’s “correct” nationality (that is membership in a nation) in accordance with ethnolinguistic nationalism’s principle of the normative isomorphism of language, nation, and state. All in all, in non-face-to-face human groups (states) writing is power, meaning, cuius regio, eius scripturam (“whose realm, his writing”).

canon (from Medieval Latin canonicalis “of or under rule,” in turn from Greek kanōn “measuring rod, rule, principle, law”; akin to Arabic قانون qaanun or Hebrew קנָנֶה kanēh “straight,” all meaning literally “reed,” hence English “cane”)—originally an ecclesiastical law or a body of law (“canon law”) in the Catholic Church. Later, by extension, a set of standard principles, axioms and rules to be followed in a field of art or research. Also, a synonym for decorum, that is, the social norms as prevailing in a given Gemeinschaft or Gesellschaft.

Another meaning of the term canon denotes the standard approved set of the “true” books of the Bible, or any scriptural religion’s recognized set of “holy texts (books),” Hence, the present-day meaning of the best books in world literature, or in a country’s literature. In ethnolinguistic nation-states, the term “canon” refers to the best books written in the national Einzelsprache, and to the state-approved principles of correctness (see prescriptivism) of writing and pronouncing a national Einzelsprache. In a broader understanding, the collocation “national canon” may refer to the preselected standard elements of a nation’s culture that are propagated through compulsory school education.

Central Europe—in the mid-nineteenth century, definitely after 1815—this term began to appear in English (as “Middle Europe”) and in German (as Mitteleuropa) for referring to the countries and areas between France and the Russian Empire. It gradually replaced the older conceptual division of Europe into Northern Europe north of the Alps and the Carpathians, and Southern Europe south of these mountain ranges. Hence, the protracted 1700–1721 warfare between Sweden and Muscovy, fought from Scandinavia to the Balkans, and from Denmark to what today is eastern Ukraine, is known as the “Great Northern War,” not...
a “Great Central (or Eastern) European War.” Therefore, any uses of the heuristically useful term Central Europe for periods prior to 1815, in essence, are anachronistic. During the Great War, thanks to the German politician Friedrich Naumann’s influential monograph Mitteleuropa, the term Central Europe was identified with the Central Powers (that is, the German Empire and Austria-Hungary) and their sphere of economic and political influence (occupation) (Naumann 1915). In the interwar period, the concept of Central Europe denoted the swath of ethnolinguistic nation-states, mostly founded after 1918, from the southern Baltic littoral to the Balkans, and from Germany to the Soviet Union. During the Cold War, Central Europe disappeared as a (geo)-political concept, due to the Iron Curtain division of the continent into Western and Eastern Europe, without any Central Europe in the middle. Emigré Central European scholars in North America and Britain developed a scholarly concept of “East-Central Europe” for talking about this part of interwar Central Europe, which found itself under Soviet dominance. They successfully defined this region with the authoritative multivolume book series A History of East Central Europe, which commenced publishing in 1974 (cf Rothschild 1974).

In 1993, the Canadian historian of Rusyn and Ukrainian origin, Paul Robert Magocsi, contributed Historical Atlas of East Central Europe to this series, which nine years later, in 2002, was republished in an extended edition, entitled Historical Atlas of Central Europe (Magocsi 1993, 2002). After the fall of communism and the breakup of the Soviet Union, it was felt unnecessary to qualify the term Central Europe with the adjective “East.” Magocsi proposed to define Central Europe as an equidistant vertical (north-south) midsection of the continent of Europe, however, he does not include Scandinavia in this concept’s scope, though the aforementioned midsection seems to be covering it. In contrast to Magocsi’s definition, the concept of Central Europe as adopted in this Words in Space and Time: Historical Atlas of Language Politics in Modern Central Europe also covers Scandinavia.

Central Europe is as much imagined as Europe itself, and these concepts, as any others developed by humans, are part of social reality. From the perspective of geography, the term “continent” denotes a large landmass surrounded by oceans and seas. Hence, Europe is a mere western peninsula (or subcontinent) of Eurasia, on par with the Indian subcontinent.

From the thematic perspective of this atlas (Words in Space and Time: Historical Atlas of Language Politics in Modern Central Europe), Central Europe is defined as this part of Europe where, after 1918, the model of ethnolinguistic nation-state has been dominant for the sake of statehood creation, legitimation, and maintenance in accordance with ethnolinguistic nationalism’s principle of the normative isomorphism of language, nation, and state. In the terms of borders and polities after the end of communism and the breakup of the Soviet Union, Central Europe extends from Italy and Germany in the west to Russia’s western frontier, and from Scandinavia to the Balkans, including Turkey (that is, Anatolia). In this understanding of Central Europe, the term Eastern Europe denotes the European section of Russia alongside the post-Soviet Caucasian nation-states of Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia. However, some observers use the European Union’s eastern frontier to propose that the post-Soviet states of Belarus, Moldova, and Ukraine also should be classified as part of Eastern Europe. On the other hand, Russia’s official adoption of ethnolinguistic nationalism in the form of the ideology of the Russian World, deployed for the legitimation of the 2014 annexation of Ukraine’s Crimea, may be interpreted as an “eastward enlargement” of the concept of Central Europe, as defined by the use of the aforementioned normative isomorphism for nation-state building, legitimation, and maintenance. Hence, it could be proposed that there is no longer an Eastern Europe. But in literature, authors prefer to speak of Central and Eastern Europe when commenting on political, ideological, and social similarities between states and areas that in the past were apportioned to Central Europe, on the one hand, and to Eastern Europe, on the other.

In his influential 1981 essay (swiftly translated into English, German, and French), the Hungarian historian, Jenő Szűcs, proposed to define Central Europe in terms of sociopolitical developments, as the area where serfdom was introduced in the late medieval period and survived through the nineteenth century (Szűcs 1985). Following in the footsteps of his sociohistoric thinking, it could be proposed that Central Europe be defined as the part of the continent where Latin survived as a leading language of administration, instruction, and intellectual discourse until the mid-nineteenth century. Afterward, the same area was denoted by the use of German as a leading language of commerce and scholarship, alongside French as a leading language of social distinction.

From the ethnodemographic angle, the founding of ethnolinguistic nation-states across Central Europe after the Great War made the region’s two diasporic populations, Jews and Roma, “politically homeless” (that is, with no national polity of their own). Respectively, they had lived in Central Europe at least from the tenth and fourteenth centuries. In reply to the rise of anti-Semitism as part of the region’s “normal politics” in the late nineteenth century, Jewish activists and scholars constructed a cultural nation-state of Yiddishland. With the exception of the interwar Soviet Union, Roma intelligentsia was practically inexistent at that time in Central Europe. A Romanistan on the model of Yiddishland, thanks to the policy of korenizatsiia, began coalescing in this communist polity, but this experiment was cut short in the late 1930s. In interwar Poland it was given a brief lease on life by a proposal to establish a Roma nation-state in a colony outside Europe. The genocide of Jews and Roma as perpetrated by wartime Germany and its allies (Croatia, France, Hungary, Italy, Romania, and Slovakia) wiped out Yiddishland and convinced most Jewish survivors either to move to the United States or to build a Jewish nation-state in the British Mandate of Palestine. In this way, politically and ideologically speaking, Central Europe was extended to the Middle East. In the Soviet bloc, Roma were commonly seen in the press and by local administration as the poorest, or lowest, stratum of the working class or peasantry, rather than a nationality in its own right, hence they were suppressed as a distinctive ethnic group, though their rights as individual citizens were quite well protected. After the end of communism, anti-Tisganism re-emerged and appeared in places where it had not existed before as a significant element of the programs of Central Europe’s radical right and nationalist parties.
Last but not least, the post-2015 dramatic rise in the popularity of populist, nationalist, pro-authoritarian, radical left, and radical right parties that led to the downgrading and denigration of democracy, liberalism, tolerance, rule of law, and European integration, unfortunately, seems now to be the main defining feature of today’s Central Europe. In a way, it is a return to the “typical historical path” of the Central Europe of ethnonationalistic nation-state, characterized by growing authoritarianism in the interwar period, and the subsequent acceptance of, or acquiescence to, wartime Germany’s national socialist totalitarianism, and the postwar Soviet Union’s communist totalitarianism. See also Bloodlands.

Chauvinism—this term (derived from the mythic figure of Nicolas Chauvin, an ideal soldier-patriot of revolutionary France’s and Napoleon’s armies) denotes excessive and unreasonable patriotism (like the native English term “jingoism”), an irrational belief in the superiority of one’s own nation, or for that matter, any form of unreasonable bigotry against or hatred of a group of people (for instance, male chauvinism).

In Central Europe’s languages the term chauvinism is typically synonymous with nationalism, as these Einzelsprachen miss a neutral designation of the ideology of nationalism. Hence, in this region the popular usage is as follows: the nationalism of one’s own nation is patriotism, while nationalisms of other nations must be a form of chauvinism.

citizenship (Old French citeain “burgher, city dweller,” ultimately from Latin civis “citizen,” and “-ship,” “noun ending”)—confusingly, the preferred English synonym for this term is nationality, hence in passports the rubric for one’s citizenship is titled “nationality.” Citizenship is a legally enshrined (usually in the constitution) relationship (contract) between a person and the state, which enumerates the person’s (citizen’s) responsibilities toward her or his state, and the privileges due to all its citizens (citizenry). In civic nationalism, all of the nation-state’s citizens are construed as the nation. In ethnic nationalism, typically some citizens of a nation-state are not members of this polity’s ethnically defined nation because they speak a different Einzelsprache than the national language or profess a different faith than the national religion.

civic nation (etymology: see nation). The adjective “civic” stems from Latin civis “pertaining to a city or citizens,” ultimately from civis “citizen”—all the citizens (citizenry) of a given civic nation-state. In a civic nation-state citizenship equates nationality (membership in the nation), unlike in ethnic nation-states, where typically the “correct” ethnonationality is necessary for one to qualify for citizenship. In ethnic nationalism, nationality is believed to be a “natural” (biological) trait, received by birth from one’s parents by the way of “blood” (that is, genetic descent). On the contrary, in civic nationalism, it is obvious to all that nationality or citizenship is a legal status that one acquires in the course of naturalization by fulfilling a set of predefined requirements (descent from parents holding the citizenship/nationality of the civic nation-state in question may, but does not have to, be one of such requirements). The legal principle for acquiring civic citizenship/nationality in this manner is known as jus soli (Latin for “right of the soil”). It is opposed to jus sanguinis (Latin for “right of blood”), or the ethnic (descent-based) manner of acquiring citizenship. In an ethnic nation-state with the orthodox jus sanguinis citizenship law, it is impossible to acquire citizenship in any other manner. This was the case of Germany until 1991, and still is the case of Qatar.

civic nationalism—this form of nationalism was invented in the United States and revolutionary France. Both polities redefined the population living on the state’s territory as citizens. In turn, all the state’s citizens (citizenry) were declared to be the nation, whose “common will” (instead of divine right) ensures legitimacy for the government and statehood of the resultant nation-state. Most of the present-day world’s politics follow this model. Outside of Eurasia all extant nation-states are civic in their character.

civic vs ethnic nationalism—a normative dichotomy developed in the early 1970s by the Montenegrin political scientist, John Plamenatz, working at the University of Oxford. In this line of thinking civic nationalisms are “good” and typical of the West, while ethnic nationalisms are “bad” and typical of the East (Plamenatz 1973). The “West” in this formulation refers to Western Europe, North America, and Australasia (that is, Australia, New Zealand, and the surrounding postcolonial island nation-states), while the “East” refers to Central and Eastern Europe. In a broader understanding of ethnicity as culture, politics and customs of civic nationalism (such as citizenship or constitution), these are part of human culture (ethnicity). Hence, in reality, all nationalisms are ethnic in their character. Civic nationalism is just a subcategory of ethnic nationalism.

Interestingly, unlike in English or other European languages, in Modern Arabic there are two different terms for each of these two kinds of nationalism. The term qawmiyya for ethnonationalism is derived from qawm, meaning “a people, tribe (ethnic group) and (ethnolinguistic) nation.” On the other hand, the termwataniyya for civic nationalism is derived from the wordواتن, meaning “homeland, country, nation-state.” The ethnonationalist (Pan-)Arab nationalism grounded in the Arabic language is referred to by the use of the neologism qawmiyya, while civic nationalisms (disparaged as “regionalisms” by Pan-Arab nationalists), centered on Arabic-speaking nation-states (such as Algeria, Egypt, or Sudan), are invariably termed wataniyyas.

civilization (from Latin civis “citizen” or “city dweller,” as opposed to “barbarian,” or “villager,” hence the French seventeenth-century verb civiliser “to civilize,” in the mid-eighteenth century adopted in English for denoting “the act or process of bringing out of a savage or uneducated state”)—a blurry, but highly ideological, concept popularized in the mid-twentieth century by the influential British historian Arnold Toynbee, who used it as a key term of analysis in his massive 12-volume history of the world, A Study of History (1934–1961). Since the mid-1990s, the current understanding of the term “civilization” has been decisively shaped by the United States political scientist Samuel
Huntington’s highly influential work *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (1996). Nowadays, civilization means a human population (typically) consisting of numerous ethnic groups, nations, or states united by a shared *culture*, supposedly underwritten by a single *religion* and the “holy script” (*writing system*) of the religion’s “holy book,” as written in a “holy tongue” (*Einzelsprache*). To a large degree Huntington’s “Orthodox civilization” is coterminous with the “post-Soviet space,” on the basis of which, and in line with, the tenets of *Eurasianism*, the present-day Russian government promotes the ideology of the “Russian World.”

**class** (from Latin *classis* “class, division, army, or fleet,” but especially “any one of the six orders of taxation into which the inhabitants of ancient Rome were divided”)—in marxism, a socio-economic stratum with the richest *elite* being the top stratum. Traditional democracy replaced *estates* (classes to which one belonged by birthright) with legal and political *equality*. For marxists (*communists, socialists*) these provisions are insufficient to achieve true equality, hence it is proposed that classes (socio-economic inequalities) must be mitigated, or even liquidated, leading to a more equal society, or even to classless society, as predicted by communists.

**collective responsibility** (etymology: *see collectivism*). The noun “responsibility” comes from “responsible,” derived from Latin *respondeere* “to respond, answer, promise in return,” ultimately from *spondere* “to pledge, promise”)—the principle that the entire group (*nation*) bears responsibility for the acts (typically assessed as “criminal,” or otherwise reprehensible) of any of its members. Hence, punishment for an individual’s (supposed) crimes may be taken out on the entire group or any of its members. Often ethnic cleansing or genocide are a form of collective punishment. *See also collectivism, individualism.*

**collectivism** (mid-1870 French neologism *collectivisme*, in turn from Latin *collectivus*, or past participle of *colligo* “assemble, gather together”)—an attitude, doctrine, or even ideology, which claims that a group, as consisting of individuals, is of more import than an individual. Collectivism is the foundational premise of *communism, fascism,* and any *totalitarianism,* or the phenomenon of *collective responsibility.* It is also a significant basis of *nationalism,* especially *ethnic nationalism,* in which the “survival, fate” of the *nation,* its *national language,* or national *religion* are prioritized over the individual. In *civic nationalism,* the power of collectivism is reined in by the purely contractual definition of *nationality* (membership in a nation), as equated with *citizenship.* One may choose to become a member (that is, citizen) of a civic nation (that is, a *nation-state*), but on the contrary one is believed to have been “born” to an ethnic nation (*speech community, religious community*), and thus “naturally” supplied at birth with the nation’s language and/or religion.

**colonialism** (from Latin *colonia* “colony,” in turn derived from *colere* “to inhabit, till or cultivate land,” also yielding *colon*[us] “serf” and “inhabitant of a colony”)—a *modern* policy of Western powers (or Westernized powers, such as Russia or Japan) to conquer non-Western lands with an eye of turning them and their populations into subject territories for the sake of exploitation. If a power managed to win a considerable number of colonies, they usually were molded into a colonial *empire* (*see imperialism*). Colonial empires were typically maritime in their character, the imperial metropolis separated from its colonial empire by seas and oceans. The notable example is the Russian Empire, which expanded in a contiguous manner across *Eurasia,* thus forming a continent-wide land empire. Another exception is that under the political guises of the Soviet Union, Soviet bloc, Russian Federation, and Eurasian Union this empire has largely survived to this day. China is also a land empire. *See also decolonization.*

**communalism** (etymology: *see communism*)—ostensibly the phenomenon of creating a sharp difference between cohabiting groups through the politicization of *religion.* Hence, nowadays, another name for *ethnoreligious nationalism.* This term is especially popular in South Asian countries that used to be British colonies. Ceylon (now Sri Lanka) was not incorporated into British India due to its Buddhist character, while in 1937 Burma was separated from British India and made into a separate colony, also due to the fact that most of its inhabitants were Buddhists. In 1947 British India was split into the nation-states of India and Pakistan on an ethnoreligious basis, resulting in huge ethnic cleansing (with elements of genocide) across the newly created frontiers. Like the term *tribalism* in sub-Saharan Africa, in today’s India the word communalism functions as a pejorative for negatively branding ethnoreligious national movements for autonomy or independence. The application of this term to a movement seems to automatically delegitimize it and allows for disregarding such a movement. This is especially true of predominately Muslim Kashmir and Khalistan, or a project of an ethnoreligious nation-state for the Sikhs construed as a nation. *See also sectarianism.*

**communism** (from Latin *communis* “common, universal, for all,” also the etymological source of “community” = *Gemeinschaft*; ironically, the meaning is shared with Greek word καθολικός *katholikos* “universal, global,” which features prominently in the name of the Catholic Church, prompting frequent comparisons of communism to a *religion*)—a far-left universalist *ideology* in its aspirations of building a global-wide classless and
nation-less society for all humanity, where spontaneous self-organization would replace the necessity of statehood, and everyone will contribute according to their skills and receive according to their needs. Although the Soviet Union is typically classified as a communist state, in the Soviet leaders’ own opinion only socialism was achieved in this country, namely, a transitional stage between capitalism (= nationalism) and communism. Western observers referred to the Soviet sociopolitical and economic system as “really existing communism (socialism).” In practice, communism has been a monoparty totalitarian or authoritarian tyranny led by an irrevocably male dictator, in which the ruling party structures double as the state’s administrative structures. The co-option of ethnolinguistic nationalism in the interwar Soviet Union was only for accelerating the transition from capitalism (bourgeois society, nations) to socialism (communism), and after achieving this goal nationalism was to be liquidated in favor of classless society with a single socialist language (apparently, Russian). The stubborn persistence of ethnolinguistic nationalism led to the adoption of national (ethnic) languages and cultures as a “form” for the socialist (communist) “content.” After the end of stalinism in 1956, national communisms (in plural) were adopted across the Soviet bloc’s countries, meaning these countries’ specific (national) “ways to socialism (communism).” Yugoslavia was the first country to adopt this policy, which, in 1948, led to the “rift” (conflict) between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union. Homogenization of the state, as sought by communists was class-oriented in its character. All classes, but laborers (workers and peasants), were to be liquidated, and thus a uniform (ideally, global-wide) “classless” (that is, single-class) society was to be achieved. In practice, class homogenization was coupled with ethnolinguistic homogenization, namely, Russification of the population in the Soviet Union, or the monolinguisation of the population in a given Soviet bloc country’s national language (Einzelsprache). See also fascism.

composite (official) language (etymology: see language. The term “composite” stems from Latin compositus, or past participle compōnere “to put together”—with the rise of the printed book, publishers strove to standardize and limit the number of administrative (chancery) Einzelsprachen employed in a polity’s chanceries, as typically connected to this or that city’s or town’s specific speech variety. Publishers engaging in such language engineering curbed the variants of extant syntactical structures, systematized spelling, and selected preferred forms of words. Furthermore, they provided vocabulary lists in which such selected (standard) forms of words were paired with their counterparts in a given local speech variety. They made this effort with an eye for being able to produce gainfully a bigger number of copies of a book title for a bigger market. In the sixteenth century, there were at least six German(ic) Druckersprachen (printing Einzelsprachen) across the Holy Roman Empire. Subsequently, the Druckersprache of Martin Luther’s translation of the Bible rapidly gained popularity with the spread of Protestantism. This translation’s Druckersprache was the chancery Einzelsprache of the Electorate of Saxony. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, it was in direct competition with the Common German of the imperial court at Vienna and with the two “Low German” Einzelsprachen of the Hanseatic League and the Dutch Republic. By the turn of the nineteenth century Luther’s version of the Saxon chancery Einzelsprache had become a German language, while the Dutch Low German had yielded a Dutch language. From this historical (diachronic) perspective, today’s German is a clear case of a composite language. The aforementioned chancery languages and Druckersprachen of the Holy Roman Empire are too simplistically seen as “belonging to” the German language, while in reality all of them were Einzelsprachen in their own right. With time, some were melded with Luther’s Saxon chancery Einzelsprache, while others fell from written use. But nowadays the composite character of the German Einzelsprache as a national language is largely forgotten, especially with the determined and continuing deployment of prescriptivism and purism for enforcing the unitary character of German.

In 1885, the Norwegian Parliament recognized the written standards of Nynorsk (New Norwegian) and Bokmål (Book Language) as official and equal varieties of the Norwegian language. In accordance with the logic of ethnolinguistic nationalism that equates an Einzelsprache’s speech community with the nation (see normative isomorphism of language, nation, and state), between 1917 and 1966, Norway’s official language politics predicted and encouraged the merger of these two varieties into a monocentric Samnorsk (Common Norwegian), causing much political and social tension before it was discontinued. However, for the sake of preserving the ethnolinguistic unity of the Norwegian nation, Bokmål and Nynorsk are not perceived as two separate Einzelsprachen, but as “written dialects (standards)” of the single, though pluricentric, Norwegian language.

In 1918, Czechoslovakia was founded based on ethnolinguistic nationalism as a nation-state of the Czechoslovak nation. But at that time Czech and Slovak were employed as separate national languages, which clashed with the principle of the normative isomorphism of language, nation, and state. Hence, following the Norwegian example, in 1920 a single (though pluricentric) Czechoslovak national language was proclaimed, comprising two equal written standards of Czech and Slovak. However, in reality the Czech standard was preferred in actual administrative use over the Slovak one. Subsequently, in emulation of the Samnorsk model, an effort was undertaken to Czechize Slovak during the early 1930s to create a single common and monocentric written standard of Czechoslovak, namely a Czech Einzelsprache with some Slovak elements added. Many Slovak activists and intellectuals opposed such an unequal merger of Czech and Slovak, thus reinforcing the separateness of Slovak as an Einzelsprache with the use of anti-Czech purism. The destruction of Czechoslovakia in 1939, followed by the creation of a wartime ethnolinguistic nation-state of Slovakia, tore apart the pluricentric Czechoslovak language into monocentric Czech and Slovak. The Norwegian style model of a composite national language turned out to be unsustainable due to the continuing ethnic (national) difference between the Czechs and Slovaks, additionally reinforced during the war by the state border. See also suprastandard bilingualism.

The Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, also founded in 1918, faced the same ideological dilemma, like interwar Czechoslo-
vacia. Following the Czechoslovak solution, in 1921, Serbo-Croatian-Slovenian (also spelled Serbocroatoslovenian) was proclaimed as the nation-state’s single (though pluricentric) national language. In practice, it came in the two written standards of Serbo-Croatian and Slovenian. In addition, the former standard had two scriptal varieties, namely, the Croatian one in Latin letters and the Serbian one in Cyrillic. The dilemma of national unity remained unresolved for much longer because the kingdom’s two nations of Serbo-Croat and Slovenes (mentioned in statistical and official documents) were not melded into a single nation of Yugoslavs until 1929. The country’s name was changed accordingly to Yugoslavia, but the name of the Yugoslav nation’s national language of Serbo-Croat-Slovenian remained officially unaltered, though in popular parlance people began to refer to it as “Yugoslav.” Due to ethnolinguistic and ethnoreligious differences reinforced by the wartime breakup of Yugoslavia and the establishment of a Croatian nation-state, the composite (pluricentric) “Yugoslav” language was split into monocentric wartime Croatian, Slovenian, and Serbian, while in what today is Macedonia, then under Bulgarian occupation, southern Serbian was renamed as Bulgarian. In postwar federal Yugoslavia the wartime southern Serbian-turned-Bulgarian was made into a separate national Einzelsprache of Macedonian, wartime Slovenian was retained as a separate national language, while Croatian and Serbian were melded into a renewed composite (pluricentric) language of Serbo-Croatian. In 1974 the four republican-cum-national-cum-scriptal varieties of Serbo-Croatian were recognized, namely, Bosnian, Croatian, Montenegrin, and Serbian. When in the first half of the 1990s Yugoslavia broke up into successor ethnolinguistic nation-states, pluricentric Serbo-Croatian was split accordingly into the monocentric national languages of Bosnian, Croatian, Montenegrin, and Serbian. In 2017, without questioning the political and national separateness of these four post-Serbo-Croatian Einzelsprachen, a sizeable group of Bosnian, Croatian, Montenegrin, and Serbian linguists and intellectuals proposed that for the purpose of everyday communication, characterized by uniform mutual comprehensibility (or superstandard multilingualism), all four languages could be seen as parts of a non-political, non-national, non-official, nameless pluricentric language, only functionally designated as the “Common Language” (Zajednički).

collection camp (from Spanish campos de reconcentración “camps for re-concentrating [populations removed by force from the rebel areas],” used by the Spanish forces during the Cuban War of Independence [1895–1898]; afterward yielding, in 1901, the English-language term “concentration camps,” as employed by the British forces in South Africa during the Second Boer War [1899–1902]; first appearing in German as Konzentrationslager in 1904 in the context of the German genocide of the Herero and Nama in South-West Africa, before becoming the official term [commonly abbreviated as KZ or KL] for a vast network of internment, forced labor and death or extermination camps, developed and maintained by national socialist Germany in 1933–1945; in parallel, the term appeared in Russian in 1919 as концентрационный лагерь konzentrationnyj lager’ for denoting ad hoc prisons for “enemies of the Bolshevik revolution,” later replaced in Soviet terminology by the term лагерь [prinuditel’nykh rabot] lager’ [prinuditel’nykh rabot] “[forced labor] camp;” a vast system of Soviet concentration camps existed between 1930 and 1956, and unofficially until 1991; during World War Two the Soviet portmanteau word konzentrationslager’ appeared as a pejorative for wartime Germany’s Konzentrationslager)”—this expression gained wider currency during the Boer Wars at the turn of the twentieth century when enemy combatants and their families and (non-white) farm laborers were indiscriminately rounded up without due trial or any charges and detained in guarded locations surrounded by barbed wire (later, often electrified) fences. The concentration camp as an instrument of population engineering had developed in the colonial context since the 1890s in North America and Australia. In the twentieth century all Europe’s authoritarian and totalitarian states built and maintained vast networks of concentration camps for detaining political opponents and for removing unwanted populations in their quest for the ideal of ethnolinguistic homogeneity. As a result, the term “(concentration, re-education or forced labor) camp” became widespread in Central Europe’s languages (for example, lageris in Estonian; Baxter in English; lager in Hungarian; tabor in Czech, Hungarian, and Slovak; Lager in German; taari, taber in Italian; nometne in Latvian; sterevolou or lageris in Lithuanian; obój or lager in Polish; lagăr in Romanian; orropol logor in Serbo-Croatian and Macedonian; taborišče in Slovenian; lager in Swedish; kamps in Turkish; or табір tabir in Ukrainian). See also authoritarianism, extermination camp, population (demographic) engineering, totalitarianism.

constructed language (etymology: see language. The verb “construct” is derived from Latin con-= “with, together” and struire “to build”)—typically, a language (Einzelsprache) that was constructed by a single person or institution for the purpose of ensuring “neutral” (that is, not connected to a state language or a nation’s language) communication (for instance, Esperanto). To some extent it is a misnomer because all Einzelsprachen are constructed. The difference is that people tend to believe (wrongly) that national languages and state (official) languages are “natural,” either a product of nature or a divinity’s will. They contrast them to constructed languages that are labelled as “artificial,” meaning “man-made.” But all languages (Einzelsprachen) are man-made. In this context the only natural (biological) element is o language.

crime against humanity (the word “crime” stems from Latin crimen “charge, crime.” The term “humanity” comes from Latin humanitas “human nature, humanity,” as derived from humanus “human, humane,” ultimately from homo “human being”)—this term was developed, first, in the 1840s among United States abolitionist for referring to slavery, and then in the late nineteenth century it was employed as a chilling assessment of the genocide-scale killings in the Belgian king’s personal colony of the Free State of Congo. Genocide and ethnic cleansing are crimes against humanity.

Cuius regio, eius religio (Whose realm, his religion)—the glossary is not a typical place for probing, in a detailed man-
ner, into the origins of a concept. However, this slogan under-
lays the principle of normative religious homogeneity, which
was alluded to in the terms of the Peace of Augsburg (1555)
and the Peace of Westphalia (1648), subsequently becoming the norm of
statehood organization, legitimation, and maintenance across
Western and (parts of) Central Europe in the wake of the reli-
gious wars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Most prob-
ably, it was the tradition of Judeo-Christian-Islamic monothe-
ism that pushed the signatures of these two aforementioned peace treaties in this direction.

In 1612, the Pomeranian scholar Joachim Stephani, professor
of law and president of the Protestant University of Greifswald,
published a second edition of his opus magnum Institutiones Iuris
Canonicis, which features the key sentence that gave rise to this
normative slogan:

Ut & ideo hodie religionem regioni cohaerere dici potest, ut
cuius sit REGIO, hoc est, Ducatus, Principatus, Territorium
seu Ius territorialij, eius etiam sit REGIO, hoc est, Ius
Episcopale, seu Iuridictio spiritualis (Stephani 1612: 52).

I took the liberty of giving the relevant fragments in bold. Subsequently, the slogan quickly appears in its finalized form, that is, cuius regio, ejus religio (Vietor 1615: Conclusio XXXVI; Hampil 1621: 1223; Mager 1625: 484). In 1695 an entire study was published on this principle of the then already international law (see Westphalian statehood), namely, Adam Rechenberg’s Problema Politicum, An Cuius regio, eius sit Religio? (Rechenberg 1695).

During the West’s (colonial and imperial) expansion across
the world, the political question of heterogeneity vs homogeneity
was firmly settled in favor of the latter principle. With the
rise of the novel ideology of nationalism in the nineteenth cen-
tury, this norm of religious homogeneity was translated into the
ideal of ethnolinguistic homogeneity, readily adopted across
Central Europe. In the sphere of language standardization
this norm spawned purism, while at the level of state building
yielded ethnolinguistic nationalism’s principle of the norma-
tional isomorphism of language, nation, and state. The old
normative slogan was reinvented as the principle of cuius regio, eius
lingua (whose realm, his language).

cultural imperialism (etymology: see culture, imperialism)—in the 1920s this term appeared in Russian (культурный империализм kul’turnyi imperialism) and German (Kulturimperialismus) as a criticism of the imposition of imperial metropolises’ institutions, legal systems, educational solutions, economic practices, customs, and the like on the colonized popula-
tions across maritime and continent-wide empires. In the case
of the former language this coinage arose as part of the lexicon
of Bolshevik propaganda for countering “Great Russian chau-
vinsm” (see Russification) and for furthering the policy of ko-
renizatsiia. However, the German-language counterpart arose
in the context of the post-World War One partition of the de-
feated Germany’s colonial empire among the victorious Allied
country-states’ maritime empires. The term “culture” in Russian
and German (like in other languages of Central Europe) is a
synonym for civilization, and the elite’s manners and customs
posed as the normative benchmark of decorum, good behavior
and manners, or good education.

In the mid-twentieth century, especially in the wake of decol-
onization, the term denotes a strong criticism of the former
imperial powers’ continuing (“soft power”) domination over their
former colonies through economic, financial, institutional and
cultural means, namely, education, literature, books, periodicals,
radio, or television in the imperial language. See also linguistic
imperialism.

culture (from Middle French culture “the tilling of land,” de-

erived from Latin cultūra “the cultivating of land, agriculture,” in
turn from colere “to till,” attested in the current meaning from the
early nineteenth century under the influence of the late eight-
teenth-century use of the German term Kultur, initially spelled
Cultur)—typically, the totality of human customs and norms of
behavior observed in human groups (societies), that is, social
reality. In a narrower understanding, culture (as equated with eth-
nicity) is opposed to politics, leading to the rise of the civic vs
ethnic opposition.

However, in Central Europe’s Einzelsprachen this term is
often employed as a measure of a civilization of an individual or
nation, typically, as a synonym for “good manners,” “appropri-
cate customs and skills,” and social norms as prescribed in light
of the model of civilization exemplified by Western Europe’s
imperial powers. A person or nation not fulfilling these ex-
pectations is denigrated as “culture-less” or “without any culture”
typically denoted as “uncultivated” or “uneducated” in English), that is, kulturlos in German, bez kultury in Polish, or бескультурный beskul’turnyi in Russian. In many ways, the pe-
jorative term “without any culture” was a counterpart of the colo-
nial one of “native” or “savage.” In Central Europe serfs or freshly
illiterate persons, and in Western Europe persons and the poor, were the West’s internal Other, those “without any culture,” or in other words “our Other,” as opposed to the colo-
nial “foreign Other.” See also assimilation, discrimination, na-
tional culture.

cyberspace (mid-1980s portmanteau neologism built from the
words “cyber[netics],” a discipline studying regulatory systems,
and “space.” Cybernetics is a French scholarly neologism stem-
ing from Greek κυβερνήτης kybernētēs “helmsman, governor,
rudder.” Space is a common noun derived from Latin spatium
“space, room, distance,” thought to stem from Indo-European
spēb “to stretch, to pull”—usually a colorful synonym for the
internet; otherwise the worldwide space of non-face-to-face
technologically enabled integrated written, oral, and audio-vi-
sual interactive (and often instantaneous) communication, which
incorporates and supersedes the former mass media of the press,
radio, television, or telephony. Earlier, for most of human history,
social reality was stored exclusively in humans’ heads (that is, in
the brain’s neocortex) and was acted out through the medium of
language (actualized as speech varieties or Einzelsprachen) in
relations between individuals and their groups (ethnic groups,
Gemeinschaften, Gesellschaften, micro-ethnic groups, na-
tions, nationalities, states). The technology of writing and its
products (books, newspapers) became a significant aide-mémoire in humanity’s constant generation and maintenance of social reality, subsequently enhanced by the mass media of telephony, cinema, radio, and television in the twentieth century. However, cyberspace radically shifts the storing and retrieval (generation, maintenance) of social reality from people’s brains to the software and hardware, which make the internet possible. Earlier, the generation, maintenance, and alteration of social reality was fully dependent on human will. Nowadays, the ongoing delegation of social reality to cyberspace leaves it open, and perhaps vulnerable, to software-based automatized manipulation without any direct human involvement, as exemplified by the appearance of ubiquitous “bots” (web robots, internet crawlers, social media bot accounts, or zombie computers).

Due to its initial “borderless” (detached from nation-states) character, cyberspace was seen as the ideal realm of free speech. But subsequently, rampant commercialization quickly compartmentalized cyberspace into insulated “kingdoms” of Facebook, Myspace, Pintrest, Twitter, Viber, or Baidu Tieba, collectively known as “social media.” This designation is confusing to say the least, because it is not society (Gesellschaft) that controls these media, but commercial companies who perceive users as individual “customers,” purely in terms of pecuniary profit. In addition, since the late 1990s totalitarian and authoritarian states—led by the examples of China and Iran—have developed vast and increasingly more refined online systems of control, surveillance, and censorship for preventing any effective web mobilization (Gesellschaft-building) or individual dissidence, which could threaten the current regime’s monopoly of power. On the other hand, these measures (to a degree readily adopted by other nation-states) also rapidly territorialize the internet, insulating the fragment that corresponds (in linguistic, scriptal, political, cultural, and economic terms) to a given nation-state from other national (nation-state-based) fragments of cyberspace. At present, North Korea excels at maintaining its own national cyberspace absolutely isolated—physically (in the terms of the hardware, that is, optical cables) and online—from the rest of the world. As a result, reflections (“avatars”) of sovereign nation-states and their nations are reproduced online. Cyberspace is rapidly nationalized, nation-states reinforce their law and regulations online, making sure that internet companies are controlled by states, not the other way around.

The possibility of storing and operationalizing a nation-state’s entire law, administration, governance, registers, and statistics (that is, statehood) online in the form of a cyberspace “avatar” led to the rise of a novel form of defense. Since the early twenty-first century Estonia has been attacked many times by Russia. Russian secret agents and military planes have illegally breached the Estonian border and air space on multiple occasions. Furthermore, the Kremlin has ordered numerous cyberwarfare attacks on Estonia. After Russia’s 2014 annexation of Ukraine’s Crimea with the employment of the then novel attacks on Estonia. After Russia’s 2014 annexation of Ukraine’s Crimea, the Estonian border and air space on multiple occasions. Russian secret agents and military planes have illegally breached the Estonian (etymology: see cyberspace imperialism) or individual dissidence, which could threaten the current regime’s monopoly of power. On the other hand, these measures (to a degree readily adopted by other nation-states) also rapidly territorialize the internet, insulating the fragment that corresponds (in linguistic, scriptal, political, cultural, and economic terms) to a given nation-state from other national (nation-state-based) fragments of cyberspace. At present, North Korea excels at maintaining its own national cyberspace absolutely isolated—physically (in the terms of the hardware, that is, optical cables) and online—from the rest of the world. As a result, reflections (“avatars”) of sovereign nation-states and their nations are reproduced online. Cyberspace is rapidly nationalized, nation-states reinforce their law and regulations online, making sure that internet companies are controlled by states, not the other way around.

The possibility of storing and operationalizing a nation-state’s entire law, administration, governance, registers, and statistics (that is, statehood) online in the form of a cyberspace “avatar” led to the rise of a novel form of defense. Since the early twenty-first century Estonia has been attacked many times by Russia. Russian secret agents and military planes have illegally breached the Estonian border and air space on multiple occasions. Furthermore, the Kremlin has ordered numerous cyberwarfare attacks on Estonia. After Russia’s 2014 annexation of Ukraine’s Crimea, the widespread Estonian fear is that one day Russian troops may annex the country in a similarly underhanded manner. The precedent of the Soviet annexation of Estonia in 1940 heightens this existential fear. Hence, as a precaution, in 2018, Estonia opened a “data embassy” (also referred to as “e-embassy”) in Luxembourg.

This data embassy is a fully functional cyberspace avatar of Estonian statehood. Should an enemy power destroy the fully internet-based systems of the Estonian state through an act of cyberwarfare, such an e-embassy would allow for the swift recreation and operationalization of such systems with the use of the e-embassy servers located in a safe third country. And in the event of a foreign occupation of Estonia, thanks to its data embassy avatar, the Estonian state would continue to serve its citizens, both in Estonia under occupation and abroad, where many Estonians would undoubtedly seek refuge. See also ISO 639.

cyberspace imperialism (etymology: see cyberspace, imperialism)—a form of cultural imperialism and linguistic imperialism; that is, the phenomenon of the initial near-domination of English (75 percent in 1998) and the Latin alphabet (100 percent) on the internet. Unicode allows for the online use of over 600 Einzelsprachen written in about 150 different scripts, but it was only in 2009 that the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) allowed for the (limited) use of non-Latin script characters (graphemes) in URL (Uniform Resource Locator) addresses (see also ISO 15924, ISO 639). In 2018, 53 percent of the internet content was in English, 85 percent in the Latin script, and practically all in Eurasia’s Einzelsprachen only. The West’s domination is clearly visible in the fact that 88 percent of the internet content is available in European Einzelsprachen, while the rest in Asian languages. Although L1 English-speakers constitute only one-quarter of the internet’s users, at least the same number of non-English-speaking L2 users of this language must contribute to the production of the English-language internet content. This disproportion is even more telling in the case of the second largest L1 group users of the web, namely, Chinese-speakers, who amount to over 19 percent. However, the Chinese-language online content is less than 2 percent of all the web content (which is also a function of totalitarian China’s quite stifling tight control of the internet). On the other hand, L1 German-speakers and L1 Russian-speakers, at 2.2 and 2.7 percent of the internet users respectively, hit way above their weight as creators of 6.3 and 6.1 percent of the online content respectively. In addition, Cyrillic-based Russian-language online content accounts for almost half of the globe’s non-Latin alphabet-based internet content, and thus dwarfs Chinese-language content in Chinese characters, which is three times smaller. In the case of Russian, the data clearly shows how the dominant position of this Einzelsprache and online production in it underpin and encourage Moscow’s current ideology of the Russian World and make it possible to launch hybrid warfare operations on this basis.

cyber inequality (etymology: see cyberspace. The term “inequality” stems from Medieval Latin inaequalis, in turn from inaequalis “unequal,” as formed from in- “not” and aequalis “equal”—during the 1990s and 2000s cyberspace became an integral part of the economy and sociopolitical life across nation-states in the rich North, hence another cleavage was introduced between the poor South and the rich North. In terms of Einzelsprachen, internet content is produced and reproduced only in a clutch of the official and national languages of the rich North’s nation-states, languages which invariably stem
from Eurasia. Hence, speakers of non-Eurasian languages have no choice but to acquire and access the web with the use of the large languages of Eurasia. Another dimension of this divide is the question of literacy and numeracy. These skills are often limited in countries of the poor South, additionally curbing their inhabitants’ access to cyberspace. The promise of the oral internet, run purely through speech, has not been fulfilled yet.

cyberwarfare (etymology: see cyberspace). The term “warfare” stems from Middle English warfare, formed Old English werre “strife, war, conflict,” and faran “the course, progress of,” cognate with German fahren “go, travel”—the militarized use of online content and resources for launching a coordinated series of internet-based attacks by one nation-state against another. Cyberwarfare is played out through software, Einzelsprachen, and writing systems, hence it is fully contained within the internet-enhanced social reality (cyberspace). As such it is bloodless but can lead to mass disruption of a variety of electronic systems from hospitals and schools to trains and administration, and as a result to indirect loss of life and economic hardship. See also hybrid warfare.

Cyrilli(ci)zation (not to be confused with Cyrillification): from the name of Saint Cyril, who together with Saint Methodius, in the 860s, developed the script of Glagolitic for writing Slavic. Some decades after these two saints’ deaths, their pupils developed a new, more Greek-like script for the same purpose in the 880s. This second Slavic script’s name commemorates Saint Cyril, who did not invent Cyrillic—transliteration of non-Cyrillic-based Einzelsprachen into Cyrillic-based languages, for instance, of Greek or Estonian into Russian or Belarusian.

Cyrillification (not to be confused with Cyrilli(ci)zation; etymology: see Cyrilli(ci)zation)—a Soviet policy of changing the (predominantly Latin) scripts of Soviet languages into Cyrillic, adopted between the mid-1930s and mid-1940s to end korenizatsia and for ensuring the normative monoscriptalism of the Soviet Union. This policy reversed or thoroughly changed the korenizatsia policy of Latinization, and after 1938 became the hallmark of the policy of Russification. See also politics of script.

decolonization (etymology: see colonialism)—the political process that during the second half of the twentieth century led to the dismantling of the European (Western) powers’ maritime (and continent-wide) colonial empires. Colonies, as constitutive elements of such empires, were given (or won) independence and turned into postcolonial nation-states. Ironically, this studiously non-national communist polity of the Soviet Union that amply used the rhetoric of anti-imperialism in order to criticize the “capitalist West,” eventually turned out to be an empire itself, which was partly decolonized in 1991. However, the Russian Federation with numerous ethnic autonomous republics strewn across its territory, especially in the Caucasus and Siberia, to a certain degree remains an empire, while the Eurasian (Economic) Union founded in 2015 appears to be a conscious effort at rebuilding the Russian (Soviet) Empire in line with the legitimizing (“soft power”) ideology of the Russian World.

Decolonization usually transformed (democratized) typically monocentric imperial languages into pluricentric languages, which now function as national (official) languages in postcolonial nation-states. Ironically, this process also led to the growing indigenization (autochthonization) of the former imperial languages (all stemming from Europe) at the expense of the indigenous (non-European) languages, which almost by default are excluded from any official written use in the postcolonial nation-states outside of Eurasia. As a result, outside of Eurasia, language conflicts are played out with the employment of European Einzelsprachen, which used to be imperial languages. For instance, the cleavage line in Canada’s Quebec sovereignty conflict is drawn between French- and English-speakers. Even more poignantly, although in everyday life Cameroon’s inhabitants use over 200 ethnic speech varieties (languages), the 2017–2018 military conflict is fought between the officially Anglophone region of Southern Cameroonians and the rest of the country where French is the official language. The ethnolinguistically defined dividing line between these two sides of conflict is that of the colonial border between the British colonial mandate of Cameroon and the French colonial mandate of Cameroun. In essence, non-L1 speakers of English and French battle out an old colonial conflict between two European powers who gave up on their maritime empires over half a century ago. See also cultural imperialism, linguistic imperialism.

deep structure vs surface structure (term “structure” stems from Latin structūra, in turn from structūre “to put together.” The adjective “deep” stems from Old English dōp and is cognate with German tief “face, shape”)—in the early 1960s, the world-renowned United States linguist Noam Chomsky (1928–), postulated that what people actually utter (speech) when speaking is the surface structure of a language (Chomsky 1964: 10, 14-16). Hence, all Einzelsprachen, speech varieties, or lects (actualizations of a language) constitute this surface structure. Allegedly, the principles of generative grammar, as developed by Chomsky, allow for doing away with the confusing “noise” of syntactical, phonological, morphological, semantic, and other structures which vary highly among Einzelsprachen, speech varieties, or lects. When such “surface” has been removed what remains is purportedly the deep structure of “pure” language, which is postulated to underpin all the human Einzelsprachen, speech varieties, or lects, that is, the surface structure. The surface structure is perceived as responsible for the phenomenon of mutual incompressibility, hence, reaching the deep structure could allow for unrestricted access to “pure” meaning as shared by and underlying all Einzelsprachen, speech varieties, or lects. Instantaneous perfect automatic translation among all the extant Einzelsprachen, speech varieties, or lects would then become possible. The confounding of human speech, as related in the biblical myth of the Tower of Babel, would finally be over. Humanity would return to the times immediately after the Great Flood, when—according to this biblical myth—all people still spoke the same Einzelsprache, prior to embarking on the disastrous construction of the Tower of Babel. This project angered the Judeo-Christian-Islamic god so much,
that this deity prevented its completion by replacing the single Einzelsprache of Humanese with many mutually incomprehensible Einzelsprachen.

This is a strong version of the deep structure, equated with the ur-meaning of a language, some edenic thought-Einzelsprache of all-Humanese, or the postulated all-Human mentalase. A weaker version proposes that the deep structure is composed from the linguistic universals shared by all Einzelsprachen, speech varieties, or lects. But it appears that such universals are not more than the biological capacity for producing and detecting phonemes from which morphemes (simple words) are composed. In the weaker version, the deep structure is indistinguishable from the biological capacity for a language.

In essence, this dichotomy of deep and surface structure appears to be a rarely realized modern echo of the Judeo-Christian-Islamic (Abrahamic) tradition of monotheism, rather than a heuristic reflection driven by evidence-based research into the observable actualizations of a language, that is, Einzelsprachen, speech varieties, or lects. It is a “linguistic” (mystical) take on the Abrahamic dualism of soul and body, nowadays rehashed as the specious mind-body dualism. But there is no scientific evidence for the soul, while mind in no way is separate (or separable) from the human body, but a product of the socio-biological functioning of the latter. Humans are bodies alone (parts of material reality), though their mutual interactions spawn cohesive groups bound together with the face-to-face use of a language. In turn, these ø language-based interactions (or group-bonding) produce the secondary in its character social reality, which exists in the form of shared ideas in human brains.

In its strong version the deep structure is part of social reality, though proponents of generative grammar see it is part of material reality. Because social reality is secondary to material reality, the former cannot underlie the latter. It is material reality that makes social reality possible, not the other way round. Hence, the deep structure, understood as the primal (primary) all-Humanes does not exist. This concept is part and parcel of social reality, like all Einzelsprachen, speech varieties, or lects, being actualizations of the biological (material) capacity for ø language. In this context, only this biological capacity (ø language) is part of the (primary) material reality, which allows for the rise of the (secondary) social reality and its elements, be it beliefs (for instance, the dichotomy of deep structure and surface structure) or actualizations of ø language (that is, Einzelsprachen, speech varieties, or lects).

Obviously, it can be remarked that a widespread and socially accepted belief in some supernatural (divine, metaphysical) reality as underpinning (and transcending) the material reality should be respected, like any religion. But, on the other hand, such a belief does not, and ought not to, constitute a subject matter of evidence-based scientific (material) enquiry. Hence, in its strong version, generative grammar’s dichotomy of deep structure and surface structure is no different than a religious belief. The success of statistics-based machine (automatic) multilingual translation (as epitomized by the Google Translate online service), steeped solely in 100-odd Einzelsprachen of the “surface structure,” without any reference to the (mystical, mythical, transcendental) “deep structure” amply proves the point.

descriptivism (from “describe,” in turn from Latin dēscribere, stemming from dé- “off” + scribere “to write”)—an attitude toward the standardization and control of the (predominantly written) use of an Einzelsprache. Typically, it is the scholarly elite of a given nation-state who standardize an Einzelsprache into a standard language and codify the principles of its use. Subsequently, the “correct” way of writing and speaking a language “beautifully” becomes a significant language barrier one needs to scale to qualify for civil service (bureaucracy), university posts, and other elite jobs. However, unlike in the case of prescriptivism, typically observed in ethnolinguistic nation-states, descriptivism allows for input from the rank-and-file users and several parallel “correct” uses of a certain pronunciation or spelling convention when employed by a considerable share of an Einzelsprache’s speakers. The descriptivist attitude toward language control is usually observed in the case of pluricentric languages and in civic nation-states. In such cases, typically no scholarly or political authority or institute exist to enforce correct language use.

dialect (Latin dialectus, stemming from Greek word διάλεκτος diálektos “discourse,” in turn from διά diá “through,” and λέγω légō “I speak”)—typically, an unwritten speech (ø language) variety. Otherwise, the term dialect is employed by ethnolinguistic nationalists to deny the existence of or recognition to various languages (Einzelsprachen), which are closely related to the national language employed in the nation-state. Their stance on this issue is conditioned by ethnolinguistic nationalism’s normative principle of ethnolinguistic homogeneity. De facto each speech variety, when used by a group of people for identification, bonding (building and maintaining in-group cohesion), and communication, functions as an Einzelsprache (“a language”). Hence, when uttered, the label “dialect” denotes the speaker’s lack of respect for the Einzelsprache of a group to which she does not belong.

dialect continuum (pl dialect continua; from Latin continua “uninterrupted,” in turn from continēre “to hold together, retain”—prior to the construction of standard or written languages (Einzelsprachen), speech varieties changed gradually from village to village, from region to region, and from polity to polity, forming “dialect chains.” Mutual comprehensibility, though increasingly imperfect with the growing distance, was retained across such dialect chains from one end to the other. The only area of rapid plunge in mutual comprehension was encountered at the (typically blurry) frontier between dialect continua, as for instance, between the Finno-Ugric and North Slavic dialect continua in today’s southern Slovakia. But the gap in comprehension between speakers from different dialect continua has been usually bridged by bilingualism (multilingualism), diglossia (polyglossia) or the use of a lingua franca.

dialect levelling (word “level” is derived from Old French livel “level,” in turn from Latin libella “plummert line, level”)—a gradual decrease in the variety of spoken and written speech varieties (dialects) in a normatively monolingual nation-state, due to the steady increase in the intensification of communication in
the polity’s official (national) language across the entire territory, thanks to compulsory elementary education, the press and electronic mass media. But this term may also refer to a conscious state policy (language policy) aimed at the intentional acceleration of this process, entailing administrative discrimination against speakers of dialects and minority languages, alongside those who speak and write the national language “incorrectly” (see prescriptivism). The goal is to achieve or deepen the ethnolinguistic homogeneity of a typically ethnolinguistic nation-state in line with ethnolinguistic nationalism’s principle of the normative isomorphism of language, nation, and state.

dialect vs language (Einzelsprachen) dichotomy—the normative Graeco-Latin concept, developed between the first century BCE and first century CE, which sees speech varieties regularly recorded with the use of the technology of writing as languages, and those not recorded in this manner as dialects. The former are commonly seen as “better” (more “civilized,” “progressive,” or “modern”) than the latter, oftentimes labelled as “barbaric,” “uncivilized,” “backward,” or “traditional.”

diglossia (polyglossia) (1884) Western scholarly Greek-based neologism, δι du “two” or πολύ poly “many, much,” and γλώσσα glōssa “languages”—the use of two (or more) language varieties (Einzelsprachen, speech varieties, dialects) in different and clearly delineated spheres of life. For instance, in the Czech Republic standard (written) Czech (pisovná čeština) is acquired at school and employed in official contexts only, including newspapers and monographs. In families, children are socialized in colloquial Czech (obecná čeština), which is used at home and with friends, and quite broadly in films, novels, and plays. Furthermore, in the eastern half of this country (Moravia and Czech Silesia), children are socialized at home in local unstandardized speech varieties (dialects). They acquire standard Czech at school and colloquial Czech from television and the perusal of fiction. On the other hand, members of national minorities use two or more Einzelsprachen in a diglossic (polyglossic) manner. For example, after 1945 in Poland’s Upper Silesia, the region’s ethnic Germans and Silesians spoke German and Silesian, while nowadays, due to forced Polonization, they speak Polish and Silesian. See also religious diglossia, scriptal diglossia.

discrimination (from the seventeenth-century Neo-Latin term discriminationem “discerning, the making of distinctions”; the prejudicial meaning arose in the mid-nineteenth century in American English in the context of slavery and racism)—a form of collective (see collectivism), often politicized, prejudice against a group of people (usually, ethnic group, nation, race, religious community, or speech community) on the arbitrary basis of a cultural (ethnic) trait (marker), seen as a “proof” of “inferiority” of such a group and its members. See also anti-Semitism, anti-Tsiganism, linguistic discrimination.

disenchantment (from the German expression Entzauberung der Welt “disenchantment of the world”—the German sociologist Max Weber’s term, coined in 1917 (Weber 1919: 15), for modernity’s emphasis on the rational (scientific) explanation of material and social phenomena, without resorting to magic or religion, which earlier was often the case. In Central Europe’s politics, this trend meant the shift from politics of estates and the divine legitimation of secular power to the “rational” world of nations and their nation-states, constructed in accordance with ethnolinguistic nationalism’s principle of the normative isomorphism of language, nation, and state. Otherwise, this change in the paradigms of politics and knowledge production may be also described as a shift from the early modern principle cuius regio, eius religio (whose realm, his religion) to modernity’s principle of cuius regio, eius lingua (whose realm, his language).

However, from the perspective of social reality, no disenchantment has actually taken place, but only an exchange of one set of arbitrary elements of this reality for another. The concept of “god” and its actualizations are as much invented (constructed, imagined) by humans as the now politically significant concepts of the nation and Einzelsprachen, together with their actualizations. In many ways, today’s world of nations and nation-states is as much enchanted as that of medieval and early modern Europe, when the name of a god was invoked in order to legitimize the forms of rule, statehood, law, social relations, or thinking about the past. Nowadays, the same purpose is served by invocation to “patriotism,” “duty to our nation (also meaning state),” “national language,” “national culture,” “national economy,” “national pride,” “national destiny,” or “national history,” all synonyms for the nation, uttered within the narrow definitional confines of the infrastructural ideology of nationalism.

divine right (“divine” from Latin divus “god”; “right” stems from Old English / Germanic riht/reht “that which is morally right, duty, obligation,” cognate with German Recht “law”—a religiously underpinned political doctrine (ideology), in use across most of Eurasia and the Middle East until the turn of the twentieth century, claiming that the legitimacy of all statehood and rulers stems from (a) god (divinity), or heaven. In the present-day, this principle of legitimation was replaced with modernity’s infrastructural ideology of nationalism, and in Central Europe with a linguistic (Einzelsprachen-based) form of this ideology, namely, ethnolinguistic nationalism, implemented in accordance with the normative isomorphism of language, nation, and state.

Dunbar’s number—in the 1990s, the British anthropologist, Robin Dunbar, established that from the biological and evolutionary perspective the human brain (neocortex) allows humans to build stable and cohesive face-to-face groups of up to 150 members through interpersonal interaction alone (for instance, hair and body grooming), that is without the use of a language (Dunbar 1992). Such natural (biological, evolutionary) groups are part, broadly speaking, of material reality, while the bonding function of a language allows for generating social reality, making it possible to build non-face-to-face cohesive human groups of millions of members (that is, nations and states).

Einzelsprache (pl Einzelsprachen) an eighteenth-century German neologism einzel “[a] single” and Sprache “language” for “one
language from many,” coined for contrasting this meaning with that of “ο language,” expressed by the common German word Sprache)—the Western (Graeco-Latin-Judeo-Islamic) concept of “a language,” that is one of many languages. This term is countable and has the plural form. Another closely related meaning is that of an actualization of the biological capacity for speech (see Ø language) in the form of an Einzelsprache. From the perspective of Western scholarship and science, the Einzelsprache represents an ideal or normative “quantum” of the linguistic (ο language). As known from the phenomena of dialect continuum and linguistic area, variation in human speech (ο language) is continuous until mediated through the technology of writing. The concept of Einzelsprache and its actualizations in the form of Einzelsprachen (languages) endowed with writing systems, orthographies, dictionaries, and grammars overhauls the continuous linguistic continuum into discrete and countable units, popularly known as “languages.” See also ISO 639.

emic—in anthropology the way of doing analysis from the perspective of the (usually ethnic) group on which research is conducted, that is, through the lens of this group’s values, concepts, and beliefs, which are most extensively coded in this group’s Einzelsprache. The term emic is derived from the linguistic concept “phonemic,” namely, a speech sound (or phone) may or may not change a meaning in an Einzelsprache, but if it does then it is one of this Einzelsprache’s limited number of phonemes. The discipline of phonemics deals with phonemes, while phonetics with phones. See also etic, endonym.

elite (middle-twentieth-century linguistic loan from French elite, originally derived from Old French elit “[the] chosen [ones],” and in turn, from Latin eligere “to elect”—the top (dominant, ruling) stratum in a state’s population. In early modern Central Europe, the term elite denotes the estates (of nobility, clergy, and burghers), while in the western part of the continent only the ruling estates (that is, to the exclusion of the estate of commoners). In early modern Central Europe, the elite monopolized all political, economic, and social power, while in Western Europe this monopoly was slightly mitigated by the recognition of commoners as an estate. In today’s world of nation-states, elite can be defined as the top stratum of citizenry who enjoy the most socio-economic power. The modern elite’s hold on political power is usually limited by universal suffrage. But in authoritarian or totalitarian tyrannies, where suffrage is suspended or practiced in a perfunctory manner, political power is also concentrated in the hands of a (typically) narrow ruling elite.

empire (from Latin imperium “empire,” in turn derived from the verb imperāre “to command”—a type of relatively extensive (“large”) composite polity (state) united by a single ruler (emperor, usually a monarch). The empire’s different parts (provinces, autonomous, fiefdoms, vassal states, colonies) are organized into separate, sometimes overlapping, jurisdictions under different legal systems, often administered with the use of different Einzelsprachen written with the employment of various scripts (writing systems). Likewise, the inhabitants have variegated unequal statuses in the empire’s different territories. In Central Europe, traditionally, the ruling elite was composed from the separate estates of nobles, clergy, and burghers, while the rest, usually peasants, had no political rights and were reduced to servitude through most of the nineteenth century. See also imperialism.

endonym (scholarly neologism formed from Greek ἔνδον ἐνδόν “within [one’s own group]” and ὄνομα ἐνδόν “name”)—autonym, or an ethnic group’s own name (ethnonym) for themselves, or a speech community’s own name (linguonym) for their language (Einzelsprache), dialect, or speech variety. For instance, the German-language endonym for the German language is Deutsch. Likewise, the Georgian-language endonym for the Georgians seen as a nation is ქართული კართელი. See also exonym.

equality (via French égalité [hence, modern French égalité], from Latin aequalitatem “equality, similarity, likeness”—the modern concept of equality of rights and status (citizenship, suffrage), alongside equality before the law for all the inhabitants of a polity (state) (see individualism) emerged in opposition to the medieval and early modern (“feudal”) practice of unequal statuses for different groups of the population in a polity of estates.

From the perspective of the contemporary social sciences, all human societies (Gemeinschaften, Gesellschaften) should be treated with the same level of respect and accorded the same level of prestige: no cultural, economic, religious, linguistic, or other differences may constitute the grounds for prejudice or any form of discrimination.

Likewise, from the perspective of language politics, all language varieties (for instance, Einzelsprachen, languages, lects, ethnolinguistic groups, dialects, sociolects, or speech varieties, including related scripts) employed by distinctive human groups (that is, micro-ethnic groups, ethnic groups, nationalities, nations, or nation-states) should be treated as of equal worth and accorded the same level of respect and prestige. This normative belief underlies the concept of linguistic human rights.

estate (from Latin status, hence, чат Čan in Belarusian, stav in Czech, Stand in German, stato in Italian stano in Polish, estado in Spanish; cognate with the English term “state” for “polity,” also from Latin status; in French “estate” is ordre, from Latin ordin “row, rank,” while in Russian сословие soslovie from Greek σώλλογος syllogos, originally “assembly,” nowadays “society”—in early modern Europe a stratum of the polity’s elite with influence on politics, usually, nobility, clergy, or burghers. In Western Europe peasantry typically was organized as an estate of commoners, while in Central Europe peasants were serfs and as such they were excluded from the system of a state’s estates. See also class, polity of estates.

ethnic boundary (“ethnic” stems from Latin ethnicus “heathen, non-Christian, pagan,” derived from Greek ἔθνος ethnos “a people, country,” but later, in the wake of Christianization, “a foreign, non-Greek, barbarian people,” also “a non-Christian, pagan people.” The word boundary “border, frontier” is an early seventeenth-century neologism composed from bound “made fast as if
by a band or bond” and the Latinate noun-forming suffix -ary)—in 1969, the Norwegian anthropologist, Fredrik Barth (1969), proposed that ethnic groups should be studied in the ecological context of other (neighboring) ethnic groups. Hence, apart from the question of group cohesion (see Gemeinschaft, Gesellschaft), that of maintaining separation between ethnic groups should also be addressed. For this purpose, Barth proposed the empirically evidenced (as based on several case studies) concept of ethnic boundary. It is a product of the dynamics of inter-group interactions, namely, members of two different ethnic groups X and Y clearly recognize one another as belonging to different groups by way of displaying and observing the prescribed respective sets of cultural traits (ethnicity), as typical of these groups. Such active display and observance creates, legitimizes, and maintains a stable separation between both groups, that is, the ethnic boundary. An ethnic boundary may be spatial, but most often it is social in its character, with members of different ethnic groups constantly sharing the same public spaces in villages, towns, and cities, and especially in marketplaces. Arguably, endogamy (in-group marriage) is the most popular instrument of maintaining any ethnic boundary in a social sense. Obviously, one can cross the ethnic boundary from one group to another, but it is a costly process in social, economic, and psychological terms, often entailing acquisition of a language (Einzelsprache), a different way of living, conversion to another religion, or permanent separation from one’s original family and friends.

ethnic cleansing (the verb “to cleanse” stems from Old English clásian, cognate with dēne “clean”—this term was developed during the wars of Yugoslav succession by translating the Serbo-Croatian term etničko čišćenje/стихийно чищене into English. It is synonymous with the earlier term population transfer. However, while under international law population transfer was legal, ethnic cleansing is a crime against humanity. In 1994, the United Nations’ Commission of Experts (established in 1992 by the Security Council’s resolution 780) defined this crime of ethnic cleansing as follows: “a purposeful policy designed by one ethnic or religious group to remove by violent and terror-inspiring means the civilian population of another ethnic or religious group from certain geographic areas” (Letter 1994: 1, 33).

ethnic group (word “group” stems from French groupe “cluster, group,” and Italian gruppo “group, knot”—this term appeared first as ethnie in the anthropological (rather than evangelizing) sense in the late nineteenth century in French-language literature, and was readily borrowed by English-language scholars. They settled for the current form of this term only in the mid-twentieth century, though some still prefer the French term ethnique. There is yet another form of this term, ethnos, which competes with ethnie and “ethnic group.” The leading Soviet anthropologist and official theoretician of the “ethnic question” in the Soviet Union, Yulian Bromley, introduced it (as этнос ethnos) to Russian-language literature. During the late Cold War period, under Soviet influence, many Anglophone left-leaning scholars adopted this form “ethnos” as the preferred term for “ethnic group.” In turn, Bromley borrowed (without acknowledgement) the main tenets of his theory from the Norwegian anthropologist, Fredrik Barth, who wrote in English and consistently employed the collocation “ethnic group” (cf Bromley 1971; Gellner 1977) (see ethnic boundary).

“Ethnic group” denotes a cohesive collection (group) of humans built and maintained with the use of some selected elements of culture (for instance, myths, religion, music, Einzelsprachen, seen together as ethnicity), as opposed to statehood.

ethnicity (etymology: see ethnic boundary)—the use of an element, or typically several elements, of culture (social reality) for defining, building, legitimizing, and maintaining a self-reproducing human group, usually referred to as an ethnic group. Prior to the rise of statehood all cohesive ethnic groups differed in speech. It was spatial and social isolation between groups (necessary for the maintenance of their separateness and internal cohesion) that generated this speech difference, typically perceived in today’s world as different languages (Einzelsprachen).

ethnogenesis (etymology: see ethnic boundary). The word “genesis” stems from Greek γένεσις genesis “origin,” in turn a translation of the Hebrew phrase מְׁיָיוֹת bərēšīt “in [the] beginning”—the coalescence, emergence, or formation of an ethnic group (nation), or a history of this process as a field of anthropological or historical study. This term, as этногенез ethnogenesis, appeared in the Soviet Union during the 1910s in the context of the policy of korenizatsiya, which entailed the state-led massive population (demographic) engineering and language engineering, which overhauled the country’s population into about 150 officially recognized nationalities (nations, ethnic groups), each supplied with its own standardized language (Einzelsprachen). Officially, it was emphatically denied that this policy created (engineered) nationalities and languages, but rather “discovered and identified” them for the sake of accelerating the transformation of “backward nationalities” into “developed nationalities,” on the way to the communist future of classless society. Hence, there was an urgent ideological need to supply each Soviet nationality with “centuries-old” culture (songs, customs, or rituals) and history (state, religion, writing, and a national epic poem). This feat of engineering numerous ethnic cultures and histories for the purpose of “archaicizing,” “authenticizing” and “indigenizing” the newly produced nationalities and their Einzelsprachen was posed as “research” on the past, a “discovery” of their “histories.”

Subsequently, the term ethnogenesis for the origins of an ethnic group and research into such origins entered English in the 1960s by way of Germany, as many Soviet publications had been translated in the late interwar and early postwar periods into the latter language.

In the 1970s, the term ethnogenesis became a key term of analysis for the official Soviet theory of “ethnos” (that is, ethnic group formation and maintenance). The somewhat dissident historian Lev Gumilev (son of the poets, Anna Akhmatova and Nikolai Gumilev) added a biologizing and spiritual turn to this official theory, by claiming that ethnoses (ethnic groups, nations) and “super-ethnoses” (multietnic empires, peoples speaking cognate languages) are living organisms spawned by the biosphere.
They compete with one another for limited resources; winners “live,” while losers “die,” all dependent on which ethnos has been “destined” to receive more “passionary energy” from the universe (which appears to stand for “god”), as filtered through the biosphere (Gumilev 1989 [1973]; Koreniako 2000).

Following the breakup of the Soviet Union, Gumilev’s “theory” became the most popular for explaining the social world among scholars in the post-Soviet countries, because it purportedly explicates why non-ethnic “chimeras” (for instance, the Soviet Union) are short-lived, and eventually must split into ethnolinguistic nations (for example, post-Soviet nation-states). Gumilev’s thought is of special importance in Russia and Kazakhstan where state leaders use his ideas for “comprehending” international relations and legitimizing some of their political decisions in this regard. Gumilev’s theory is relatively unknown in the West, which often leads to a variety of methodological misunderstandings when Western and post-Soviet scholars meet. They use the very same terms of ethnic group (ethnos, ethnic) or ethnogenesis in starkly different manners, as underpinned by quite varying methodologies. Furthermore, the former see these concepts as terms of analysis, while the latter often see them to be instruments of applied politics.

**ethnic language** (etymology: see ethnic boundary, language)—a speech variety or an Einzelsprache (standard language) specific to an ethnic group. If the ethnic group in question is recognized as an [ethnic nation], then its ethnic language usually is referred to as a national language.

**ethnic nationalism** (etymology: see ethnic boundary, nation)—a type of nationalism that does not use citizenship for defining the nation, but various elements of culture (see ethnicity), in Central Europe typically the Einzelsprache (“a language”; see ethnolinguistic nationalism) or religion (see ethnoreligious nationalism). See also civic nationalism.

**ethnic nation** (etymology: see ethnic boundary, nation)—a nation built on an ethnic basis, typically, a common Einzelsprache (language) and/or religion. In an ethnic nation-state, not all citizens are members of the polity’s ethnic nation, but only those who speak a “correct” Einzelsprache and/or follow a “correct” religion in order to qualify for membership (that is, nationality) in such an ethnic nation. Unlike in the case of the civic nation, in the ethnic nation nationality does not equate to citizenship. Citizens of an ethnic nation-state who do not qualify as members of this polity’s ethnic nation are typically classified as “national minorities.”

**ethnographic map** (cartography)—see ethnolinguistic map.

**ethnolect** (etymology: see ethnic boundary, lect)—lect (speech variety, language variety) of an ethnic group (nation, nationality), in most cases used as a leading marker or one of the important markers of this group’s identity (ethnicity). From this perspective, each distinctive speech community is an ethnic group, while a “proper” ethnic group should be (treated as) a speech community. The alluded normativity of this rule (dating back to Johann Gottfried Herder’s late eighteenth-century initiative that different peoples speak different languages [Herder 1793: 146]) hinges on mutual comprehensibility, but is not absolute, since other elements of the social reality (ethnic or cultural markers) than speech or language alone may be decisive for the construction, legitimation, and maintenance of an ethnic group. For instance, the Hutus and the Tutsis share the same Einzelsprache of Kinyarwanda, which is Rwanda’s [official (national) language]. But this fact did not become a basis for any merger of both groups into a single ethnolinguistic nation and did not prevent the 1994 genocide of Tutsis. During the colonial period, the administratively enforced status of serf-like peasantry for Hutus and of noble-like administrators for Tutsis shaped the two social strata into separate ethnic groups, and this insidious legacy of imperialism continues to this day (see also cultural imperialism).

The ISO 639-1 standard for registering “all the world’s languages” is based on the normative assumption (rarely acknowledged by this standard’s Registering Authority, or SIL International) that each ethnic group speaks (and sometimes writes) its own specific (ethnic) language. Hence, this standard aspires to cover all the human ethnolects. The abandoned ISO 639-6 standard, now preserved by the Linguasphere Observatory/Observatoire Linguistique network, aims at registering all of humanity’s speech varieties. Assessed at 25,000, their number is three times higher than that of the 8,000-odd ethnolects. Hence, ethnolects add up to one-third of all extant speech varieties, meaning that two-thirds of existing speech varieties are not employed for building, legitimating, and maintaining ethnic groups.

Nowadays, in Poland, a growing number of scholars and journalists employ the term ethnolect for referring to the officially unrecognized (in Poland) Einzelsprache of Silesian. It is a kind of compromise usage, which withholds the prestigious label of language from Silesian, but acknowledges that in the past it was inappropriate to dub Silesian as a “subdialect” (gwara); the term seen as offensive by most Silesians. At the level of language politics, this stop-gap solution preserves the Polish national dogma, which claims that Silesian is a dialect of the Polish language, but also confirms that this “Silesian dialect” functions as the main marker of Silesian ethnicity. Importantly for the needs of contemporary Poland’s ethnolinguistic nationalism and national master narrative, this stop-gap measure does not permit Silesians to be seen as an ethnic group (let alone, nation) in its own right. Officially, the Silesians remain a social or regional group of the Polish nation.

**ethnolinguistic homogeneity** (etymology: see ethnic boundary). The word “homogenous” stems from Medieval Latin homo geneus, in turn from Greek ὁμογενής homogenēs, constructed from ὅμοιος homois “same” and γένος genos “kind”)—the foundational normative idea of ethnolinguistic nationalism, which proposes that the “true” nation-state should be inhabited only by speakers of a single national language. The speech community of such an Einzelsprache is seen as the nation, to which this nation-state “rightfully” belongs. Not surprisingly, the ethnolinguistic nation-state encourages normative monolingualism among its nation, and assimilation to the national language.
ethnolinguistic map (cartography) (also known as ethnographic map: “map” stems from Medieval Latin mappa mundi, in turn formed from mappa "napkin, cloth" and mundus "world." The term “cartography” stems from Latin charta or carta "chart, map,” in turn from Greek χάρτης khártes “map,” and γράφω graphō “to write”)—a map showing the spatial extent of a people (ethnic group, nation, or nationality) through the lens of an Einzelsprache (at times, in conjunction with a religion and customs), which purportedly defines this people (speech community). This genre of cartography began to coalesce at the turn of the nineteenth century in the form of maps with information on the presence of specific religious communities in towns, cities, and regions depicted with the employment of symbols. During the first half of the nineteenth century, when the popularity of ethnolinguistic nationalism grew and spread across Central Europe, religious communities of this type were additionally identified with speech communities, resulting in maps of ethnolinguistic-cum-ethnoreligious groups. In the 1840s, the first maps were produced that used solid blocks of color for depicting different nations (ethnic groups) defined through their national languages. At that time, the business of mapping religious communities (religions) was separated from that of ethnolinguistic nations, but both genres, namely, the map of religions and the (ethnographic) map of (ethnolinguistic) nations (or languages) continued using blocks of color for coding and depicting information. Traditionally, a given polity’s population was queried about their religions by census. After 1872, the language question was added as obligatory to censuses. On this basis, “scientific” maps of ethnolinguistic nations (national Einzelsprachen) began to be produced. Both maps of nations (languages) and religions were included in the new type of school textbook, namely school atlas (of geography and history), which appeared in and became increasingly popular across Central Europe in the second half of the nineteenth century. In quick succession, entire ethnolinguistic atlases made an appearance and rapidly were recognized as a “scientific” argument for justifying the destruction of the established state frontiers, then to be replaced with “ethnographic” boundaries in the wake of the Balkan Wars and the Great War. The drive toward increasing precision and inclusiveness even of the tiniest of differences and ethnolinguistic communities led, at the turn of the twentieth century, to the fusion of number (symbol) tagging with color coding on ethnographic maps produced in the Russian Empire. During the age of korenizatsia (mid-1920s to mid-1930s) in the Soviet Union, the development of ethnographic (ethnolinguistic) cartography accelerated even more because Soviet planners and bureaucrats needed maps for organizing and maintaining over 17,000 autonomous ethnolinguistic administrative entities, which existed then in the communist polity. Finally, in the Soviet Union, an entire ethnolinguistic Atlas narodov mira (Atlas of the Peoples of the World) was published in 1964 and remains unequaled to this day (Bruk and Apenchenko 1964). In the West, during the Cold War, this Atlas was commonly pirated by specialists in Area Studies, who adapted or just translated relevant maps into English, retaining the Soviet hallmark of color coding combined with number tagging. The school atlas of history and geography (combined or in the form of two separate books), complete with ethnographic maps and maps of religion (sometimes appended with maps of races), remains a compulsory textbook in Central Europe’s nation-states, mainly because with the use of text only it is next to impossible to present and explain in a clear manner ethnolinguistic nationalism’s highly counterintuitive principle of the normative isomorphism of language, nation, and state. On the other hand, the school atlas of history is a rarity elsewhere in the world, like in the nation-states where civic nationalism is employed for statehood building, legitimation, and maintenance. See also linguistic map.

(ethno)linguistic nationalism (etymology: see ethnic boundary, language, nation)—a form of nationalism that defines or identifies the nation as all the speakers of a language (Einzelsprache). It equates the nation with a speech community. The nation defined in an ethnolinguistic manner is always primary to the nation’s nation-state. In this ideology’s thinking nations can exist without states. In the early twenty-first century, ethnolinguistic nationalism is mainly contained to Central Europe and Southeast Asia. The globe’s most popular form of nationalism is civic (see civic nationalism), while all the extant ethnolinguistic nation-states are contained to Eurasia. Often on the unacknowledged basis of ethnoreligious nationalism, some speakers of a given national language are excluded from the nation, as for instance, Judaists (Jews) from many ethnolinguistic nations of Central Europe (see anti-Semitism). See also tribalism.

ethnonym (etymology: see endonym)—the name of an ethnic group (nation, speech community, etc.) See also endonym, exonym, linguonym.

(ethno)religious nationalism (etymology: see ethnic boundary, nation, religion)—a form of nationalism that defines the faithful of a religion (denomination) or a Church as a nation. This form of nationalism was popular in the Ottoman Balkans during the nineteenth century. The Rum (Orthodox) millet, split along the territorial lines of the extant and historic Orthodox patriarchates, yielded the ethnoreligious nation-states of Bulgaria, Greece, Montenegro, Romania, and Serbia. Albania, founded in 1912, was the Ottoman Balkans’ first-ever ethnolinguistic nation-state; it was founded for the entire Albanian speech community, whose members professed Catholicism, Islam, and Orthodox Christianity, and as such belonged to at least three millets. See also communalism, sectarianism.

ethnos—see ethnic boundary, ethnic group, ethnogenesis.

etic (not to be confused with “ethnic”)—in anthropology the way of researching a (typically, ethnic group from the outside (“neutral”) perspective, without taking into consideration this group’s values, concepts or believes. The term etic is derived from the lin-
guistic concept “phonetic,” namely, a speech sound (or phone) attested among the extant Einzelsprachen. See also emic, exonym.

Eurasia (1852) German neologism Asia-Europe, coined by geographer Carl Gustav Reuschle from the Kingdom of Württemberg (Reuschle 1852: 43); subsequently, in the 1880s it was more broadly adopted in the form Eurasien, quickly yielding the English-language term “Eurasia.” Interestingly, the coinage “Eurasia” popped up briefly in the 1830s in British India for denoting Brits and other Europeans domiciled or born in India. The name “Asia” originates from Greek άσια, of uncertain origin, but the proposed Semitic (Hebrew) etymology (חָּיוֹת) “to go out, to rise,” suggesting “land of the rising sun,” is ideologically appealing, because equates this continent with “the East.” The name “Europe” stems from Greek Ευρωπή, likewise of uncertain origin, though the proposed Semitic (Akkadian) etymology (אָבָא) “man of the future,” who is supposed to be either the ideal fascist or communist. The main differences between fascism and communism lie in the latter’s rejection of the nation and nationalism, and in the former’s enmity toward communism (stereotyped as “Judeo-Bolshevia”).

face-to-face (human) group (etymology: see crime against humanity, ethnic group)—humanity’s natural (biological, evolutionary) propensity to build and maintain cohesive groups up to 150 members (Dunbar’s number) through everyday interpersonal interaction alone (that is, face-to-face) without the use of a language. See also non-face-to-face (human) group.

fascism (from Latin fascis for “bundle [of rods],” employed as a symbol of state authority in the Roman Empire, and then adopted by interwar Italy’s Partito Nazionale Fascista [PNF, National Fascist Party]—a far-right ideology that accepts the infrastructural ideology of nationalism as the basis of statehood construction, legitimation and maintenance. The ethnolinguistically (“racially”) defined nation is at the center of each fascist project, for the nation in question an appropriately large nation-state and empire must be won at the expense of “civilizationally lower” and “biologically less worth” nations and their states. From the perspective of social darwinism (eugenics, racial hygiene), nations are believed to be “living organisms” in constant evolutionary competition for resources and survival. Only the fittest (that is, arguably fascist) nations are to survive and flourish. Fascism shares with communism the monoparty totalitarian, or authoritarian, system of government, with the invariably male tyrant (dictator) at the top, and the ruling party’s structure doubling as the state’s institutions and administration. Proponents of both ideologies see democracy, liberalism, and individualism as unacceptable or even “degenerate,” and share the same vision of the “new modern man of the future,” who is supposed to be either the ideal fascist or communist. The main difference between fascism and communism lies in the latter’s rejection of the nation and nationalism, and in the former’s enmity toward communism (stereotyped as “Judeo-Bolshevia”).

Interwar and wartime Germany’s ideology of fascism is typically known as nazism. This English pejorative term was derived from the official name of the ideology of Germany’s ruling fascist party, Nationalsozialisti sche Deutsche Arbeiterpartei (NSDAP, National Socialist German Workers’ Party), namely, Nationalsozialismus (national socialism). In none of the Soviet bloc’s countries was communism achieved, and these policies employed only the term “socialism” in their official names. The Soviet satellites’ socialism was national in its form, hence, in scholarly works it is referred to as “national communism” in order to avoid the collocation “national socialism,” which is so negatively tainted and strongly connected to wartime (nazi) Germany (Third Reich).
Like in the case of ethnolinguistic nationalists, fascists aspired to ethnolinguistically and racially (biologically) homogenize the nation. The largest target of such “racial homogenization” (that is, the Holocaust) were the mostly German(ic)-speaking (Yiddish-speaking) Jews. But they were not identified through any measuring methods (for instance, “cranio-metry”) of the “science of race” (Rassenkunde), but with the aid of synagogues' registers of faithful. Hence, de facto fascists practiced a form of ethnoreligious homogenization.

Wartime Soviet propaganda made the term “fascist” into a generalized pejorative hurled at any political opponent. The post-communist Russian discourse adopted and popularized this in- vective, so at present it is used in a similar manner also in English.

Gemeinschaft (German loanword, from gemein “common, together,” and the suffix -schaft “-ship, -ness”; hence, also Gemeinde “commune [the lowest administrative unit]”—in essence any face-to-face group (community), where each member knows the others through regular (everyday) interaction. Gemeinschaft stands in the dichotomic opposition to Gesellschaft. It is a classical sociological opposition described and elaborated in 1887 by the Schleswig (German) scholar, Ferdinand Tönnies (1887).

genocide (from Greek γένος γένος “a people” [see gens] and Latin —cide “act of killing”—a neologism coined in 1943 by the Polish-Jewish jurist, Rafał (Raphael) Lemkin for a planned (intentional) extermination of a people (Lemkin 1944: 79). The United Nation’s 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide defines, in Article 2, genocide as “acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group” (Convention 1948). After wartime Germany's planned genocide of Jews and Roma, a tradition developed to give ethnic-specific names to widely recognized acts of genocide against specific peoples (ethnic groups, nations, or nationalities), for instance, the “Holocaust” (or Shoah) for the Jewish Genocide, or the “Samadaripen” (also Por[e]jmos or Kali Tras) for the Roma Genocide.

gen (pl gentes; Latin term gens “clan, extended family with the shared male lineage” is cognate with Greek γένος γένος, both probably derived from the hypothetical from Proto-Indo-European *gēnhtis “birth, production”)—a late medieval and early modern Latinate term for “a people,” seen as the entire population of a region or a polity. See also natio.

Geschichtspolitik (a German term, coined by combining the terms Geschichte “history” and Politik “politics”; at times translated into English as “politics of memory”—in the wake of the fall of communism and the end of the Cold War during the 1990s, the grand narratives of the defeat of the Third Reich and the subsequent East-West ideological confrontation unraveled across postcommunist Europe, giving way to revived, and often highly contradictory, national master narratives, especially in Central and Eastern Europe's ethnolinguistic nation-states.

A clear scholarly realization that the remembrance of the past is part and parcel of social reality and can be “shaped” (falsified or interpreted selectively; see invented tradition) in line with the needs of current political projects led to the rise of a new field of study (within historiography) and another of political practice. The former aims at limiting such arbitrary “shaping” of the remembrance of the past through objectivizing respect for the past as known from preserved oral, written, and material (archeological) records. On the contrary, the aforementioned new field of political practice usually focuses on shaping the remembrance of the past as required for legitimizing and furthering a given political or national goal, while paying a mere lip service to the observance of the ideal of historical objectivity.

Gesellschaft (German loanword, from Geselle “journeyman, associate, fellow,” and the suffix -schaft “-ship, -ness”—in essence any non-face-to-face group (society), where group cohesion is ensured by social reality. The ideology of nationalism seeks to present the nation (Gesellschaft) in the terms of Gemeinschaft, that is, Gemeinschaft-izes Gesellschaft. The group-bonding of a successful national project is so strong, because although the members of a nation live in a non-face-to-face Gesellschaft, they believe it is a closely-knit face-to-face Gemeinschaft.

globalization (word “globe” stems from Latin globus “ball, sphere”—after the fall of communism and the end of the Cold War division of the world at the turn of the 1990s, globalization was a slogan of a better equal interconnected cooperating and peaceful world. In practice globalization is the freedom of movement for capital and goods across the world for international corporations, the network of international institutions allowing for political cooperation or dialog between all the extant and legitimate (recognized) nation-states, and the internet infrastructure that underpins the worldwide cyberspace. The last element allows relatively rich literate and numerate individuals with a working command of Eurasia’s large languages (preferrably written in the Latin alphabet) to access and interact with cyberspace on a global scale. Individuals of this kind live mostly in the rich North, while a considerable percentage, often the majority, of the inhabitants of the poor South’s nation-states do not fulfill these threshold conditions. As a result, they are excluded from active participation in globalization, which however does not shield them from positive and negative ramifications of this process. Hence, in many ways, globalization reproduces and deepens the practices of economic imperialism, cultural imperialism, and linguistic imperialism. The rich North decides on the practices of globalization and their “appropriate” uses, while the poor South has no choice but to concede. There is no equality of opportunities in globalization, this process firmly tilted in the rich North’s favor. These skewed dynamics allow the proposition that in this arrangement the North’s inhabitants can be seen as “globalizers,” while the South’s populations represent the “globalized.” This dichotomy is eerily similar to that of colonialism, namely, between Western colonizers and the colonized populations in the Western(ized) great powers’ maritime and continent-wide empires.

global system of languages (Einzelsprachen) (etymology: see globalization, language, writing system)—the globalized system of formal recognition and registration of lan-
guages (Einzelsprachen), which emerged in an unplanned and piecemeal manner after World War Two in the wake of decolonization, as a reply to the exponential growth in information production, in an equally exponentially increasing number of Einzelsprachen and scripts (writing systems). Initially, this system allowed for automated retrieval of (typically bibliographic) data and facilitated evangelization (predominantly, translation of the Bible into non-European Einzelsprachen), before it became one of the organizational and technical pillars of the internet (cyberspace) at the turn of the twenty-first century (see ISO 15924, ISO 639). Because the registration authorities (Infoterm, Library of Congress, Linguasphere Observatory/Observatoire Linguistique, SIL International, or Unicode) of this global system of languages are located in the West (that is, the rich North), the system tends to meet and champion the West’s needs, to the neglect of and even disrespect (prejudice) for the expectations and needs of non-Western nation-states, nations, ethnic groups, Gesellschaften, and Gemeinschaften. Above all it enforces the Western in its origin concept of Einzelsprache as the standard unit of the linguistic and imposes this norm, alongside the equally normatized dialect vs language (Einzelsprache) dichotomy, on the rest of the world. This situation characterizes present-day linguistic imperialism and cultural imperialism. The creation, recognition, and use of non-Western Einzelsprachen are decided solely in the West and by its agents (missionaries, linguists, anthropologists, or IT specialists), with little or no consultation with the concerned non-Western speech communities. From the perspective of global language politics, the West is all powerful, while the “Rest” are made completely powerless; the former “globalizes” (that is, culturally, linguistically, and technologically colonizes) the latter, making it into “the globalized” (or “new colonials”). The 300-odd linguistic versions of Wikipedia are a good litmus test of this novel “cyberspace imperialism,” or the global internet cleavage. The vast majority of these Wikipedias are available in Eurasian languages, the plurality in European languages, and the vast majority of information is offered in European languages. The half a million-strong speech community of the unrecognized Central European Einzelsprache of Silesian enjoy a Silesian-language Wikipedia with over 7,600 articles, while South Africa’s 8 million Xhosas have a paltry Xhosa-language Wikipedia of 750 articles, and actually there is no Wikipedia in the country’s official language of Ndebele, spoken by as many as 2.5 million people.

global (world) language (etymology: see globalization, language. The word “world” stems from Old English world or wœruld, and is cognate with Dutch wereld and German Welt)—a large language, which is a lingua franca employed across several continents and tens of polities by 0.5-1 billion people (for instance, Arabic, English, French or Spanish). See also language of international (interethnic) communication.

glotonym (neologism formed from Greek γλώσσα glóssa “language,” and ἄνωμα ὄνομα “name”)—see linguonym.

grapheme (from Greek γραφήμα grafhema “letter”—a letter, the basic unit of a writing system (script). In linguistics the term “grapheme” is preferred to “letter,” because the former phonetically corresponds to phoneme, emphasizing the point that in alphabets and abjads graphemes typically correspond to phonemes. Obviously, in syllabaries and morphemic scripts graphemes correspond to syllables and morphemes, respectively.

Gulag (from the Russian acronym ГУлаG ГУЛаг, derived from the name Главное управление лагерей и мест заключения Glavnoe upravlenie lagerei i mest zaklyuchenia for “Main Administration of Camps and Places of Detention”—a term for the system of the Soviet (forced labor) concentration camps. In the present-day English often a synonym for concentration camp (typically, “gulag” or “gulag camp”). Officially, no gulag camp was intended for extermination, though in practice some gulag camps functioned as de facto extermination camps.

heterogeneity vs homogeneity (etymology: see ethnolinguistic homogeneity). The term “heterogeneity” stems from Greek ἕτερος heteros, in turn from ἐτέρος heteros “other, different” and γένος genos “kind”—a sociopolitical dichotomy that informs much of medieval and modern European thinking on legitimate forms of statehood. Without giving appropriate attention to this tacitly accepted norm, the widespread belief in Europe (and the West) has been that in order for a state to be legitimate and viable it should be homogenous, meaning that all its inhabitants should conform to a shared single cultural trait (or marker), in the majority of cases this trait being a religion or an Einzelsprache. However, homogeneity is a “movable feast.” For instance, the United Kingdom of the Netherlands (1815–1830) was ethnolinguistically quite homogenous, the majority of its population spoke Dutch (Flemish). However, from the religious perspective (see religious homogeneity), half of this Kingdom’s inhabitants were Catholics and the other half Protestants, which in 1830 led to the breakup of the polity into a Catholic nation-state of Belgium and a Protestant nation-state of the Netherlands. But with the rise in popularity of the concept of ethnolinguistic homogeneity, the religion-based homogeneity of Belgium turned out to be insufficient in the twentieth century, as in the eyes of its inhabitants the country began to appear as ethnolinguistically heterogeneous. This change in perception from the homogeneity to heterogeneity of Belgium has entailed repeated calls for a breakup of this country into a homogenously French-speaking nation-state of Wallonia and a likewise homogenously Flemish (Dutch)-speaking nation-state of Flanders (which could be united with the Netherlands). Practically, each extant nation-state from one perspective may be posed as being homogenous (meaning, legitimate), or as heterogeneous (meaning, illegitimate) from another, depending on the perception of the country’s character by its elite and population. Perception and changes in it are fully dependent on human will, as well as the espousal of the concept of homogeneity in the role of the litmus test of the legitimacy of statehood. Both this concept and such changing perceptions of a polity’s character are part and parcel of social reality. Historically speaking, the normative concept of homogeneity as the basis of legitimate statehood is strongly connected to the Judeo-Christian-Islamic tradition of monotheism. Finally, nothing prevents humans from
deciding that only a homogeneously multiethnic or polyconfessional (that is, heterogeneous) polity is legitimate.

historiography (sixteenth-century term borrowed from Medieval Latin, in turn a loan from Greek ἱστοριγραφία histiorgrafia, that is, ἱστορία historia “history” and -γραφία –grafia from the Greek verb γράφειν graphein “to write”, meaning written presentation, or record, of the past)—a scholarly discipline that aspires to record, analyze and explain the human past. Traditionally, in a highly Eurocentric (Westernocentric) manner, this discipline’s purview used to be limited to literate (that is mostly, Western) societies (states), which produce written records (see writing). The past of non- or pre-literate societies, dubbed as “prehistoric,” was to be researched by anthropologists, that is, the West’s specialists in the Other, or peoples (“tribes”) disparagingly referred to as “civilizationally lower,” “backward,” or even “savage.” On the other hand, until the late twentieth century, the past of Asia’s and Northern Africa’s non-Western literate societies and states was seen as the field of Oriental Studies. Furthermore, when researching the past of Europe (West), earlier historians typically focused on “high history,” that is events impacting and produced by the ruling elite (estates). Until the mid-twentieth century the past of the “lower classes” (peasantry, serfs) or the modern common man was seen as suitable for the discipline of sociology. While anthropology was tasked with the study of the “non-Western Other,” sociologists were to probe the West’s “social Other within.”

Nowadays, historians (or practitioners of historiography) aspire to research the entire human past from the objectivizing (etic) perspective. Historiography’s output is collectively known as “history,” though in popular usage the term “history” is employed as a preferred synonym for the discipline of historiography. See also national historiography.

history (from Greek ἱστορία historia “inquiry, knowledge from inquiry,” or “to judge,” derived from ἵστορ histo “the one who knows, wise person, judge”)—a description, analysis, and explanation of the past, usually of human societies, ideally from an etic (objectivizing) perspective, through a causal analysis and explanation of the events, which are typically entirely contained within the sphere of social reality. History is a product of historiography (that is, the scholarly discipline of history). See also national history.

“holy book” (word “holy” stems from Old English hālīg or hālēg “scared, pacific, ecclesiastical,” cognate with hāl “whole[some],” and Dutch and German heilig “holy.” The word “book” is derived from Old English boek, cognate with Dutch boek and German Buch; perhaps, ultimately from “beech,” or Buche in German, as initially tree bark was employed for writing among Germanic and Slavic ethnic groups)—a collection of texts, construed as a foundation of (typically monotheistic) religion in the Judeo-Christian-Islamic (“Abrahamic”) tradition. Monotheistic religions (faiths) are “scriptural” in their character, because a “divinity’s voice” is imagined to have been written down in the form of a “holy book,” also known as a “holy scripture.”

“holy script” (etymology: see “holy book,” script)—a writing system in which a “holy book” was written. This writing system often symbolizes the religion and its sociocultural practices, as connected to a given “holy book.”

“holy scripture” (etymology: see “holy book,” script)—a synonym for a “holy book” in a monotheistic religion. But importantly, a specific writing system (script) in which a given “holy book” (or its canonical translation) was written is usually seen as “holy” and symbolic of a given religion. In many ways such a script serves as a religion’s logo, for example, Cyrillic in the case of Slavophone Orthodox Christianity, the Latin alphabet in the case of Roman Catholicism, the Hebrew abjad in the case of Judaism, and the Arabic script in the case of Islam.

“holy tongue” (etymology: see “holy book”). The word “tongue” stems from Old English tūng, cognate with German Zunge “muscle in the mouth”—an Einzelsprache in which the original of a “holy book” (or its canonical translation) was written.

human (free) will—adjective “human” stems from Latin homō “human being.” The noun “will” is derived from Old English willan “to will, be willing, wish, or desire;” cognate with German wollen”—here the capacity of humans and their groups to use a language and shape Einzelsprachen as they want. Hence, the generation and maintenance of social reality (semiosphere, noosphere) is fully and solely dependent on people, and their intentions and acts. On the other hand, material reality (extrasemiotic sphere, the biosphere, the universe) is fully independent of human will.

human rights (etymology: see divine right, human will)—the modern belief in and legal practice that all humans (see individualism) should enjoy the same basic rights, for instance, to life, marriage, suffrage, equality before the law, free speech, education, healthcare, or clean environment, alongside some rights earmarked to be enjoyed collectively (collectivism) within human groups (for instance, in the case of national minorities). See also linguistic human rights.

hybrid warfare (etymology: see cyberwarfare. The term “hybrid” stems from Latin hybrīda or hibrida “crossbred animal”)—conventional warfare combined with cyberwarfare.

ideology (early nineteenth-century French neologism idéologie, from idéo “idea” and logie “-logy,” that is, “a body of knowledge, writings”)—in politics, a system of believes and assumptions that legitimizes (justifies) the exercise of power over the population in a state. Until the American and French Revolutions, the most popular form of legitimation of rule was divine right: presumable a divinity anointed a monarch to rule. Afterward, the function is served by the nation’s “common will,” typically expressed through the ballot box (elections).

identity (from Latin idem “the same,” see also the etymology of ethnolinguistic homogeneity)—what an individual or a group sees as symbolic of them, as their essential “logo,” usually a set of ideas, beliefs, and values. Identity, as part of social reality, is created and maintained, or altered and discontinued, by humans alone; it is fully dependent on human will. See also national identity.
imagined community (etymology: see communism. The verb "to imagine" stems from Latin imaginor, ultimately from imāginō "copy, likeness, image")—nowadays a highly popular term among social scientists, originally developed in 1983 by the Irish scholar of Southeast Asia working in the United States, Benedict Anderson, for the purpose of succinctly commenting on the character of the nation, namely, that it is part of social reality, a non-face-to-face group constructed as an act of human will (Anderson 1983). The attraction of the nation lies in the fact that the ideology of nationalism successfully presents the nation, which is a form of Gesellschaft (aka "cold modern society") to its members as a cozy and caring face-to-face Gemeinschaft. See also invented tradition.

imperialism (from Latin imperium "empire")—term that emerged in the 1870s as a criticism of the European (Western) powers' policy of acquiring, outside Europe, maritime (continent-wide) empires, typically built from a string of colonies. See also linguistic imperialism.

imperial language (etymology: see empire, language)—the official language of an empire, in the case of modern maritime or continent-wide empires, typically, the official (dominant, national) language of a former imperial metropolis ("home country"), turned into a "regular" nation-state. However, such erstwhile imperial metropolises-turned-nation-states are "more equal" (that is, powerful) than the postcolonial nation-states, as indicated by the fact that many of the former are permanent members of the United Nations' Security Council and (or) their economies dwarf the latter's on the global scale. Nowadays, former imperial languages rebranded as "large languages" (also known as global or world languages) are an important or even the main tool for projecting "soft power," that is, for establishing, legitimizing, and maintaining cultural imperialism and linguistic imperialism across former empires. See also language as a weapon (instrument) of power.

individualism (late 1820s neologism, derived from the word "individual," ultimately from Latin individuum "an indivisible thing")—an attitude, doctrine, or even an ideology that prioritizes the individual over their own group, or any groups whatsoever. This doctrine lies at the heart of human rights and underlies the principle of individual merit in capitalism and that of personal choice in democracy. Individualism stands in direct opposition to collectivism, while (Catholic) proponents of personalism propose to mitigate this stark dichotomy.

infrastructural ideology (term "infrastructure" is a late 1920s French neologism, formed from Latin infra "below, underling," and the word "structure," ultimately from Latin structura "building, edifice," in turn from struere "to build")—the globe's (or a large area's) main or even sole ideology that underpins the founding, legitimation, and maintenance of statehood. In today's world, nationalism fulfills the function of such an infrastructural ideology.

integration (from Latin integrātiō "renewal, restoration")—in ethnolinguistic nation-states a policy of full acceptance for minorities, alongside their languages, religions and cultures, on the understanding that members of minorities would reciprocate by becoming fully bilingual and bicultural in the state (national, official) language and culture of their nation-state of residence. Integration of this type is rather impossible without the members of the nation-state's own nation reciprocating in kind. To my knowledge, the sole case of successful integration of a minority can be observed only in Finland. Swedes (Swedish speakers) constitute about 5 percent of the country's population, but their national (minority) language of Swedish enjoys the same status of a state (official) language, like Finnish, spoken by Finland's nation of Finns. Minority Swedes are required to acquire full command of Finnish, but likewise all ethnic Finns are also required to become fluent in Swedish.

international (etymology: see nation. The prefix "inter-" stems from Latin inter "between, amid")—characteristic of the relations between states. The Latinate prefix "inter-" means "between, among," but the term "nation" in this compound word, confusingly refers to "state," not the nation in the meaning of a group of people with the recognized right to separate statehood. In the international languages of English and French the term "nation" is often used as the preferred synonym for "state." Hence, the United Nations (or Nations unies in French) is an international organization of states, not nations understood as human groups. See also transnational.

international law (etymology: see international. The term "law" stems from Old English lagu "law" and is cognate with Swedish lag and Danish lov)—a body of agreed upon conventions and principles that govern relations between the globe's states (that is, actors of international relations).

international relations (etymology: see international. The term "relation" stems from Latin relātiō, in turn from referō "I refer, I relate," ultimately from fero "I bear, I carry")—interactions (relations) between states, not nations.

invented tradition (etymology: see traitor of one's nation. The verb "invent" stems from Latin invenire "to come upon, find")—nowadays a highly popular term among social scientists, originally developed in 1983 by the tandem of British historians, Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, for the purpose of succinctly commenting on how the nation is supplied with "centuries-long history and customs," when needed for a given national project, that is, for constructing and legitimizing a, typically ethno-linguistic, nation (see imagined community) and/or its nation-state. Practically, in all cases such "old" or "long-established traditions" are a modern construct ("invention"), which proves the human remembrance of the past is part and parcel of social reality (Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983). As such, an act of human will may shape social reality as deemed necessary for a given present-day political (national) project. A conscious realization of this possibility in the 1990s led to the rise of a new field and political practice, that is, Geschichtspolitik, in the freshly postcommunist Europe.

ISO 15924 (etymology: see ISO 639)—a standard for registering the world's scripts (writing systems) developed in 2004 and en-
trusted to the Unicode Corporation, because since 1987 this corporation had developed a comprehensive, and now universally accepted, Universal Coded Character Set. In turn, this Universal Coded Character Set stems from the Xerox Character Code Standard created in 1980. At present (2018) the ISO 15924 covers about 150 scripts and further 40 variants of some of these scripts. See also global system of languages.

ISO 639 (commonly, but incorrectly ISO is believed to be an acronym derived from the name of the International Organization for Standardization, founded in 1947 in Geneva, because standards issued by this organization are preceded by the term “ISO”; actually derived from the Greek adjective ἴσος ἴσος “equal”)—due to the post-1945 explosion in the production of printed and audiovisual material in multiple non-European (that is, overwhelmingly Asian) Einzelsprachen, it was necessary to recognize this fact for ensuring the success of the then nascent automatic retrieval of bibliographic data. In 1967, an ISO 639 standard was developed for supplying the most important post-war Einzelsprachen with machine readable two-letter codes. This standard was maintained by Inforterm based in Vienna. At the same time, the Library of Congress in Washington DC, developed United States MARC (MAChine-Readable Cataloging) standards, among others, also for cataloging Einzelsprachen. The MARC standards became official across the United States in 1971. In 1998 the MARC standard for cataloging Einzelsprachen was recognized as an ISO 639-2 standard of three-letter codes, while the original ISO 639 standard was renamed as ISO 639-1, and its maintenance was entrusted to the Library of Congress. At present (2018) ISO 639-1 registers almost 200 languages, while ISO 639-2 almost 600. Both systems underpin the linguistic dimension of cyberspace. Unicode’s Universal Coded Character Set (with over 136,000 characters in 2018) allows for the online use of over 600 Einzelsprachen written in about 150 different scripts, as registered in the ISO 15924 standard, also maintained by Unicode. The relative ease of employing the internet for publishing (see writing) in potentially all the world’s Einzelsprachen and speech varieties led, in 2007, to the issuing of the ISO 639-3 standard for registering “all the world’s languages (Einzelsprachen).” The Library of Congress developed this standard but entrusted its maintenance to SIL International, previously known as the Summer Institute of Linguistics. It is a Christian evangelizing organization specializing in translating the Bible into “all the world’s languages,” hence in the production of Einzelsprachen out of speech varieties of non-European (and typically non-Eurasian) ethnic groups, without much respect for these groups’ wishes or needs. Hence, in the case of the majority of such newly-minted Einzelsprachen, the translation of the Bible is the only book available in them, which often brings about the swift destruction of a local ethnic culture and the related non-scriptural religion (cultural imperialism, linguistics imperialism). At present (2018), ISO 639-3 catalogs almost 8,000 Einzelsprachen. In light of numerous criticisms of SIL International’s clandestine religious agenda, in 2009, yet another standard ISO 639-6 was adopted for registering the globe’s estimated 25,000 Einzelsprachen and speech varieties. But with no donations from religiously motivated donors or state grant agencies, and with no prospect of speedy commercialization of such a huge registration list, this standard was withdrawn in 2014. At present the non-denominational Linguasphere Observatory/Observatoire Linguistique network based in Britain and France developed and maintains a similar register, which complies with the principles of the ISO 639-6 standard. See also global system of languages.

isolgloss—see linguistic map (cartography).

Kinderaustausch (German “exchange of children”—between the sixteenth and mid-twentieth century, a sociocultural practice among the serfs (peasantry) in the villages of the Klein Tiefebene (Little Hungarian Plain; nowadays, Kisalföld in Hungarian and Malá dunajská kotlina in Slovak), that is, in the vicinity of Bratislava. In the wake of the centuries-long wars between the Habsburgs and the Ottomans, what today is Hungary changed hands often and was depopulated. Refugees streamed to northern Hungary, which remained under the Habsburgs, or today’s Slovakia. The Hungarian capital was also moved to Prešburg/Pozsony (Bratislava). As a result, illiterate peasants using often incomprehensible speech varieties (that can be anachronistically identified as “Croatian,” “German,” “Hungarian,” and “Slovak”) lived side by side in a single village. In order to survive they needed to cooperate during harvest, house construction, or while negotiating labor owed to the noble landowner. Hence, they had to be able to communicate swiftly and successfully in everyday life. In order to prepare their children for this task, parents speaking different speech varieties regularly sent their children to stay with their neighbors for a fortnight to two months every year for five to six years in a row. The “exchanged children” were treated as one’s own and participated in all the usual household and family activities. As a result, without attending any school and mostly remaining illiterate, the region’s peasants were highly multilingual. However, they did not see this de facto multilingualism in terms of Einzelsprachen, the concept known to the region’s noble elite but not yet to the peasants. Peasants still spoke in order to communicate and did not need to negotiate a mutually comprehensible Einzelsprache prior to the act of communication, which is now the norm in the modern world. See also bilingualism, diglossia, linguistic area, language barrier, language boundary.

korenizatsia (Russian term кorenизация, translated as “nativization,” literally “rooting in,” from корень koren “root”—in the interwar Soviet Union it was a policy of building Einzelsprachen (language engineering) for recognized “backward nationalities,” and for ensuring the use of these new Einzelsprachen and the already extant Einzelsprachen of the “developed nationalities” in a variety of autonomous territories founded for all these nationalities, that is, in administration and education. This policy entailed mass production of books and periodicals in all these nationalities’ Einzelsprachen.

L1 (acronym derived from the term “Language 1”, or the “First Language”—the very first Einzelsprache that a person acquires after birth, in early childhood. See also mother tongue.)
L1 (L3, L4, etc.)—by analogy to the term “L1,” the second, third, fourth/ and umpteenth Einzelsprache that a person happens to acquire.

L1 speaker—a neutral designation for “native speaker.”

∅ language (from Latin lingua, meaning both “language” and “tongue [muscle in the mouth],” hence the English term “tongue” for Einzelsprache, as in mother tongue)—“language with no article in front of it.” This term has no plural and is uncountable. It denotes the biological (evolutionary) capacity for speech. The main evolutionary pressure that caused language to emerge is improvement in the efficiency of bonding individual humans into cohesive groups. Conveying information is a secondary function of language, which appeared with the rise of large-scale artifacts of social reality, for instance, states or nations. These artifacts allow for creating cohesive non-face-to-face (imagined) groups of millions and even a billion members.

a language (etymology: see above)—English noun that is always preceded by an article in singular, has a plural form and is countable. In linguistics the concept of a “quantifiable unit (quantum) of the linguistic,” that is for making the continuous nature of speech and speech variation (see dialect continuum, linguistic area) discrete, countable, and quantifiable. On the other hand, in popular parlance and politics (especially language politics as pursued by ethnolinguistic nationalists), the term “a language” is a form of status which is accorded to some written speech varieties (for instance, national languages) and withheld from others, disparaged as, for example, “dialects.” Hence, the term “a language” is not a neutral term of analysis. A neutral designation for a (written or not) speech variety with no political connotations is the term Einzelsprache. See also dialect vs language (Einzelsprache) dichotomy.

language as a weapon (instrument of power) (from Russian язык как орудие власти iazyk kak orudie vlasti)—an expression and concept arguably coined by Vladimir Lenin in the early 1910s (cf Stalin 1931: 76-77). It denotes the conscious use of an instrument of power (etymology: iazyk as a Weapon of Power) explicitly operationalized (“weaponized”) the Russian language as the basic instrument of action within the legitimizing scope of the Kremlin’s current “soft power” ideology of the Russian World (Rybin 2018). Four years earlier, in 2014, the Russian language had been tacitly employed in this manner for legitimizing the annexation of Ukraine’s Crimea, the argument being that the majority of the peninsula’s inhabitants speak Russian, hence, they must be Russians, while ethnolinguistic nationalism’s principle of the normative isomorphism of language, nation, and state dictates that all the speakers of the national language (seen as members of the nation) should reside in their own indivisible and singular nation-state.

language barrier (etymology: see language. The word “barrier” stems from Old French barriere, in turn from barre “bar, obstacle”—the concept of the lack of an (adequate) command of a dominant Einzelsprache (typically, an imperial language or large language) appeared at the turn of the twentieth century, but especially during the Great War, when the imperial powers drafted soldiers from across their empires. These soldiers stemmed from an unprecedented number of ethnic groups, all thrown into the tragic melee of the war theaters in Europe and the Middle East as combatants and POWs. The predominantly monolingual manner of command (with the rare exception of the Austro-Hungarian army) hampered the efficiency of military operations and relief efforts for POWs and refugees.

The invention of Esperanto in the 1880s, and other constructed languages later on were a popular solution to this phenomenon of language barrier. But imperialism (even in its “softer” incarnations of cultural imperialism or linguistic imperialism) entailed the great powers’ de facto disdain for constructed languages, often leading to an official ban on their use. In 1922 Esperanto was banned from French schools, and in 1924 Paris blocked the motion to make Esperanto into another working language of the League of Nations, while in totalitarian states (especially in Germany and the Soviet Union during the 1930s) Esperantists were incarcerated in concentration camps, where many were summarily executed or worked to death (“liquidated”).

The term “language barrier” was not in use before the 1880s, because only in the age of high imperialism the concept of Einzelsprache was thoroughly “naturalized” and imposed on the rest of the world, mostly through the spread of the ideal of compulsory elementary education for all, channeled through writing, which is the main instrument for creating and solidifying Einzelsprachen. Prior to the age of imperialism, most people talked to communicate (see Küberaustausch), while later, a mutually comprehensible Einzelsprache first had to be negotiated and agreed upon before communication could take place.

See also ethnolinguistic map, linguistic map, mutual comprehensibility.

language border (etymology: see language. The phrase stems from German Sprachgrenze. The word “border” stems from Old French bordure “seam, edge of a shield, border,” cognate with German Borte “ribbon, trimming.” On the other hand, the German term Grenze, or Grenze in obsolete spelling, stems from Middle High German Grenze or Granize, which is of Slavic origin, hence cognate with Bulgarian and Russian граница granitsa or Polish granica)—the German term Sprachgrenze appeared with the rise of the concept of normatively monolingual
national territories (of speech communities equated with nations), construed in line with the ideology of ethnotaxonomic nationalism, and made visible with the use of cartography for representing data obtained during censuses by asking the "language question" (see ethnotaxonomic map). In this way ethnotaxonomic nationalism was naturalized, and made into an object of "scientific" research, thus making scholars and civil servants oblivious to the fact that it was them who created this element of social reality by making specific decisions on the basis of specific assumptions. After World War One, at the Peace Conference in Paris, the Allies led by the United States President Woodrow Wilson decided to use the cartographically-cum-statistically imagined ethnotaxonomic nations for replacing Central Europe's multiethnic and polyglot empires with ethnotaxonomic nation-states. The United States geographer of Ottoman-Armenian origin Leon Dominian gathered these ideas in his seminal 1917 monograph The Frontiers of Language and Nationality in Europe, which was closely read and followed by Wilson and his team of advisors. Dominian popularized the term "language border" as an instrument of geopolitical decision-making. Obviously, a language border is a highly idealized concept, because until the mid-twentieth century bilingualism and diglossia were the norm in Europe, while people speaking and writing different Einzelsprachen and speech varieties could live peacefully side by side without unduly politicizing this fact, let alone making it into an argument for expelling (ethnic cleansing) speakers of a "foreign language," in quest for ethnotaxonomic homogeneity in a given nation-state. In today's world genuinely "sharp" language borders overlapping with state frontiers exist almost exclusively in Central Europe. This tight overlap, in line with ethnotaxonomic nationalism's principle of the normative isomorphism of language, nation, and state is a result of numerous acts of ethnic cleansing and genocide in the short twentieth century, which touched upon the lives of about 100 million people in this region. See also ethnotaxonomic map, linguistic map, mutual comprehensibility.

language conflict (etymology: see language). The word "conflict" stems from Latin conflicitus, past participle of confligere "collide, clash, engage in combat," in turn from con- "together" and fligō "strike")—a form of language politics, in the course of which two or more ethnic or political groups use an Einzelsprache (or its specific variety) as a rallying flag for legitimizing and forcing their preferred solution or point of view on the other group. For instance, after two decades of political pressure, in the early 1880s Czech became a co-official language, alongside German, in Bohemia, and in 1882 Prague University was split alongside the linguistic cleavage into two universities, one with German and the other with Czech as the sole language of instruction. In 1831–1833, an "alphabet war" (abecedna vojna) was waged in the Austrian Empire's Crownland of Carniola (the central part of today's Slovenia) between proponents of two different orthographies (spelling systems) of the Einzelsprache of Slovenian. Hence, this conflict fell specifically under the rubric of the politics of script. During the first half of the twentieth century in Ottoman/Mandate (British) Palestine a "war of languages" (in Hebrew מלחמת השפות, Milhemet HaSafot, or a heated discussion developed about which Einzelsprache should become official in Jewish institutions, Hebrew, Yiddish or German. The founding of Israel in 1948 settled the conflict in favor of Hebrew. In independent Greece proponents of Katharevousa (antiquated Greek) and Demotic (vernacular Greek) quarreled for almost two centuries before the latter became official in 1976. During the twentieth century this strife led to the persisting association of Katharevousa with traditionalists and conservatives, while Demotic with modernizers and socialists.

language death (etymology: see language). The word "death" stems from Old English dēasp, cognate with German Tod)—a misnomer (from Medieval Latin lingua mortua "dead language," when commenting on the then observed non-existence of the speech community of Latin or Quranic Arabic) for language disappearance (extinction, obsolescence). Einzelsprachen, speech varieties, dialects, standard languages, or national languages are not living organisms, as popularly, but erroneously maintained. They do not live, they are not born, do not give birth to "offspring (children) languages," and thus cannot die. It is humans and human groups who use their biological capacity for speech (Ø language) to build (see language engineering), maintain, and employ Einzelsprachen. When a speech community abandons the oral and written use of an (or "its") Einzelsprache, then this language disappears from active employment and becomes obsolete.

language disappearance (extinction, obsolescence) (etymology: see language)—occurs when a given Einzelsprache falls out of active use, when its speech community gives up on it and decides to employ another Einzelsprache in speech and writing. Critics of such a shift use the emotionally charged collocation language death for mobilizing (shaming) the original speech community (ethnic group) to recover the use of the abandoned Einzelsprache, or more often to prevent such abandonment (obsolescence) when a new dominant Einzelsprache is preferred to the group's original (earlier) ethnic (national) language.

language engineering (etymology: see language). The term engineering stems from Old French enginier, in turn from Medieval Latin ingeniātor "inventor, designer," ultimately from ingénium "talent, skill," and gignere "to beget, produce")—a term borrowed from Russian (языковое строительство izykovoe stroitel'stvo) for a conscious state or state-supported policy of building Einzelsprachen. The origin of this term goes back to the interwar Soviet Union, when in the framework of the policy of korenizatsia over one hundred Einzelsprachen were built for a similar number of ethnic groups.

language family (etymology: see language). The word "family" stems from Latin familia "household, the slaves of a household")—in the highly idealized classificatory method of Stammbaum (language family tree), a group of "genealogically related" Einzelsprachen (typically national languages, other speech varieties or dialects disregarded as "civilizationally or culturally lower elements" of the former, seen as "roofing languages"),
The aforementioned principle closely corresponds to and rein-
agency, as sole creators and maintainers of
language, but forces the census norm (non-existent
thropomorphization of languages speciously endows them with
lexical commandment "Thou shalt not commit adultery." This an-
family," "linguistic adultery" strongly forbidden in line with the bib-
lical commandment "Thou shalt not commit adultery." This anth-
thropomorphization of languages speciously endows them with
non-existent agency. Only humans and their groups enjoy such
agency, as sole creators and maintainers of languages. However,
The aforementioned principle closely corresponds to and rein-
forces the census norm (language question) that a person (con-
strued as a native speaker) can naturally have only a single na-
tional language as her or his "mother tongue," which should
clearly indicate their membership (nationality) in a given nation.

At the level of research, these aforementioned normative as-
sumptions make scholars oblivious to the fact that, from the
Stammbaum perspective, English belongs both to the Germanic
and Romance "families" of languages. Similarly, prior to the na-
tionally-induced "purification" (purism) of Hungarian and Romanian, the former belonged both to the Finno-Ugric and
Romance "families" of languages, while the latter to the Romance
and Slavic ones. Osmanlica (Ottoman Turkish), due to its centu-
ries-long extensive borrowings and adaptations from Arabic and
Persian, used to belong to as many as three "families" of Turkic,
Semitic, and Indo-European (Iranian) languages. At present, Ivrit
(Modern Hebrew), as mainly constructed by Yiddish-speaking
Ashkenazim predominantly stemming from Slavophone ter-
ritories, also belongs to three such "families," namely those of
Semitic, Germanic, and Slavic languages. Likewise, due to its spa-
tially central localization in the Balkan linguistic area, Bulgarian
may be usefully seen as a member of the four "families" of Slavic,
Hellenic (Greek), Turkic and Romance languages.

The constructed and normative character of the Western con-
cept of "language family" became, long ago, obvious to students
of non-European languages (speech varieties), especially outside
Eurasia. This concept obscures rather than helps scholarly ef-
forts at understanding the history and dynamics of linguistic
exchanges among non-Western speech communities (ethnic
groups). However, this insight on the constructed and norma-
tive character of the concept "language family" is still rarely taken
note of in today's West of nation-states, especially in the pres-
et-day Central Europe of ethnolinguistic nation-states.

glossary language family tree—see Stammbaum.

glossary language of instruction (education)—see medium of educa-
tion.

glossary language of international (interethnic) communication (et-
tymology: see international, language). The term "communication"
stands from Old French communicacion, in turn from Latin
communicationem, and ultimately from communicō "I share, I
impair")—a lingua franca, an Einzelsprache employed as a sec-
ond language (L2) by speakers from different ethnic groups (or
ethnolinguistic nations) or citizens from various nation-states
who do not share the same L1 (first language). Oftentimes it is
a “large language,” spoken by at least 100 million speakers or
more. At present, a large language that is used as a lingua franca
across several continents and tens of politics by 0.5-1 billion
people tends to be dubbed a "global (world) language.”

glossary language planning (etymology: see language). The word "plan"
stems from French plan “a ground-plot of a building,” in turn from Latin planus “level, flat, plane”)—a synonym for language
engineering.

glossary language politics (etymology: see language, politics)—using
languages (Einzelsprachen) for political ends (for example, con-
structing ethnolinguistic nations and their nation-states); also
official legislation that extends a state’s control over ("regulates")
the use of Einzelsprachen and their writing systems in the state.
See also bureaucracy, politics of script.

glossary language status planning (etymology: see estate, language plan-
ning, state)—an element of language engineering and language
politics, namely, an official decision on the role which a given
Einzelsprache should play in a state. For instance, in the Russian
Empire White Russian (Belarusian) was considered to be a dia-
lect of the Great Russian language. After 1864, the use of White
Russian in writing and publishing was banned in order to enforce
Russian as the sole Einzelsprache for the Empire’s all Slavophone
Orthodox Christians. The lift of this ban in 1905 saw the mak-
ing of White Russian into the national language of the then co-
alescing White Russian national movement. The German occupa-
tion of the northwestern Russian provinces made White Russian,
for the first time in history, into a language of administration and
a medium of instruction. When Belarus emerged briefly as an in-
dependent nation-state in 1918, Belarusian was made into the na-
tion-state’s sole official language. Subsequently, within the Soviet
Union, in Soviet Belarusia, Belarusian was a co-official lan-
guage, alongside Polish, Russian, and Yiddish. In 1938, the co-of-
official role of Polish and Yiddish was scrapped, and the leading role
of Russian reinforced, which de facto downgraded Belarusian
to a second co-official language in Soviet Byelorussia. This situa-
tion lasted until the re-emergence of independent Belarus in 1991.
Between 1991 and 1994 Belarusian was this nation-state’s sole na-
tional and official language (see normative isomorphism of lan-
guage, nation and state). But beginning with 1995, the status of
Belarusian was reduced to that of the national and a co-official
language, while Russian is de facto the leading co-official language
in today’s Belarus. See also script status planning.

glossary language question (census) (etymology: see language). The word
"question" stems from Anglo-French question, in turn from Latin
quaerere “to seek, ask, inquire”)—in
Central Europe during the mid-nineteenth century an idea ap-
peared and spread that the demographic size (population) of na-
tions can be identified and measured (counted) by including the
“language question” in state-wide censuses. It was argued that a
person can “naturally” have only one language (L1, mother
tongue), which is “truly” their national language. As such an an-
swer to this language question was believed to be a clear indicator
of a person’s nationality, that is, their membership in an ethno-
linguistically defined nation. In 1872, the eighth International Congress of Statistics held at St Petersburg recommended that such a language question as a measure of nationality be included in censuses. Afterward, censuses with this question included produced data, which in the numerical and cartographic forms (see ethnolinguistic map), were seen as “evidence” for the existence of a variety of ethnolinguistically defined nations across Central Europe. In reality, census-takers, scholars, and politicians imposed a specific ethnonational view on the region’s social reality, making the as yet non-national inhabitants accept the concept of the ethnolinguistic nation and pledge their allegiance to one of such nations. Thus, Central Europe’s ethnolinguistic nations were produced between the 1860s and 1920s, including the region’s supposedly “centuries-old multinational” character. See also language family, native speaker, Stammbaum.

language war (etymology: see cyberwarfare, language)—see language conflict.

large language (etymology: see language. The adjective “large” stems from largus “abundant, plentiful, copious, large, much”—a journalistic term for an Einzelsprache (usually a lingua franca) spoken by at least 100 million speakers or more in numerous countries. See also global (world) language.

Latinization (from the name of the language of “Latin,” or Latinus in Latin, ultimately from the name of the region of Latium—nowadays Lazio in Italian—where the city of Rome was founded)—a language engineering policy of endowing unwritten Einzelsprachen with a Latin alphabet-based script, or for replacing an Einzelsprache’s different script with the Latin alphabet. In the early twentieth century the Latin alphabet was believed to be the best (“most progressive”) of all the extant scripts (writing systems), and it was naively assumed that writing an Einzelsprache in Latin letters alone would ensure “progress” and “modernization.” Hence, Latinization was part and parcel of the Soviet policy of ko-renizatsiya between the mid-1920s and mid-1990s.

Latinization is also a synonym for Romanization.

lect (from Latin lèctus, namely, the past participle of legere “choose, gather, read”)—a neutral, scholarly, not ideologized designation for any speech variety or language variety.

legitimacy (from Medieval Latin lègitimatus, the perfect passive participle of lègitimō “to make legal,” in turn from lēgitimās “lawful, fixed by law, in line with the law”—in politics the consent of the governed that a ruler exercises power (governs) in a state legally, in accordance with a principle(s). Such a principle (divine right or ideology) is the utmost benchmark to decide that one’s rule is not a tyranny. In today’s world the most widespread ideology for legitimizing not only rule, but above all statehood, is nationalism.

lèse-majesté (lèse-majesty) (French loanword, from Latin [crlmen] laesae majestātīs “[the crime] of injured majesty”)—originally a criminal offense against the dignity of the public office or the emperor in the Roman Empire, and later against monarchs in medieval and early modern Europe; nowadays an offense against the sovereign nation-state, usually high treason. See also blasphemy, traitor of one’s nation.

lingua franca (pl lingua francæ; from the Italian name Lingua Franca “the language of Franks [Romance-speaking Christians]” for Sabir, or the Romance-based pidgin spoken along the shores of the Mediterranean from the eleventh to nineteenth centuries)—a language (Einzelsprache) of broader communication, typically spoken and/or written by speakers of other languages for the sake of communication across language barriers (between Einzelsprachen) and across dialect continua. In Europe, Latin fulfilled this purpose until the early modern period, and later French until the mid-twentieth century, before it was replaced by English in the wake of World War Two and the collapse of the Soviet bloc. Originally, (Mediterranean) Lingua Franca was a pidgin (rudimentary language not native to any speech community) developed by sailors and traders. The name means the “language of the Franks,” that is, Romance-speaking Christians, as perceived by Muslims since the time of the crusades. The Romance dialectal base of Lingua Franca was that of the Mediterranean coasts of today’s Spain, France, and Italy. Furthermore, it was infused with linguistic elements from Arabic, Berber, Greek, and Turkic. See also language of international (interethnic) communication, large language.

linguistic area (also Sprachbund, linguistic league, area of linguistic convergence. Etymology: see language, linguistics. The word “area” stems from Latin ārea “vacant piece of level ground, open space in a town”)—due to centuries-long stable interactions of speakers of languages (Einzelsprachen, dialects) from different dialect continua, a variety of linguistic features comes to be shared by distinctive speech communities; Abstand languages become more similar to one another, or more Ausbau-like. This phenomenon was first described in the case of the Balkans, where Albanic-, Greek-, Indic-, Romance-, Slavic-, and Turkic-speakers brushed sides, first, in the (East) Roman Empire, and then in the Ottoman Empire. The Balkan linguistic area is the best researched and described.

linguistic discrimination (etymology: see language, linguistics, discrimination)—prejudice and unfair treatment of individuals and groups on the basis of the Einzelsprachen and scripts (writing systems) that they employ. For instance, in ethnolinguistic nation-states, speakers of other national languages are seen as “potentially dangerous or disloyal” “minorities.” Within a speech community (ethnolinguistic nation), a person can be discriminated against for speaking their local dialect (“accent”) rather than conform to the standard (official) language as established, spoken, and written by a given nation-state’s elite. See also standardization.

linguistic human rights (etymology: see divine right, crime against humanity, language, linguistics)—a subsection of
human rights, which emerged in interwar Central Europe, where the post-1918 replacement of the empires with ethnolinguistic nation-states yielded the widespread phenomenon of national minorities whose collective rights (see collectivism) were guaranteed under the League of Nations’ minority treaties system. Linguistic human rights were tacitly incorporated in the United Nations’ 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, thanks to Article 2, which among others, prohibits limiting any person’s human rights on account of their language (Universal 1948). In light of this norm of international law, from the perspective of language politics, all language varieties (for instance, Einzelsprachen, languages, lects, ethnolocs, dialects, sociolcs, or speech varieties, including related scripts) employed by distinctive human groups (that is, micro-ethnic groups, ethnic groups, nationalities, nations, or nation-states) should be treated as of equal worth and accorded the same level of respect and prestige. Any person ought to be able to freely avail herself of whatever language variety she may wish in private (see individualism), and should have the freedom to use such a language variety in public, together with other speakers of this variety (including, education, politics, state administration, or mass media). In practice, linguistic human rights are observed (to a degree) only in Eurasia, while elsewhere the actual norm is linguistic imperialism, conducted with the use of the former colonial European Einzelsprachen (“large languages”). During the past decade cyberspace imperialism considerably widened this gap in the observance of linguistic human rights between Eurasia and the rest of the world.

linguistic imperialism (etymology: see empire, language, linguistics)—a term developed by the Scottish linguist, Robert Phillipson, for the policy of imposing European powers’ official (national) languages (Einzelsprachen) and their scripts (writing systems) on the colonized populations in these powers’ maritime (continent-wide) empires. After World War Two, the process of decolonization delegitimized and effectively ended political imperialism, but practically all postcolonial nation-states outside of Eurasia continue to use the European (former imperial) languages as official (national) Einzelsprachen, to the strict exclusion of the indigenous (non-European) languages. European languages and scripts constitute a clear-cut index of the West’s undeclared (and often not consciously noticed) continuing policy of linguistic imperialism. Outside of Eurasia, de facto only the Latin alphabet is employed for writing and publishing (including the indigenous languages), and the vast majority of the internet content is available in European languages (including Europe’s recognized and unrecognized minority languages and regional languages). On the other hand, there is almost no internet content available in non-Eurasian languages.

In Eurasia, decolonization typically went hand-in-hand with the replacement of European (imperial) languages with the leading (main) indigenous ones. Hence, in the former British colonies of Burma and Sri Lanka, English was replaced with Burmese and Sinhalese; in the former Dutch colony of Indonesia, Dutch was replaced with Indonesian; in the former French colonies of Laos or Vietnam, French was replaced with Lao (tian) and Vietnamese; and in the former Japanese colonies of Korea and Taiwan, Japanese was replaced with Korean and Chinese. A similar process unfolded in the former Soviet colonies (union republics), both in Europe and Asia. Russian was replaced with the post-Soviet nation-states’ leading indigenous languages. However, in the case of Central Europe, the Russian Federation (as the Soviet Union’s successor) questions and tries to prevent this transition, wishing to support the policy of linguistic imperialism in favor of the former imperial language of Russian. Hence, in practice, in Belarus the Russian language continues to be employed in official capacity to the near-exclusion of Belarusian from public life. In Ukraine, only after 2014 have more publications and official documents been produced in Ukrainian than in Russian, though the country’s online and audiovisual content is still produced mainly in Russian. A significant share of publishing, online and audiovisual production remains in Russian in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Kazakhstan, or Moldova. See also cultural imperialism, soft power.

linguistic map (cartography) (etymology: see ethnolinguistic map, language, linguistics)—typically, a map of the spatial distribution of the speakers of an Einzelsprachen or speech variety (dialect), including internal variation (for instance, different pronunciations of the same word, different words for the same object, or the same word referring to different objects) within the area where a given language is spoken. Like the ethnolinguistic map (also known as ethnographic map) that makes an ethnolinguistic nation into a depictable and “scientifically” constructed (“recognized”) entity, the linguistic map does the same for an Einzelsprache. The first linguistic maps were produced in the early nineteenth century, while the first linguistic atlas (of Europe) was published in Italian at Milano in 1841 (Atlante Linguistico d’Europa) (Biondelli 1841). Four decades later, a German-language atlas of this kind, however based on a questionnaire poll, came off the press in 1881 at Straßburg (Strasbourg) and London (Sprach-Atlas von Nord- und Mitteldeutschland) (Wenker 1881). But only in 1892, drawing at the method of depicting spatial information in geography (contour lines, or isohypses, late eighteenth century) and meteorology (isobar and isotherm, mid-1860s), the term isogloss (Greek ἰσος “equal or similar” and γλῶσσα “dialect, language”) was proposed by August Bielenstein in “Die Lettischen Dialekte der Gegenwart. Isoglossen-Karte” (that is, map 6 in his Atlas der Ethnolinguistischen Geographie des heutigen und des praehistorischen Lettenlandes published in St Petersburg) (Bielenstein 1892). Isohypses are employed for depicting a terrain of equal height, isobars for an atmospheric area of equal pressure, while isotherms for an area of equal temperature, hence all depict material reality.

By contrast, isoglosses depict an area where the same (or similar) linguistic element is employed by speakers, hence social reality. This borrowing of a method from the natural sciences recalls August Schleicher’s 1860s borrowing of some methodologies from the then nascent evolutionary biology (for instance, the concept of “living organism” and the tree diagram of speciation, or Stammbaum) for philology (Schleicher 1861: 4). The hope was that in this way philology would be transformed into an exact “science” of language (linguistics). However, as clearly shown by perceptual dialectology, social reality is solely dependent on human will and often strongly influenced (changed,
re-shaped) by the act of observation (perception) itself. No aspect of social reality can be weighed or measured with a theodolite, hypsometer (thermobarometer), or thermometer. Social reality is visible exclusively to those “in the know,” to the “mind’s eye” of the observer, who is as much of an observer as a participant in shaping and maintaining a given fragment of social reality. Therefore, an observer-cum-participant of this kind can decide herself, as was shown by Alexander Maxwell in his seminal 1906 article (“Why the Slovak Language Has Three Dialects: A Case Study in Historical Perceptual Dialectology,” Austrian History Yearbook), that the territory of Slovakia is intersected by two important “bundles of isoglosses,” yielding three main Slovak dialects, or by many more bundles, yielding multiple dialects. There is no “scientific” way (in the meaning of the natural sciences or laws of physics) to measure the actual or “true” number of Slovak dialects. This common methodological error of seeing isoglosses as a measure or depiction of material reality did not stop an avalanche of laboriously compiled and produced linguistic atlases during the twentieth century, of the majority of Slovak dialects. This common methodological error of seeing isoglosses as a measure or depiction of material reality did not stop an avalanche of laboriously compiled and produced linguistic atlases during the twentieth century, of the majority of Central Europe’s national languages and some selected Einzelsprachen from elsewhere in Eurasia. Tellingly, the work on linguistic atlases was at its most intensive in Central Europe’s ethnolinguistic nation-states and some other European national and non-national polities, where Einzelsprachen were (still are) of import for some administrative and political purposes. The genre of linguistic atlas is practically unknown outside of Eurasia. In the Americas, Africa, and Australasia almost exclusively (former imperial) European Einzelsprachen are in official use, while the continents’ polities are nearly invariably civic nation-states. In the aftermath of the Great War, linguistic maps (along ethnolinguistic maps) were employed as a “scientific” (that is, politically acceptable) argument for changing borders and establishing frontiers of the newly founded ethnolinguistic nation-states across Central Europe. As a result, the employment of isoglosses for border proposals, demarcation, and legitimation underscored the rise of the political concept of the language boundary at the level of social communication (mutual comprehensibility), corresponding to the idea of a language barrier. The proposed (perceptual) normative, and to a large degree constructed (imposed from above and outside), spatial and conceptual overlapping of isoglosses, language boundaries, language barriers, and state frontiers set the ground for the actualization of ethnolinguistic nationalism’s principle of the normative isomorphism of language, nation, and state. The declarative (if not actual) ethnolinguistic homogeneity (normative monolingualism) became the sole basis of statehood creation, legitimation and maintenance in Central Europe of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.

linguistics (mid-nineteenth century neologism, perhaps borrowed from German Linguistik, ultimately from Latin lingua “language”)—ostensibly a “science of language,” in opposition to philology (whose followers, from an emic perspective, research Einzelsprachen through the lens of cultural, national, ethnic, religious, and other values and assumptions). On the other hand, linguists, from an etic perspective, aspire to research language and all speech varieties, without proposing that one should be seen as somehow “better” or “superior” than another. Scientists (or natural scientists) research material reality (the universe) in order to describe it and discover the unchangeable laws that govern it—laws that are fully independent of human will, as material reality is. In this sense, linguistics is “scientific” only in the case of its subdisciplines of morphology, neurolinguistics, phonemics, or phonetics. On the other hand, the subdisciplines of syntax, historical linguistics, lexicography, sociolinguistics, or pragmatics analyze o language and Einzelsprachen in the context of specific human societies (ethnic groups, speech communities), that is, practitioners of these subdisciplines probe into the interaction of material reality with social reality, from the etic perspective, which is typical in anthropology, or the social sciences in general. Obviously, social reality is fully dependent on human will, though some regularities can be observed across societies. In contrast, following the methods of the humanities, philologists focus on ø language and Einzelsprachen entirely within the confines of the social reality, through the lens of a specific ethnic group’s (speech community’s) values.

linguonym (neologism formed from Latin lingua “language” and Greek ὄνομα “name”)—language or dialect (Einzelsprache) name, also glottonym. See also ethnonym.

literacy (from Latin littera “learned, scholarly” [hence, the English term “literati” for “scholars, bureaucrats, civil servants”], in turn from Latin littera “letter”—the skill of reading and writing in a language (Einzelsprache) with the use of a script. See also numeracy.

“living organism” (mid-seventeenth-century neologism “organism” was formed from Greek ὄργανον “tool, instrument” and the abstract noun suffix “-ism,” ultimately from Greek ὲπόστασις—a popular biologizing (see nature) metaphor (often mistaken for material reality) for Einzelsprachen, nations and peoples. Its source is, perhaps, the Saxe-Meiningen linguist August Schleicher’s 1850 monograph Die Sprachen Europas in systematischer Übersicht (The Languages of Europe: A Systematic Overview), in which he proposed to see Einzelsprachen as Naturorganismen (living organisms) (Schleicher 1850: 27, 33, 75). This claim that languages are a product of nature became popular quickly because it agreed so well with the biologizing tendency of ethnolinguistic nationalism, then a political ideology on the rise. Even more credence to this metaphor was lent by the publication of Charles Darwin’s On the Origin of Species in 1859 (Darwin 1859). An idea swiftly appeared that languages, nations, and peoples may be “species.” Schleicher seized on it in his 1861 pamphlet, six years later published in an English translation as Darwinism Tested by the Science of Language (1869) (Schleicher 1861, 1869). In this book, the now excessively popular genre of the language family tree (Stammbaum) made its first-ever appearance. In this diachronic manner (from the perspective of the flow of time), Einzelsprachen-species are imagined as branches of a language tree, closely modeled on the Darwin-influenced (evolutionary) tree of life (that is, biological species). This metaphor taken as a faithful reflection of material (natural, biological) reality led to the rapid acceptance of the view that languages are “born” and “die,” or that “parent languages” spawn “offspring,”
which are seen as “sister languages” in relation to one another. In turn, such a “parent language” and its “children/sister languages” constitute a “language family.”

While the metaphor of the tree of life helped to turn biology into an exact science (especially after the discovery of the DNA double helix in 1968), its linguistic counterpart spurned and gave undue “scientific” credence to the ideology of social darwinism, which in turn underpinned eugenics, racial hygiene, and the “science of race.” What is more, in Central Europe, the language family tree inspired the efforts to create and standardize Einzelsprachen (see purism) and led many to see ethnolinguistic nationalism as a “scientific founding,” rather than an ideology solely dependent on human will.

Finally, the unbridled popularity of the family tree (“genaealogical”) as a method of linguistic research and classification seriously marginalized the models of dialect continuum and linguistic area, which are better grounded in the observed facts and less ideologically driven. Perhaps, due to the sheer diversity of human groups through time and space, there is no single universal model available for classifying all human speech varieties and their highly diversified sociopolitical uses. The employment of the family tree model in a tight feedback loop with the needs of ethnolinguistic nationalism (see normative isomorphism of language, nation, and state) made this model appear a perfect fit for classifying and describing Einzelsprachen in Europe. In turn the hubris of imperialism (cultural imperialism, linguistic imperialism) convinced Western academia to announce it (erroneously) as universal for all humanity’s languages, myopically seen as Einzelsprachen.

local ethnic group (etymology: see ethnic boundary, ethnic group. The adjective “local” stems from Neo-Latin localis “belonging to a place,” in turn from locus “place”)—see micro-ethnic group.

material reality (see biosphere, extrasmiotic sphere; adjective “material” stems from Neo-Latin mēterialis “of, belonging to matter,” in turn the noun “matter” is derived from Latin mēter “woody part of a tree, material, substance,” ultimately from māter “mother.” The term “reality” stems from Medieval Latin realitās, in turn from realis “real”—the universe, nature, matter, and energy, or things (for instance, stone, flowers, the sun, or electrons) and phenomena (for example, radiation, weather, erosion, or evaporation) that can be detected with the senses of hearing, sight, smell, taste, or touch. Material reality is accessible (or detectable =earable, tactile, or visible) not only to humans, but to all living creatures with organs for sensory perception. See also reality and social reality.

medium of education (word “medium” stems from Latin medius “middle.” The term “education” stems from Latin educātīō “breeding, bringing up, rearing,” in turn from ēdācī “I teach, train”—a language of instruction (education), that is, an Einzelsprache with its specific script in official use in a school, university, or an educational system of a region or state. Sometimes the employment of speech varieties not (yet) made into Einzelsprachen is permitted in the lower grades of elementary school, especially if the unstandardized L1 of pupils is radically different from the language of education.

micro-ethnic group (etymology: see ethnic boundary, micro-language)—in the late 1970s this term appeared as an ideologized criticism for referring to ethnolinguistic movements that sought national autonomy within freshly decolonized states in Africa, or even independence (cf Ashworth 1978: 55) (see tribalism).

In 1991, the Austrian-Slovenian historian Andreas Moritzsch introduced the concepts of Dorfethnos (“village ethnic group”) and Lokalethnos (“local ethnic group”) as terms for analyzing the dynamics of ethnicity in Central Europe’s polities of estates, among socially and spatially immobile serf populations (Moritzsch 1991: 49, 89). Because of this legally and traditionally prescribed centuries-long serfdom-style immobility, the peasantry identified only with their home village or parish, with no chance of having a personal experience of the broader world. In his famous 1983 diagram representing the social stratification of pre-modern “Agraria,” Gellner depicted serf villages (parishes) as spatially isolated communities (Gemeinschaften) differing from one another in customs, speech, views, and identification, that is, in ethnicity (Gellner 1983: 10). Above this peasant (village) population which constituted the vast majority of the inhabitants, a polity’s ruling political elite—of the estates of nobility, clergy, and (sometimes) burghers—presided (extended), thus affording the state (empire, kingdom, principality) a degree of social cohesion across its entire territory. The socio-political system and its cohesion were usually underpinned by the same religion (in accordance with the principle cuius regio, eius religio), which allowed for legitimizing and enforcing the entire populace’s loyalty (kaisertreu-ness) toward the monarch (ruler) in line with the doctrine of divine right.

In the early modern period, this estates-based elite was already a “modern-style” non-face-to-face urban Gesellschaft, who later, typically internalized the Western European late eighteenth-century concept of the nation, and remade itself into a national movement (that is, a national elite). Subsequently, this estates-based elite-turned-national movement, on the basis of a “common” Einzelsprache in Central Europe, sought to remold the polity’s numerous face-to-face village Gemeinschaften (or micro-ethnic groups) into a single ethnolinguistic nation, indeed e pluribus unum (“out of many, one”).

Often the estates-based national movement’s internalization (naturalization) of nationalism was so swift and deep that from their own emic perspective, noble national activists were highly surprised to find out that peasants had no awareness of “their” nation, nor displayed any eagerness to join it, especially prior to the introduction of compulsory elementary education for all in the national language, which would effectively communicate the national message to all and sundry across the state’s territory. On the other hand, peasants were equally surprised why they should be expected to switch their loyalty from their face-to-face micro-ethnic groups to some invisible and unknowable (non-face-to-face) nation of their former, or even current, noble lords. It took much longer to bridge the estate (class, social) division between the nobles-turned-national activists and peasants who
preferred to remain members of their rural micro-ethnic groups. Hence, in essence, this mutual incomprehension was an effect of the rarely acknowledged **ethnic boundary** (cleavage) between the still noble character and membership of the nation-in-making and the target peasant (village) micro-ethnic groups for inclusion (**assimilation**, coercion, or cooption) into this nation. If the latter successfully withstood this nationalizing pressure, a given national project usually failed.

Prior to the rise of the phenomenon of the **state**, all human groups were face-to-face micro-ethnic groups. Until the modern period, the majority of people still lived in such micro-ethnic groups, be it in the colonies, or “at home” in Europe, that is, in their insulated rural Gemeinschafts. Only in the wake of **decolonization** in the mid-twentieth century and following the universal acceptance of nationalism as the world’s sole infrastructural ideology of **statehood** building, legitimization, and maintenance, did the phenomenon of micro-ethnic groups largely disappear; humanity sundered among the non-face-to-face Gemeinschaften of their nations and nation-states as the standard units (“quanta”) of legitimate groupness and statehood.

**Microlanguage** (also “literary microlanguage”; etymology: see **language**. The prefix “micro-” stems from Greek μικρός “small”)—a term (developed by the Russo-Estonian slavist, Aleksandr Dulichenko Александр Дулченко, or Aleksandr Dulitenko in the Estonian language-based transliteration [Dulichenko 1981]) that became popular at the turn of the twenty-first century for referring to Slavic Einzelsprachen with some written production. In the **nation-states** where in use, these Slavic microlanguages are officially not recognized as languages or treated as **dialects** of these **nation-states’** Slavic **national (official, state) languages**. This often occurs despite the wishes of these Slavic microlanguages’ speakers (speech communities) to the contrary. They want their Einzelsprachen to be recognized as languages. The scholarly label “microlanguage” conveys some respect, which the states of their residence deny to such microlanguages’ speakers (speech communities). The **elite** of a given nation-state denying official recognition to a microlanguage usually espouses **ethnolinguistic nationalism**. From this ideological perspective, recognizing a **language** means redefining its speech community as a **nation**. As a result, the nation-state’s **ethnolinguistic homogeneity** is compromised, and the newly recognized nation, following the ideology of **nationalism**, may request an independent nation-state of its own.

**Millet**—from the Osmanlica (Ottoman Turkish) term ئاملا milla, an ethnoreligious non-territorial autonomy within the Ottoman Empire for the faithful of a **monotheistic religion**. For instance, the Rum (Roman) Millet was for Orthodox Christians, the Jewish Millet for Jews, the Millet of Islam for Muslims, and the Armenian Millet for the Monophysitic Christians of the Armenian Apostolic Church. In today’s Turkish the term millet means “nation.”

**Minority** (from Medieval Latin minoritas “minority,” in turn from Latin minor “of little importance or significance”)—in international law a term for a part of the population (members) of an ethnolinguistic **nation** who happen to reside in a polity other than their “home” **nation-state**. This concept and term entered popular political and legal use in Europe after World War One, when the Allies decided to reorganize the political shape of **Central Europe** (east of France and west of the Soviet Union) on the principle of **ethnolinguistic nationalism** (normative isomorphism of language, nation, and state). In this region each nation-state was supposed to be ethnolinguistically (ethnoreligiously) homogenous. This goal of “unmixing” or “homogenizing” the population could be achieved only through the following methods of population (demographic) engineering, namely, assimilation, ethnic cleansing (population transfer), or genocide. While initially the Allies tacitly approved of population transfers, the sheer scale and destabilization they tended to generate made the Allies change their mind in favor of assimilation. Hence, under the auspices of the League of Nations, between 1919 and 1924, a series of unilateral, bilateral, and multilateral treaties were contracted for the sake of protecting the rights of (national) minorities, shielding them from population transfers and forced assimilation. However, the resultant normative tension between minority rights and the **normative isomorphism** of (language, nation, and state) was resolved in most interwar Central Europe’s states to the detriment of the minorities who were suppressed, persecuted, and blamed for the outbreak of World War Two. During this war and in its aftermath, most minorities were ethnically cleansed, exterminated, or their existence was denied. Afterward no international system of minority rights protection was extended over the remaining minorities during the Cold War period. Following the fall of communism and the subsequent breakups of Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union, and Yugoslavia, a modicum of such a system was recreated under the auspices of the Council of Europe.

**Minority language** (etymology: see language, minority)—a national language of a minority, typically legally recognized in the minority’s country of residence, which is not the minority’s “home” nation-state. Some low-key auxiliary use of the minority language may be allowed in education and local administration in the administrative units (regions) where the minority’s members constitute a considerable share of the population (usually at least more than 20 percent; this arbitrary threshold dates back to Austria-Hungary’s legislation on minority language rights). Since 1998 the use of some minority languages in Europe has been protected under the provisions of the Council of Europe’s European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (European Charter 1992). See also regional language.

**Modernity** (early seventeenth-century neologism, from Neo-Latin modernus “modern,” “in turn from Latin modo “just now”)—the period of the last two to four centuries when the West’s model of statehood organization (especially the nation-state), social organization (especially the nation), economy (capitalism), and technology (industrialization) was either imposed on or adopted by the rest of the world, including, the concept and practice of Einzelsprache. Often, the qualified term “early modernity” is employed for referring to Western and Central Europe during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.
The rise of the non-Western modern powers such as Brazil, China, India, or Japan—with a combined populations considerably larger than that of the West—prompts many commentators to speak of the world’s “modernities,” or “global modernities” in plural.

**monocentric language** (etymology: see language. The term “monocentric” is a late twentieth-century neologism, formed from the prefix “mono-” and the adjective “centric.” The former comes from Greek μόνος “alone, only, one,” whereas “centric” stems from Greek κέντρος “center,” which stems from Greek κέντρον “needle, spur, pivoting point in drawing a circle,” and in turn from κέντησις “to sting, prick”—an *Einzelsprache* or speech variety employed and controlled (regulated) by a single speech community (ethnic group, nation), typically housed in its own nation-state. In line with ethnolinguistic nationalism’s principle of the normative isomorphism of language, nation and state, a “true” national language must be monocentric. For instance, this is the situation of Czech or Polish, which nowadays are the sole official (national) languages only in the nation-states of the Czech Republic and Poland respectively. See also pluricentric language.

**monoethnic** (etymology: see ethnic boundary, monocentric language)—the socio-demographic character of a town, city, region, state, or empire on whose territory only a single ethnic group (nation) resides; such a situation is preferred in Central Europe’s nation-states in line with ethnolinguistic nationalism’s principle of the normative isomorphism of language, nation, and state. See also multiethnic.

**monoscriptalism** (etymology: see monolingualism, script)—the normative or de facto use of a single writing system (script) for writing a single language (*Einzelsprache*) (for instance, English is written exclusively with the employment of the Latin alphabet) or for writing all the official languages in a state (for example, Finland’s two official languages of Finnish and Swedish are written in Latin letters).

**monotheism** (seventeenth-century neologism, from Greek μόνος monos “single” and θεός theos “god”—belief in a single god, normatively seen as the universe’s only “true god.” Not to be confused with monoreligionism, that is, a neutral descriptive term for the fact of practicing (professing) a single religion by a person or within a human group. Such a single religion can be either monotheistic or polytheistic in its character.

**mother tongue** (etymology: see holy tongue, material reality)—a highly ideologized term for L1, or the first *Einzelsprache* that one acquires in early childhood. In the popular mind, and especially among ethnolinguistic nationalists, the incorrect belief is rife that a baby is born with the naturally (biologically) installed knowledge of the national language, which is referred to as her “true” or “real” mother tongue. Babies are never born with a command of an *Einzelsprache*, only with the biological (evolutionary) capacity for speech (Ø language).

The word “mother” in the collocation “mother tongue” appears to be an English *translation* of the Latin term *patria* (“fatherland”), as a celebratory synonym for “nation-state.” In English this Latin concept can be translated either as “fatherland” or “motherland,” but the common stereotype claims that a newborn receives their language with the proverbial “mother’s milk,” hence it cannot be a “father tongue.” This terminological choice is highly gendered, reflecting the traditional (that is, patriarchal) gender division of social roles between women and men, tasking the former with child rearing and household duties, while isolating the latter from these.

This leads to semantic paradoxes in some national *Einzelsprachen*. For instance, in Polish *patria* is invariably rendered as ojczyzna (“fatherland”), though “mother tongue” as język ojczysty (“fatherland’s tongue,” or “father tongue”). But obviously, also among Polish-speakers, the typical belief is that one acquires one’s L1 from one’s mother, not father. In Polish, the neologism język matczyny (literally, “mother tongue”) is possible to form, but it is considered incorrect. See also L1 speaker, native speaker.

**multietnic** (etymology: see ethnic boundary. The prefix “multi-” stems from Latin multus “much, many”—the socio-demographic character of a town, city, region, state, or empire on whose territory several ethnic groups coexist. See also heterogeneity vs homogeneity, monoethnic.

**multiscriptalism** (etymology: see multiethnic, script)—the normative or de facto use of several writing systems for writing a single language (*Einzelsprache*) (for example, interwar Yugoslavia’s Serbocroatoslovenian [Serbo-Croat-Slovenian] was written in Arabic, Cyrillic and Latin letters), or for writing several official languages, each in a different script, within a state (for instance, Moldovan in Latin letters, while Russian in Cyrillic, and Gagauz in Cyrillic and Latin letters in today’s Moldova). In the present-day European Union, the 24 official languages are written in three scripts, namely, Bulgarian in Cyrillic, Greek in the Greek alphabet, and all the other 22 languages in Latin letters. See also scriptal diglossia.

**mutual comprehensibility** (adjective “mutual” stems from Latin mutuus “reciprocal,” in turn from mutāre “to change.” The term “comprehensibility” stems from the early sixteenth-century Neo-Latin neologism *comprehensibilis* “comprehensible,” in turn from *comprehendere* “comprehend, understand,” formed from Latin *com-* “with, together” and *prehendere* “to grasp”—the phenomenon arises when speakers of different *Einzelsprachen* or speech varieties can successfully communicate with one another, hence, their languages are said to be mutually comprehensible. In 1926, the United States linguist Leonard Bloomfield in an effort to overhaul “subjective” philology into a “science” of linguistics published the seminal text *A Set of Postulates for the Science of Language* in the quarterly *Language* (Bloomfield 1926). Among others, he proposed to employ the category of mutual comprehensibility for defining the difference between the traditional concepts of “language” and “dialect” (*dialect vs language* (*Einzelsprache*) dichotomy). He proposed that languages are
speech varieties that are mutually incomprehensible, while dialects (tacitly imagined as always belonging to a language) are mutually comprehensible.

However, the Western category of “a language” (Einzelsprache) and its implementation for dissecting the continuous linguistic (language) into the countable “quanta” of languages are fully dependent on human will, and as such are part and parcel of social reality. Humans and their groups alter social reality as they want, hence, its elements cannot be expected to follow some aspirationally scientific definitions or “laws.” As a result, Bloomfield’s definition is easily falsified by the example of mutually incomprehensible dialects of Chinese that are treated as this language’s dialects, or by the mutually comprehensible post-Serbo-Croatian languages of Bosnian, Croatian, Montenegrin, and Serbian, which are not treated as dialects of one another.

In the mid-1960s another United States linguist, Einar Haugen (1966), noticed that comprehensibility between Einzelsprachen is usually asymmetric. Speakers of large(s) languages, living in more populous nation-states are worse at understanding speakers of smaller languages in less populous nation-states. And vice versa, speakers of smaller languages, living in less populous nation-states, tend to be better at comprehending speakers of large(s) languages, living in more populous nation-states. Hence, a Portuguese-speaker from Portugal has no problem to follow Spanish-speakers from Spain, while the latter often claim that they are unable to understand the former. Hence, mutual comprehensibility is (also) a function of power relations between nations and nation-states as well as inside a given nation-state and its official single speech community, between the center and the peripheries, and between the elite (ethnic group) and the masses (subjugated ethnic groups).

See also ethnolinguistic map, linguistic map.

natio (pl nationes; etymology: see nation)—a late Medieval Latin (Neo-Latin) term for the estates (nobility, clergy, burghers) construed as the ruling elite in an early modern polity in Western and Central Europe. Sometime, confusingly and incorrectly this Latinate term is translated into English as “nation” or “political” nation. See also gens.

(the) nation (from Medieval Latin natio, derived from Latin nāscī “to be born,” hence literal translations into Slavic languages, such as národ “nation” in Czech from rodit “to give birth” or народарод “a people, nation” in Russian from родить родит’ “to give birth”)—according to the ideology of nationalism, the “highest possible type” of human group. On this account only, nations have the right to independent statehood. The actualization of this right produces nation-states.

national culture (etymology: see culture, nation)—the culture of a nation; but in ethnolinguistic nationalism, national language, national heritage, literature in the national Einzelsprache, national music, national cuisine, national theater, national fine arts, the national mass media in the national Einzelsprache, national history, national heroes, national legends, national identity, or national religion, all seen as rightfully and exclusively “belonging to” a single nation.

national historiography (etymology: see historiography, nation)—the discipline of the study of the past of a nation and/or its nation-state, in line with the social, political, economic, and other assumptions of the ideology of nationalism. Practitioners of national historiography (or national historians) produce national histories in plural, or even national master narratives. The former approach allows for a limited etic approach, which the latter bans, prescribing the emic approach only.

A given nation-state typically maintains tight control over national historiography, because its product (national history, national master narrative) constantly creates and re-creates, legitimizes, and maintains national statehood, as required by the government and perceived by the nation, that is, the nation-state’s citizens (population). Furthermore, national history or the national master narrative is often taught in school to the nation’s successive generations in the form of a typically compulsory subject of History.

Generally speaking, in civic nation-states, national historiography focuses on the history of the polity in question. However, in ethnic nation-states, apart from state history, the discipline also covers the stateless (pre-state) period of the nation’s past, or in other words, the history of the nation separate from the history of its nation-state’s history, and the history of the ethnic nation’s important ideological bases or attributes, namely, the history of the national language, national culture, national religion, national music, national folklore, national painting, national art, national theater, or national film.

national history (etymology: see history, nation)—history of a given nation. It can be an etic (objectivizing) analysis and description of the founding, development, and disappearance of a nation, researched and written both by members and non-members of the nation in question.

However, in most cases, national history is an emic pursuit of such an interpretation of the past, which is squarely in the interest of a given nation (or rather a given government or regime in power), written in accordance with the nation’s values espoused and cherished, seen as the embodiment of patriotism (meaning, this nation’s specific form of nationalism). In other words, national history produced in this way is none other than a national master narrative. Ideally, only members of the nation should be researching and writing national history, because “foreigners” (non-members) of the nation “naturally” have no access to the nation’s “spirit,” bestowed by “destiny” or “deity.”

Also analyzing and writing the human past exclusively through the lens of the nation, that is, in line with the vision of nationalism, in which all the world’s states must be nation-states, and all humanity is “naturally” divided into nations. This methodological approach denies the validity or sidelines other perspectives of analyzing the past, for instance, through the lens of a non-national ethnic group, a non-national polity, a religion, a region within a nation-state, or a (fragment of a) continent with numerous national polities (for instance, Central Europe).

national identity (etymology: see identity, nation)—a preferred synonym of nationality in the meaning of one’s membership in a nation. But in the nationalist discourse (discourse of nation-
alism), this collocation is often invoked for referring to and ex-
tolling the most important traits and values of a nation, which
collectively are seen as a constructed or even “natural” (“god-
given”) essence of the nation in question. This essence is supposed
to hold the nation together and connect its members to the na-
tion and one another, thus creating a perfectly homogenous na-
tional monad (singularity), which is knowable exclusively to the
nation’s members. This nationally limited knowability is an argu-
ment for why a given nation and its elements (for instance, the na-
tional language) can be truly comprehended and analyzed only
by scholars who are members of this nation. In the case of the na-
tional language or national history, linguists or “foreign” histo-
rians are never up to the task, but only “proper” (that is belong-
ing to the nation) philologists and national historians. Hence, in
the 1840s the now quite popular collocation “[great mystifying] 
Russian soul” was developed as a term for the Russian national (ethnolinguistic) identity. Its vague and emotionally-colored usage is sim-
ilar to the usage of the term “German physics” in the 1930s and
1940s. See also identity, national physics.

Nationalism (1830s neologism, from “nation,” influenced by the
use of French nationalisme)—an ideology which proposes that
the highest possible kind of human group is the nation, while
the sole legitimate type of statehood is the nation-state. From
the national perspective, all humanity is “naturally” by biol-
ogy or a divinity’s will, divided into nations, and all nations have
right to separate statehood. Hence, implementation of this ideol-
yogy on a global scale during the past two centuries, and especially
after World War Two in the wake of decolonization, replaced the
globe’s non-national polities with nation-states only. The last
non-national polity to disappear was the Soviet Union in 1991. As
such, nationalism is the present-day world’s sole infrastructural
ideology of statehood creation, legitimation, and maintenance.

In the national languages of Central Europe, the term na-
tionalism is often used as a pejorative label for “excessive national-
ism,” otherwise known as chauvinism in English. “Patriotism”
is a positive term for nationalism in these languages, but they
have no neutral word for referring to this ideology, which makes
any discussion on nationalism in Central Europe a tall order.
Hence, in the region’s Einzelsprachen, the term “nationalist”
does not denote a mere proponent of the ideology of nationalism,
but functions as a pejorative to be hurled at political oppo-
nents and enemies, often interchangeably with the term “fascist.”

Nationality (late seventeenth-century neologism from “nation,”
influenced by the French term nationalité)—a confusing term of
too many closely related meanings in English (and French). In
popular parlance, like the word “nation” is the preferred synonym
for state, the term nationality is the preferred synonym for “citi-
zenship.” Otherwise, this term has two further distinctive mean-
ings of importance for the ideology of nationalism. First, nation-
ality denotes the state of being a member of a nation (see national
identity). Second, nationality means a group of people who are
recognized to be a “semi-nation” with the right to cultural and/or
political autonomy in a state’s province, but not to a separate na-
tion-state of their own. This term originated in Austria-Hungary
as a concession to (ethnolinguistic) national movements, which
on one hand allowed them to meet some of their political goals,
while on the other preserved the territorial integrity of the Dual
Monarchy. In Austria-Hungary’s legislation nationality was al-
ways Volkstamm (pl Volkstämme, literally “tribe”), while the
term Nationalität (nationality, pl Nationalitäten) denoted the
state of being a member of a Volkstamm or Volk (pl Völker, na-
tion). However, in the press, the term Nationalität was loosely
used as the preferred synonym of Volkstamm, giving the rise to
the English translation of “nationality” for both Volkstamm and
Nationalität.

The distinction between the nation and nationality, for
human groups with the right to independent national state-
hood and autonomy, respectively, was adopted in the Soviet
Union. Understandably, none of the different ethnic groups pop-
ulating this communist polity was recognized as a nation, but
almost all as nationalities. However, in Russian, this term came
in two different forms, namely, национальность nationalnost’
(pl национальности nationalnosts) and народность narod-
nost’ (pl народности narodnosti). The former was coined from
the term нация natsia (pl наши natsii) for “nation,” while the
latter for the word народа narod (pl народа narody) for “a peo-
ple.” In the Soviet legislation the term nationalnost’ denoted a
“developed nationality” with a full-fledged Einzelsprache and
abundant literature written in it, while narodnost’ “a backward
(undeveloped, developing) nationality” without a (fully-formed)
Einzelsprache. These “backward nationalities” were much more
numerous than the “developed nationalities.”

The interwar Soviet policy of коренизация korenizatsiia
(nativization, literally “rooting in”) was to endow “backward na-
tionalities” with Einzelsprachen, ensuring intensive press and
book production in their newly standardized languages. On the
other hand, regarding “developed nationalities,” this policy was
to ensure autonomous territories for them and the use of their
Einzelsprachen as the main languages of administration and ed-
ucation in these autonomous nationalities (etymology: see language, nation)—
the nation’s “true” (indigenous, native, unique) language (Einzelsprache, also known as “mother tongue,” or more neutrally, as “ethnic language”). In the ethnolinguistic nation-state (see normative isomorphism), the national language should double
as the polity’s sole state (official) language and should not be
shared with any other nation or polity. Typically, (national) phi-
ology (not linguistics) is the academic discipline tasked with re-
searching (or rather building and shaping) the national language.
Furthermore, in ethnolinguistic nation-states, the national lan-
guage is an important subject of study for the discipline of na-
tional historiography.

The first academies (of sciences), as founded in Europe since
the sixteenth century, were initially established for the singular
purpose of producing an authoritative dictionary and grammar of a state (national) language in order to make it into a “proper
Einzelsprache,” equal in usefulness and prestige to Latin. Later,
academies became more versatile and encompassing in their re-
search goals, but the creation, standardization, and “fine-tuning”
of the (typically, ethnolinguistic) nation-state’s national lan-
guage has remained the leading goal. For this purpose, usually
national master narrative (etymology: see nation. The noun “master” stems from Old English and Latin magister “master, person with the power to control others, slave owner,” in turn from Latin magnus “great.” The term “narrative” stems from Latin narrāre “to tell, report, give an account, narrate”)—this collocation made a shy appearance in the mid-1970s, but it was the French sociologist Jean-François Lyotard’s 1979 critique of what he called “grand narratives,” which made this expression into a recognized term of analysis (Lyotard 1979). This term has been in wide use since the mid-1990s. “National master narrative” is a critical designation for national historiography’s product of national history, especially in its highly ideologized emic form, as turned out in strict accordance with a given nation-state’s ideology of, typically, ethnic (ethnolinguistic) nationalism.

national physics (etymology: see nation. The late sixteenth-century term “physics,” stems from Neo-Latin physica “natural science, medicine,” in turn from Greek φυσική phusikē “pertaining to nature, natural,” from φύσει phusí “nature, property, origin”), ultimately from φύω phúo “to produce, bear, grow”—physics is a natural science for the study of material reality (matter, radiation, the Universe), which is independent of human will. But, in 1936, the Nobel Laureate in Physics, Philipp Lenard, an Austro-Hungarian and German scientist born in Pozsony (today’s Bratislava), published a university textbook, titled Deutsche Physik (German Physics). He disparaged the research of British and Jewish physicists as “English physics” and “Jewish physics.” In Lenard’s opinion the only “true physics” had to be “Aryan,” that is, “German” (Lenard 1936).

In this erroneous view, the ethnic (social) reality is either primary to material reality, or a national (ethnically defined) fragment of social reality is seen as identical with material reality, or at least with the biosphere. On the basis of such an assumption, human will of a “racially superior” (ethn-national) character is believed to prevail over material reality, allowing an absolute (“god-like”) insight into its laws and for the manipulation of material reality through thought alone.

This erroneous assumption of the primacy of (national) social reality (human will) over material reality is similar to that which underlies the belief in miracles, namely, that an incantation or prayer (“word,” that is, a language or an Einzelsprache) has the power to alter (create, destroy, or transform) material reality. See also linguistics, philology.

nation-state (etymology: see nation, state. The term “nation-state” is a late 1910s neologism)—state for one nation only, as prescribed by the ideology of nationalism.

national statehood (etymology: see nation, state)—idea, quality, or condition of being a nation-state in line with modernity’s infrastructural ideology of nationalism. Hence, nation-states (national polities) are specific actualizations of this idea, and as such are seen to be units (“quanta”) of this quality (condition), imagined as “uncountable abstract substance.” See also statehood.

native (from Latin nātus “inborn, innate,” derived from natus “birth,” as in the case of the etymology of nation)—a noun for referring to a person born and raised in a country, preferably from parents who were also native to this land, or an adjective for qualifying things and attitudes as uniquely produced in or typical of a given country. However, in popular parlance, in accordance with the myth of “civilizational superiority,” “natives” is a pejorative designation for the non-European indigenous population of a European power’s maritime colony, used to draw a line of distinction between the “backward” or even “barbaric” natives (often denigrated with the pejorative “savages”) and the “civilized” European (Western) colonizers. Hence, a “native” from the British colony of Kenya or Ceylon (today’s Sri Lanka) was, or maybe still is, referred to as a “native” when living in Britain, while a British person pronouncing such an opinion, who is genuinely native to the British soil, would not refer to herself as a “native.”

Outside Europe, in such colonies-turned-settler countries like the United States or Canada, “natives” are the indigenous population as opposed to European colonizers and settlers, alongside their descendants, seen as “whites.” In the racialized (racist) political vocabulary, this usage yields the pernicious “natural” opposition between “us-whites” and “them-natives.” See also native language, native speaker.

native language (etymology: see language, native)—ostensibly any language (Einzelsprache, speech variety) indigenous to a given country or land (see ethnic language). But in actual usage, this term is applied only for referring to the ‘natives’ languages in the colonies and postcolonial states, or more broadly to indigenous languages outside of Europe. Hence, no one would speak about English as spoken in England (Britain) or French as spoken in France as “native languages” or “native European languages.” On the other hand, if an American (US citizen) is asked to give names of some American languages (such as Apache, Cree, Dakota, Navajo, or Yupik), she usually asks for clarification whether the inquirer may mean “native American languages.” In this usage a European language cannot be “native,” while all languages outside Europe (with some rare exceptions of the national languages of non-European and non-Western powers, such as Japan or Turkey, and at present China) are “native” by definition. This means that the term “native” is an unacknowledged synonym for power. Einzelsprachen of all the European (Western) former and current imperial powers, alongside the Einzelsprachen of all the European (meaning, “civilized”) nation-states and of some non-European (that is, recently “civilized” = Westernized, so that the West must take note of their opinions) powers are seen as adjective-less “languages.” On the contrary, all Einzelsprachen of non-European (non-Western) nation-states, typically former colonies, with the exception of the aforementioned non-Western powers, are qualified as “native languages.” Officially, political colonialism or imperialism is over, but economic and cultural imperialism flourishes. In this disposition, “native languages” are spoken by these powerless (non-Western) peoples who continue to be dominated in this manner by powerful (Western) peoples, who speak “languages.”
native speaker (etymology: see native. The noun “speaker” stems from Old English *spēcan* “speak, utter,” cognate with German *sprechen* “to speak”—an implicated (ideologized) English-language term, which incorrectly suggests that a human is born with the (natural, potential) full and correct command of the *Einzelsprache* of the group (ethnic group, nation, nationality, state) to which her parents belong. In reality each newborn comes to this world supplied only with *Ø language* (hard-wired biological capacity for speech) and acquires a given *Einzelsprache* through socialization and schooling. In the everyday but unacknowledged practice in Anglophone states the term “native speaker” is employed to denote a “white, Christian, middle-class university graduate with a formally attested command of the standard (non-dialectal) *Einzelsprache* of English” (cf Paikeday 1985). Hence, this collocation is an element of language politics, not a neutral term of analysis. A neutral counterpart is, for instance, an L1 speaker. The ideological dimension is readily seen in the fact that typically a native speaker is supposed to be fluent in the colonizers’ European languages of English, French, Spanish, or Portuguese, not in the colonized populations’ (non-European) native languages. Native speakers are not persons versed in native languages.

*natiölekt* (Russian neologism *националёнт* from русский *нация* “nation,” and лекс лект “lect”)—a term for a national or state-specific variety of the Russian language, proposed in 1982 by the Belarusian linguists Anatoli Girutskii and Arnol’d Mikhnevieh (Girutskii and Mikhnevieh 1982), and three years later employed by the latter in a monograph on the Russian language in Belarus (Mikhnevieh 1985: 11-12, 169). Interestingly, this term became largely forgotten after the breakup of the Soviet Union. Furthermore, nowadays in line with the Kremilin’s ideology of the Russian World, any discussion on the national varieties of Russian in the post-Soviet *nation-states* is discouraged.

*nature* (from Latin *natura* “things as they are, the universe,” in turn from *natus* “born.” The term *nation* shares the same Latin etymology, which may be the source of the biologizing myth on the “natural” character of nations. The Latin term *nature* developed as a translation of the Greek term *φυσική фύσις* “nature,” hence τα φυσικά τά φυσικά “natural things, material reality” is the subject matter of research for the discipline of physics, as opposed to metaphysics, “beyond the natural”, which in essence focuses on social reality, though specifically construed as a “divine reality” or “hereafter”—the universe, material reality, matter, and energy, understood as governed by the discoverable universal laws of physics. In a looser, often metaphorical, meaning, “natural” means “traditional,” taking place from “times immemorial,” dictated by the biological and social realities of humanity, construed as one of the biological species, that is, the Homo sapiens sapiens (or anatomically modern human). This metaphorical use confusingly blurs the distinction between material reality and social reality. See also culture.

non-face-to-face (human) group (etymology: see ethnic group, crime against humanity. The word “face” stems from Latin *facies* “form, appearance”)—it is impossible to build and main-
tain cohesive groups of humans with more than 150 members (Dunbar’s number) through interpersonal (face-to-face) contact alone (Dunbar 1992). Such huge cohesive human groups as *nations* or *states* with millions and even a billion members are constructed and maintained thanks to the bonding function of *Ø language*, which allows for generating social reality. Non-face-to-face groups are part of social reality, while face-to-face groups are part of material reality.

non-scriptural religion (etymology: see script, religion)—a neutral designation for “traditional” religions, which during the past two millennia were destroyed and replaced in Europe and the Middle East with monotheistic counterparts (scriptural religions), each endowed with a dedicated “holy book.” Hence, in this sense, monotheistic religions are scriptural. In monotheistic propaganda, religions with no “holy book” or use of writing in liturgy are seen as “untrue” or “wrong,” and thus disparaged as “heathenish,” “polytheistic,” or at least “animistic.”

Typically, a non-scriptural religion is a faith of a face-to-face human group (Gemeinschaft), that is, a (micro)-ethnic group. As such, it is expressed and reproduced in this group’s speech variety. In few cases a given speech variety might be standardized into an *Einzelsprache* during the past two centuries, usually by translating the Christian Bible into it. As a result, the group’s non-scriptural religion and socio-cultural traditions connected to it have been largely destroyed, when European (Western) missionaries have succeeded in imposing Christianity on these groups to the exclusion of their indigenous non-scriptural religions. Like the concept of Einzelsprache, *monotheism* (at best, Christianity) is seen as a “precondition” of successful modernization and progress.

noosphere (from Greek νος *νοῦς* “mind,” and Latin *sphaera* “ball, globe, celestial sphere,” in turn from Greek σφαίρα *sphaira* “ball, globe”)—during the 1920s the Russian-Soviet scholar of Russian-Ukrainian origin, Vladimir Vernadsky, developed a tripartite categorization of reality, namely, consisting of the universe (entire reality), the biosphere, and the noosphere (Vernadsky 1945). The noosphere is this corner of the biosphere where the (human) mind operates, that is, where humans live and use *Ø language* for bonding and generating social reality.

normative isomorphism of language, nation, and state (etymology: see language, nation, normative monolingualism, state. The term “isomorphism” is an 1820s scholarly neologism from Greek ἴσος *isos* “equal” and μορφή *morphē* “form, shape, structure”; the suffix –ism, from the Greek suffix –ισμός *isms*, for forming abstract nouns that denote action or practice, state or condition, principles, doctrines, or ideologies)—formula of the implementation of the ideology of ethnolinguistic nationalism which proposes that for the sake of establishing a “proper” *nation-state*, the full and tight spatial and ideological overlap (isomorphism) must be achieved between the national language (*Einzelsprache*), the *nation*, and the nation’s nation-state; hence, Language (*Einzelsprache*) = Nation = State. Ideally, the national language should *not* be shared with any other nation or state (cf Kamusella 2017).
normative monolingualism (the adjective “normative” is a 1870s neologism derived from the noun “norm,” which stems from Latin norma “carpenter’s square, rule, pattern.” The term “monolingualism” is a mid-twentieth-century neologism formed from the prefix “mono-,” derived from Greek μόνος monos “single,” and from Latin lingua “language”) —a widespread modern belief that a person is born with, or is capable to master fully, only a single Einzelsprache seen as the person’s “mother tongue,” namely, that only L1 must be the person’s “natural” and “real” language. In English-speaking countries, and more broadly in the West, this belief taken as a social and scholarly norm underlies the ideologized concept of native-speaker, claiming that L2 cannot be mastered to the same level (let alone better) than L1. In stronger versions of this normative conviction, it is popularly maintained that everyone is born with, or to, their Einzelsprachen (typically equated with a speech community). At this juncture, this conviction is indistinguishable from ethnolinguistic nationalism’s normative insistence that normally and naturally a person can only have a single Einzelsprache because it is the very sign (marker, or even “proof”) of a person’s membership in a nation (that is, one’s nationality), and in accordance with the infrastructural ideology of nationalism a person can, or rather, is allowed to, belong only to a single nation. Those who disagreed with this approach (see language question (census)) were effectively silenced in 1872 by the authoritative decision of the eighth International Congress of Statistics at St Petersburg to treat census declarations of, or returns on, one’s Einzelsprache as the “measure” (indicator) of one’s nationality. However, the congress’s participants remarked that for this new statist norm to function properly it must be assumed that a person cannot have (or be permitted to declare) more than a single Einzelsprache. During the past century and a half, statisticians and linguists (philologists) have fortified this principle of normative monolingualism by proclaiming, oftentimes unreflectively, time and again its scientificness (“scientific character”). Hence, they have been engaged in language politics rather than research. From the perspective of observed ideological practice, without sticking to the axiom of normative monolingualism, the normative isomorphism of language, nation, and state would be an impossibility, and thus no nation or nation-state could be successfully built, legitimized, and maintained on the basis of ethnolinguistic nationalism. It appears that this almost “naturalized” rule of normative monolingualism stems from the older monotheistic principle of normative monoreligionism. See also bilingualism, diglossia, ethnolinguistic homogeneity.

However, in such modern states as China or Japan, which are not qualified as “pagan,” people can simultaneously profess (or rather practice) several religions, for instance, Buddhism, Shintoism, and elements of Christianity (that is, Christmas, church wedding ceremonies) in Japan, or Confucianism, Buddhism, and Taoism in China. From the perspective of the Judeo-Christian-Islamic monotheism, Hinduism is a form of polytheism, that is, polyreligionism, or the simultaneous profession of multiple religions connected to separate divinities and divine forces.

Normative monoreligionism underlies Christian Europe’s early modern political principle of cuius regio, eius religio (whose realm, his religion). In the nineteenth century, it yielded ethnolinguistic nationalism’s norm cuius regio, eius lingua (whose realm, his language), which underpins normative monolingualism.

Functionally and structurally, as concepts and forms of sociopolitical practice, both normative monoreligionism and normative monolingualism are almost identical. The difference lies in the fact that people may not have or practice any religion, because religion, as an element of social reality, is fully dependent on human will. On the other hand, each healthy human is biologically hard-wired with the capacity for speech (a language), which is part of material reality, hence independent of human will. Thus, under the normal conditions of socialization, each human does have a language (Einzelsprache or speech variety), that is, an actualization of a language. Atheists do exist, but aphasia is a medical condition.

numeracy (from Latin numerātus, that is, the past participle of numerāre “to number,” in turn, from Latin numer “number”) —the skill of counting, representing numbers by (written) symbols, operating numbers, and numerical formulas in writing. See also literacy.

official language (etymology: see language. The word “official” stems from Latin officium “duty, service”) —see state (official) language.

orthography (fifteenth century neologism developed with the use of Greek, σφυξ ortho “correct” and γραφία raphía “writing”) —usually a synonym for “spelling system,” but otherwise the term for the “correct” employment of a spelling system or a given Einzelsprache in writing (and sometimes even in speech). Typically, it is the scholarly elite of a given nation-state who standardize an Einzelsprache into a standard language and codify the principles of its use. See also prescriptivism, descriptivism.

patriotism—an eighteenth-century Graeco-Latin neologism of a highly patriarchal character, meaning “love of and devotion to one’s own country” (patria or “fatherland”). In the age of nationalism, this love and devotion is directed at one’s own nation-state, while in the case of ethnolinguistic nationalism also at the nation, especially when this nation is stateless (with no nation-state of its own). Typically, patriotism is seen as a laudable and positive civic feeling to be fostered by school and state institutions. Hence, it is a valorizing (emotionally colored) designation for nationalism.
In Central Europe’s Einzelsprachen, which miss a neutral term for nationalism, “patriotism” is posed as such a term, while the word “nationalism” is employed in the meaning of chauvinism. Hence, in this region, one’s own nationalism is seen as “patriotism,” while the nationalisms of people from neighboring nation-states are denigrated as “nationalism,” that is, “chauvinism.”

(a) **people** (from Latin *populus* “people,” cognate with *plebēs* “common people, crowd,” and with Greek πλῆθος *plethōs* “crowd”) — typically, a **non-face-to-face** cohesive self-reproducing group of people; an **ethnic group, nation, nationality, or state**. (NB: in meaning and usage different from the uncountable cognate word “ø people” that takes no plural, used to speak about the entire humanity or some unspecified humans, without designating them as belonging to a specific group.)

**perception** (from Latin *perceptionem* “comprehension,” in turn from *percipere* “to perceive, grasp,” formed from *per* “by, through,” and *capio* “to take” — the observation or cognizance of **social reality** from the perspective of a given individual or a specific human group (for example, *ethnic group, Gemeinschaft, Gesellschaft, nation, or speech community*). To the “mind’s eye” of different observers, an element of social reality (for instance, a deity, **national master narrative, nation-state, nation**, or an **Einzelsprache**) may exist or not, and also may be interpreted in differing manners. For instance, a **civic nationalist** has no problem to “see” (perceive) a Canadian or Australian nation, but these nations do not exist from the perspective of an ethnolinguistic nationalist, because both the Canadians and Australians share their official (national) language with other nations across the world (for instance, the British or the Nigerians), which is at odds with ethnolinguistic nationalism’s principle of the **normative isomorphism of language, nation, and state**.

Furthermore, much ink has been spilt on the “duo-continental” character of Russia and Turkey as countries located in both Europe and Asia. However, the continent of Europe does not fulfill the geographical definition of continent, hence from this geographic perspective, Europe and Asia are just a single continent, **Eurasia**. Should this view be adopted, then Russia and Turkey could be seen as regular “monocontinental” states.

And while discussing perceptions, it is worth noticing that the seemingly objectivizing neologism Eurasia is yet another unacknowledged sign of the power and continuing influence of European (Western) **imperialism** (including cultural imperialism and linguistic imperialism). Why should Europe as the westernmost peninsula of Eurasia take precedence in this name over Asia that constitutes the very bulk of Eurasia? Usually, the neologism Eurasia is traced back to the Electorate of Württemberg geographer Carl Gustav Reuschle’s seminal work *Handbuch der Geographie oder Neueste Erdbeschreibung* (1838: 57-62). He nevertheless acknowledged the territorial and demographic predominance of Asia; his original coinage was much more objective. **Asien-Europa** (Asia-Europe). So indeed, why not speak of Asiaeuropa, or Asiarea?

**perceptual dialectology** (etymology: see perception, dialect) — in the late 1980s, the United States linguist Dennis R. Preston began studying non-linguists’ views on areal **linguistics**, namely, on the classification of the United States **dialects** of English as perceived by people from different regions of this country (Preston 1989). Such non-specialist (“folk”) views vary widely, indicating that classifying dialects is highly dependent on the act of observation and a variety of assumptions, including **prejudices**. Linguists’ perception of dialects in a given territory (for instance, in a **nation-state**) is more consistent and stable because they have a “scientific” system of periodicals, book presses, universities, academies, conferences, doctoral seminars, or peer review, for working out a consensual view, and subsequently, for enforcing it. Hence, both linguists’ and non-linguists’ views are in essence equally perceptual, because both are directed toward elements of social reality, meaning on Einzelsprachen (speech varieties) and their classification. However, linguists developed certain methodologies for etic-style (outside) observation, which limit the interference of the act of observation with the observed (or distortion). On the contrary, philologists from a specific (typically ethnolinguistic) nation-state usually propose that their **emic** assumptions on their own **national language** constitute an objective (etic) vantage of observation. It is often emphasized, however, that this national vantage is not fully accessible to a philologist (linguist) who is not a member of the **nation** whose national Einzelsprache is under scrutiny. Scholars can be as gullible as laymen and confuse their perceptions and assumptions with the observed. This phenomenon is richly evidenced by the biologizing metaphors of “language death,” “language family,” “living organism,” or “Stammbaum.”

**periligualistic** (etymology: see language, linguistics. The prefix “peri-” comes from the Greek prefix περί περί “about, around, or toward”) — the term is for characterizing the highly interwoven relation between Ø language and elements of **social reality** that are not part of Ø language. For instance, the technology of writing is not part of Ø language but it is closely related with the creation, maintenance, and use of any Einzelsprache. In turn, in fully literate societies (Gesellschaften, nations), the fact of the intensive use of official (national) language (that is, an Einzelsprache) in writing often impacts syntax, pronunciation, word choice and speech practices, or more broadly, Ø language thus leading to a cultural co-evolution of writing and Ø language. Similarly, the concept of Einzelsprache (like writing) is not part of Ø language, either. The imposition of this concept on the linguistic (Ø) language with the use of writing and the power of state (bureaucracy) enabled the emergence of Einzelsprachen. Significantly, Ø language is part of **material reality**, while the technology of writing or the concept of Einzelsprache belong to social reality. Hence, it may be proposed that typically, the periligualistic relationship is between Ø language (that is, part of material reality) and elements drawn from the social reality.

**personalism** (from “person,” in the meaning of “human being,” in turn, from Latin *persōna* “role [in life, a play, or a tale],” but impacted by the Medieval Latin usage for a “member of the Holy Trinity” originally “actor’s mask,” from Greek πρόσωπον πρόσωπον “face, mask,” coined from πρός próς “toward” and ὅψ ὅψ “eye”; see face-to-face) — an answer to extreme **collectivism** or individu-
alism espoused by the Roman Catholic Church’s social teaching. The human being is seen as a person living together with other persons within communities. As such this person enjoys individual freedom that does not encroach on the freedom of other persons. The community protects and serves the person in return for their contribution to the good of all persons in this community.

philology (a neo-Greek eighteenth-century neologism, namely, φιλός philos and λόγος logos for “love of words, languages”) — a traditional discipline usually for the study of texts in classical and standard Einzelsprachen (languages), conducted in line with some cultural and ethnonicational values, beliefs, and preconceptions (that is, within the confines of social reality); in the age of nationalism, often for the sake of creating and shaping national languages, and also for “proving” the superiority of one ethnolinguistic nation’s language over other nations’ Einzelsprachen. For instance, from the philological (emic, ethnonicional) perspective the Japanese language is seen as 国語 Kokugo (literally, “national language”), which can be analyzed exclusively by Japanese researchers specializing in Kokugo studies. The subject of “Japanese” in Japan’s schools is known as Kokugo, Japanese researchers specializing in Kokugo studies. The subject is referred to in Japanese “Japanese” (speech sound). However, from the etic (non-national) perspective, linguists (including non-Japanese scholars) who research Japanese as one of many standard Einzelsprachen, refer to it as 日本語 Nihongo (literally, “Japanese [language]”). When a foreigner (non-Japanese) attends a Japanese language course, the subject is referred to in Japanese as Nihongo, not Kokugo.

At present, in ethnolinguistic nation-states, in order to give a sheen of “scientific” respectability to philology, this discipline is often dubbed as “national linguistics.”

phone (from Greek φωνή fónē “voice, sound”) — the smallest unit of articulation (human speech), one of the speech sounds occurring in humanity’s languages, dialects. See also phoneme, etc.

phoneme (from French phonème, in turn from Greek φωνήκα fónēka “sound produced by speaking”)— a phone (speech sound) which in a given Einzelsprache or speech variety changes the meaning of words. Hence, it belongs to the limited repertory (usually from more than ten to fewer than a hundred) of a given Einzelsprache’s phonemes. See also emic.

pluricentric language (etymology: see monocentric language). The prefix “pluri-” stems from Latin plāris, in turn from plus “more,” and was developed on the model of Greek πολύς polús “many, much,” which yielded the English prefix “poly-”—an Einzelsprache or speech variety employed and regulated (or not) by several speech communities (ethnic groups, nations), typically living in different nation-states. For instance, English—spoken and written in some varying ways in England, Scotland, the United States, Nigeria, India, or Australia—is a pluricentric language. The same is true of German, which is a national, official, or co-official language in Austria, Belgium, Germany, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, and Switzerland. Practically all large languages or global (world) languages are pluricentric in their character. Historically speaking, most developed as monocentric languages of colonial metropolises, but the subsequent process of de-colonization transformed (democratized) such former imperial Einzelsprachen into pluricentric languages. For the time being, Russian is the only exception in this regard. Until 1991 it was the sole official and monocentric language in the Soviet Union. Despite the breakup of this communist polity into 15 post-Soviet ethnolinguistic nation-states, where Russian is widely employed and has a variety of statuses, the Russian Federation aspires to the position of the sole controller and regulator of this language across the post-Soviet space and the world, in line with the highly ethnolinguistic ideology of the Russian World.

Ethnolinguistic nationalism’s principle of the normative isomorphism of language, nation and state provides that a “true” national language must always be monocentric. In the wake of the breakup of Yugoslavia, the communist federation’s main official language of Serbo-Croatian became (co-)official in the five post-Yugoslav nation-states, namely, Bosnia, Croatia, Kosovo, Montenegro, and Serbia. Hence, it was transformed overnight from a monocentric to pluricentric language. But this transformation sat ill at ease with the ethnolinguistic nationalisms of most post-Yugoslav nation-states. Hence, from this ideological perspective, it became necessary for the sake of separate national statehood construction, legitimation, and maintenance to ban the linguonym Serbo-Croatian and rename this Einzelsprache as “Bosnian” in Bosnia, “Croatian” in Croatia, “Montenegrin” in Montenegro, and “Serbian” in Serbia. As a result, the non-national (multinational, multiethnic) Einzelsprache of Serbo-Croatian was splintered and re-made into the aforementioned four post-Serbo-Croatian national languages. Subsequently, elements of language engineering, language planning, language status planning, and of the politics of script were deployed for deepening selected lexical, morphological, orthographic, pronunciation, or syntactic differences among these “successor languages.” However, the changes still do not prevent mutual comprehension, hence, quite a few linguists and intellectuals in the concerned post-Yugoslav nation-states propose to respect the national and political reality and need of treating Bosnian, Croatian, Montenegrin, and Serbian as separate national languages, while, at the level of everyday use, treating them as a single, nameless, neutral, and bисcriptal “Common Language” (zajednički jezik/заједнички језик), not connected to any political or nation-building project.

politics (from Aristotle’s term τα πολιτικά τα politika “affairs of state”) — legitimate exercise of power over a group of people, usually coterminous with a state or nation.

politics of script (etymology: see politics, script)— using scripts (writing systems) for political ends (for example, constructing ethnolinguistic nations and their nation-states); also official legislation that regulates or extends the state’s control over the use of writing systems in that state. See also language politics.

polity (via Latin polita “government,” from Greek πολιτεία politèia “citizenship, government, commonwealth,” in turn from Greek πόλις polis “city, city-state”) — a general synonym for “state,” which does not imply any specific organizational form of statehood. Hence, the term polity can be employed in a general-
izing manner to refer jointly to states, nation-states, empires, or polities of estates.

**polity of estates** (also "state of estates"); a translation from the German-language term **Stände**—in early modern Central Europe, the typical form of **statehood** organization in which the entire population, or just the ruling (political) **elite**, are divided into estates (or **Stände** of nobility, burghers, clergy, commoners) that they are born into. The estate of Catholic clergy was an exception in this respect, because due to celibacy one was not able to be born into it. During the early modern period, and even in the nineteenth century, in many of Central Europe’s polities, peasantry (or the vast majority of the population) were excluded from the system of states, due to their status as serfs (see **serfdom**).

The concept of the polity of estates is closely related to the post-Westphalian idea of a religiously homogenous territorial state (from German **Territorialstaat** for a polity under a single law and ruler. Such a polity constitutes a single jurisdiction, which ideally should be territorially continuous (within a single piece of territory). The entailed (ethno-)**religious homogenization** of the population in a polity of estates led to the transformation of confessional homogeneity into the idea of legal **equality** for all the subjects (inhabitants), giving rise to the concept of the homogenous nation housed in its own nation-state, which underpins the ideology of nationalism. (See also **Westphalian (modern) statehood**.)

The idea of estates-based statehood was revived in fascist Austria (1934–1938) and wartime Slovakia, where all the citizens were allocated, respectively, into Stände or stavy (corporate groups) in accordance with their professions (that is, the professions of paterfamilias), in line with the Roman Catholic Church’s social teaching. In the context of fascist Austria, the term **Ständestaat** is usually translated into English as “corporate state.”

**polyconfessionalism** (not to be confused with **polyreligiosity**; formed from the prefix "poly-") and term "confession." The former stems from Greek πολύς polús "many, much," while the latter from Latin confessio “confession, acknowledgment, creed, or avowal of one’s faith,” in turn from conficere “I confess, I admit”)—the fact of the often formally tolerated practice of different religions on the territory of a single polity, meaning that the polity is confessionally **heterogeneous**. The situation was typical across early **modern** Central Europe, where the faithful of different religious denominations, and churches were free to practice their religious rites and customs in Poland-Lithuania and the Ottoman Empire, and after 1781 also in the Habsburg lands. In Western Europe the post-Westphalian principle of **religious homogeneity** (that is, cuius regio, eius religio “whose realm, his religion”) within a single polity was observed, and for different reasons the same ideal was also espoused in the Russian Empire.

**polyreligiosity** (not to be confused with **polyconfessionalism**; etymology: see **polyconfessionalism**, religion)—a neutral term for describing the sociopolitical phenomenon of a group of people (typically, a **Gesellschaft**), who profess simultaneously two or more religions, or venerate (worship) more than one god (or supernatural force) at the same time. The very same phenomenon is denoted by the term **polytheism**, which is biased due to the fact that it is a criticism of polyreligionism from the perspective of **monotheism** seen as the “civilized” norm. See also religious **dysglossia**.

**polytheism** (etymology: see **atheism**, polyconfessionalism)—a belief in the existence of many equal or unequal gods, deities. See also **monotheism**.

**population (demographic) engineering** (noun “population” stems from Neo-Latin **populatio**, in turn from **populus** “people,” cognate with plēbēs “common people, crowd” and with Greek πλῆθος plēthos “crowd.” The neologism “demography” was formed from Greek δῆμος démos “people” and γραφία graphia, the latter in turn derived from the verb γράφειν graphain “to write”)—in ethnolinguistic nationalism, a sum of policies from assimilation to ethnic cleansing and genocide for achieving the ideal of ethnolinguistic homogeneity in a nation-state.

**population transfer** (etymology: see **population engineering**. The term “transfer” stems from Latin transfers, formed from trans “across,” and ferre “to bear, carry”)—a legal term coined at the end of the Great War for a bilaterally agreed or unilateral expulsion of a people from one state to another. The first instances of population transfers (exchanges) took place during the Balkan Wars. In 1913, in Annex I (Article C), the Constantinople Peace Treaty between Bulgaria and the Ottoman Empire used the term “population exchange” in the sense of ethnoreligiously and ethnolinguistically defined expulsions. In international law this instrument of population transfer was assessed positively as conducive to furthering human rights and preserving political stability. Since the mid-1990s, thanks to the United Nations’ decision, population transfer has been considered a crime against humanity and was renamed as ethnic cleansing.

**power** (Middle English poer “vigor, strength, might [especially in battle], ability to extend violence, to coerce,” via Old French pouvoir “to be able to,” from Latin posse “to be able to”)—a person’s capacity to impose his or her decisions on other people; or in politics, on groups of people, defined as nations and states.

**prejudice** (from Latin praejudicium “prejudgment”)—a preconceived unfavorable opinion or feeling. In the sphere of language attitudes (language politics), usually an official stance adopted by the dominant (powerful) elite or nation (and typically justified in **scientific** terms,” as supported by a given national academy of sciences) that the speech variety of a subjugated (powerless) ethnic group (nationality, minority) never was, is not, and cannot ever be an **Einzelsprache**, national language, official language, or a medium of education. Typically, this negative and discriminatory attitude is displayed when the first attempts are undertaken to standardize a subjugated group’s speech variety into an Einzelsprache and to start publishing with it. In the late Russian Empire the status of (Einzelsprache) was denied to Belarusian and Ukrainian, publishing was banned in these languages, they were officially dubbed as “White Russian” and
“Little Russian,” and classified as наречия неречи (idioms or dialects) of the standard (Great) Russian language. Bulgarian politicians and linguists recognize the existence of Macedonia as a state (but not as a nation-state), however, they deny the existence of any Macedonian nation or language, and classify the Einzelsprache of Macedonian as another (read: superfluous) written or literary standard of the Bulgarian language. Similarly, in today’s Poland the state administration and university philologists maintain that there is no such thing as a Silesian language (despite the standardization of this Einzelsprache, sustained book production in this language, international recognition in light of the ISO 639-3 standard, or the Silesian Wikipedia that ranks as the 142nd largest among all the 302 Wikipedias [October 2018]). See also respect.

prescriptivism (from the verb “to prescribe,” in turn from Latin praescrībere for “to write before or above,” meaning “to present in writing rules [that must be followed]”)—an attitude toward the standardization and control of the (predominantly written) use of an Einzelsprache. Typically, it is the scholarly elite of a given nation-state who standardize an Einzelsprache into a standard language and codify the principles of its use. Subsequently, the “correct” way of writing and speaking a language “beautifully” becomes the very (language) barrier one needs to scale in order to qualify for civil service (bureaucracy), university posts, and other elite jobs. In ethnolinguistic nation-states, the idea of the administrative enforcement of such linguistic correctness becomes part and parcel of politics and domestic power relations, as the main instrument of creating, legitimating, maintaining, and preserving the unity of the nation, in accordance with ethnolinguistic nationalism’s principle of the normative isomorphism of language, nation, and state. In Eurasia (especially in Central Europe and Southeast Asia) most national monocentric languages are placed under protection and control of state-approved scholarly or administrative authorities (institutes) tasked with establishing and enforcing “correct” language use. See also descriptivism.

prestige (from French prestige “deceit, imposture, illusion”; initially, meant “trick” in English and remained derogatory until the early nineteenth century, denoting “dazzling influence”—high status or reputation in language politics, as ascribed to an Einzelsprache or speech variety by its users and outside observers (from other speech communities). Typically, this high status is a function of political, economic, military, or cultural (religious) power enjoyed by the speakers of a given language (speech variety). Such ascription allows for culture-specific (arbitrary) ranking of Einzelsprachen. For instance, in the Ottoman Balkans, among Muslims the highest prestige was accorded to Arabic as the language of the Quran and jurisprudence, then to Osmanlca (Ottoman Turkish) as the language of administration and the military, and last but not least to Persian as the language of secular cultural pursuits. From the Muslim perspective, all the non-Muslim Einzelsprachen stood at a lower rung of the prestige ladder in comparison to the three aforementioned Muslim languages, graphically united by the same Arabic script. Hence, Slavic-speaking Muslims of Bosnia tended to write their Slavic vernacular in Arabic letters. In the Rum (Roman) Millet of Orthodox Christians the Greek language in its own specific writing system stood higher than the Cyrillic-based (Church) Slavonic, hence many Slavophones in what today is Macedonia noted down their Slavic vernacular in Greek letters. However, the elevated position of Greek was contested by the Catholic Einzelsprache of Tuscan (Italian) written in Latin letters because the latter was commonly employed for commercial and diplomatic contacts between the Ottoman Empire and the Christian polities of Western and Central Europe. With Russia’s successful forays into the Ottoman Balkans during the nineteenth century, the prestige of (Church) Slavonic and Cyrillic increased due to the fact that Russian is a Slavic Einzelsprache written in Cyrillic. Obviously, in the confines of the Judais (Jewish) Millet Hebrew, written in its own specific script, was the most prestigious language. However, the rise of French-medium education for the Ottoman Empire’s Sephardic Jews led to the switch from the “holy script” of Hebrew to the gentle Latin alphabet for writing their Romance vernacular of Spanyol (Ladino). By the turn of the twentieth century, irrespective of the different millets to which they happened to belong, Albanian-speakers had decided to support the spread of literacy and publications in their Albanic vernacular. Their efforts were frustrated by the parallel employment of a variety of scripts connected to different millets’ “holy tongues.” Finally, in 1908 they settled on the (Catholic and Protestant) alphabet of Latin letters, then seen as the “script of Europe, the West, modernity, and progress.” Again, irrespective of millet, the lowest prestige was accorded to the Romani language (see anti-Tsiganism).

In Central Europe’s ethnolinguistic nation-states, the highest prestige is lavished on the national language, invariably in the function of the state’s official language, although in Belarus the co-official language of Russian de facto takes precedence before the country’s national and official language of Belarusian. Recognized minority languages of national minorities residing in “not their own” nation-state are perceived as “lower” (for instance, German or Lithuanian in Poland), followed by: minority languages of ethnic minorities without a kin nation-state (for example, Lemkian or Tatar in Poland), large languages of expat and diaspora communities (for instance, English and German in Poland), national languages of unrecognized emigrant minorities (for example, Georgian and Vietnamese in Poland), recognized regional languages of speech communities seen as part of the Polish nation (for instance, Kashubian in Poland), and unrecognized regional languages of speech communities seen as part of the Polish nation (for instance, Silesian in Poland).

In Europe the status of an official language of the European Union has been a game-changer. In light of EU law, such status confers formal legal equality on all the member states’ official (state) languages in accordance with the formal equality of member states as entailed by the principle of sovereignty. As a result, the large languages of English, French, or Spanish; the muddling national languages of Italian, Polish or Romanian; the small national languages of Czech, Danish or Swedish; the smaller national languages of Bulgarian, Slovak or Finnish; the national microlanguages of Estonian, Latvian or Slovenian; and the tiny national languages of Maltese and Irish are seen and treated as equal in the European Union. In turn, due to the political and
economic importance of the European Union in the world, an EU small or smaller national language has more prestige than such a non-EU middling national language like Ukrainian.

From the perspective of the entire globe, Eurasia's large languages are accorded the highest rank of prestige, though the former imperial European languages are even “more equal,” given the fact that they are employed as official (national) languages in the postcolonial nation-states outside of Eurasia. Eurasia’s national (official) languages employed in administration, education (including universities), and publishing are more prestigious than others of limited use in the aforementioned spheres. The lowest rung of the prestige ladder is occupied by languages not employed in administration, education, or publishing. Their position is largely equal to practically all indigenous languages outside of Eurasia.

Prestige can also be traced within a given Einzelsprache’s speech community and is generally correlated with the socio-economic stratification of a nation, Gesellschaft, ethnic group or Gemeinschaft. In a nation-state, typically the speech variety of the capital’s (political, intellectual, or economic) elite is seen as the most prestigious. Usually, the standard of a national Einzelsprache is steeped in such an elite’s speech variety, or acrolect (“high variety,” from Greek ἀκρός akro “topmost, highest” and [dia]lect “speech variety”). The nation-state’s urban middle class (bourgeoisie), aspires to emulate the speech standard set by the elite, usually not with complete success because the elite keeps moving the goal posts by constantly changing their speech customs. Hence, such a middle class ends up speaking a less prestigious speech variety, or mesolect (“middle variety,” from Greek μέσος més “middle, average” and [dia]lect “speech variety”). The lowest stratum of society, the uneducated, often the rural population, or the inhabitants of a fur-flung province who do not strive to speak and write like the elite, and even may take pride in their own (ethnic, regional, local, social) speech variety, from the national elite’s perspective (see perception) are seen as speaking the least prestigious speech variety, or basilect (“bottom, lowest variety,” from Medieval Latin bassus “low, short” and [dia]lect “speech variety”). Hence, from the Polish elite’s vantage of observation Silesian is a basilect of the Polish language and Silesians a social and/or regional group of the Polish nation. However, from the perspective of the Silesians—who see themselves as a nation or ethnic group—Silesian is an Einzelsprache in its own right, or the Silesian national (ethnic) language.

purism (early nineteenth-century neologism, from “pure,” in turn from Latin pūrus “clean, unmixed, plain, pure”)—a highly ideological term of long standing in European history. In the course of the Iberian Reconquista the Spanish term sangre pura (pure blood) denoted “true,” “real,” or “old” Christians, as opposed to “recent” Muslim or Jewish conversos (converts) to Christianity. In this politicized (metaphoric) sense, rather than literal washing or cleaning, purification meant an act of ethnic cleansing or even genocide in the quest for ethnoreligious homogeneity within the boundaries of a polity, in line with the principle cuius regio, eius religio (whose realm, his religion). Obviously, this idea is the source of the nineteenth- and twentieth-century European norm (obession) of the ethnolinguistic (in reality, often ethnoreligious) homogeneity of the nation and its nation-state in accordance with ethnolinguistic nationalism’s axiom of the normative isomorphism of language, nation and state.

But in the terms of the ideology of ethnolinguistic nationalism, the nation could not be “pure,” unless its national (official) language would be pure, too. As a result, the construction, standardization, “correction,” or “purification” of a national Einzelsprache entailed ridding its lexicon of words and phrases seen as “foreign,” “alien,” or belonging to an “enemy” nation’s language. In this way, at the turn of the nineteenth century German was “purified” of “ugly Gallicisms and Latinisms”; in the first half of this century Hungarian was “purified” of the same, alongside a clutch of Germanisms and Slavicisms; in the second half of the nineteenth century, Romanian was “purified” of Slavicisms; between the mid-nineteenth and mid-twentieth century Polish was “purified” of Germanisms and Russianisms; at the same time Bulgarian was “purified” of Turkicisms and Grecisms; in the interwar period Turkish was “purified” of Arabisms, Persianisms, Slavicisms or Latinisms; in the late 1940s Macedonian was “purified” of Bulgarianisms; while at present Croatian is “purified” of Serbianisms, Bosnian of Serbianisms and Croatianisms, and Montenegrin of Bosnianisms, Croatianisms and Serbianisms. The lexical and idiomatic lacunae left by this nationally driven linguistic purism are filled in, preferably, with neologisms created from “pure” root words (morphemes) of the national language, for instance, Croatian zračna luka (literally “air harbor”) “airport,” Czech divadlo (literally “something for watching”) “theater,” or German Rundfunk (literally “a spark cast around”) “radio”. However, in most instances, such lacunae tend to be filled in with linguistic borrowings from other “ideologically acceptable” Einzelsprachen, for instance, from Italian and French in the case of Romanian, from German in the case of Slovak, from Turkish and Arabic in the case of Bosnian, or nowadays from English for the majority of Central Europe’s languages.

questione della lingua—sixteenth-century Italian expression for “language question,” or the dilemma faced by literati of a given speech community (ethnic group, nation, state), namely, how to shape their own speech variety into an Einzelsprache that in versatility and prestige would be equal to Latin. The standardization of each European Einzelsprache (national language), and some non-European languages constructed in accordance with the European concept of Einzelsprache, was typically preceded by a period of experimentation and discussion on the “proper” manner of standardizing a given language.

race (from Italian razza “breed [of an animal],” of unclear origin)—in Europe until the mid-twentieth century a synonym for an ethnic group. Nowadays, in line with the American usage, a term for perceived skin color as the main feature to construing people as a group.

discrimination against a group (“race”) and its perceived members, typically on the basis of a prejudice related to skin color. Oftentimes, any form of ethnic discrimination. See also anti-Semitism, anti-Tsiganism.
raison d’État (French for “reason of state”)—national interest, meaning the interest of a given nation-state as perceived and formulated by the polity’s ruling elite. In the framework of the ideology of ethnonationalism, typically any opinion that contradicts the officially adopted national master narrative is seen as a danger to raison d’État, and thus may be criminalized as “treasonous”. See also collectivism, Geschichtspolitik, traitor of one’s nation.

reality (from Medieval Latin realitās, derived from realis “real,” in turn from res “thing, matter, business”)—all that exists and is accessible to the human senses and mind. See also material reality and social reality.

register (from Medieval Latin regesta “catalog,” derived from re-gerere “to record, to carry back,” in turn from gerere “to carry, bear”)—a speech variety employed in a specific social setting or sphere of life, most often opposing formal to informal settings, for instance, when an acrolect is used in the former case, while a mesolect or basilect in the latter. Typically, registers are construed as belonging to a single Einzelsprache, hence the standard of a given Einzelsprache is employed in formal situations, while a colloquial form or a dialect (purportedly) “belonging to” this Einzelsprache in informal situations. In reality, registers may be ethnolects and separate Einzelsprachen, meaning that in this situation registers function as leccts employed in the course of diglossia. In a way, each Einzelsprache is composed from a few registers (leccts), which a competent speaker is expected to master and deploy when appropriate. Therefore, it may be proposed that even a monolingual person (monoglot) is “multilingual” (see bilingualism) in the employment of the registers (leccts) of her Einzelsprache. The term register in this sociolinguistic meaning was introduced in 1956 by the British specialist in Romance linguistics, T. B. W. Reid, in his article “Linguistics, Structuralism and Philology,” published in Archivum Linguisticum (Reid 1956).

regional language (etymology: see language). The noun “region” stems from Latin regiōn “direction, line, boundary, district,” in turn from regere “to rule”—an officially recognized language of an ethnic group, which is a minority in the (ethnonational) nation-state of its residence. Irrespective of whether this ethnic group or minority considers itself a nation, this claim is not recognized by the nation-state’s authorities. Typically, this nation-state’s government, from above, legally defines such a minority as an ethnic minority (that is, with no “home” nation-state extant), or as a mere regional or social group of the nation-state’s nation. The former is the case of Lemkos or Roma in Poland, while the latter of Kashubs or Silesians in the same country. Under the Polish law, the Einzelsprachen of Lemkian and Romani are recognized as ethnic languages, that of Kashubian as a regional language, while no formal recognition has been extended to the Silesian language yet. Some low-key auxiliary use of a regional language may be allowed in education and local administration in the administrative units (regions) where the language’s speakers constitute a considerable share of the population (usually at least more than 20 percent). Since 1998 the use of some regional languages in Europe has been protected under the provisions of the Council of Europe’s European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, which came in force in that year (European Charter 1992). See also minority language.

religion (from Latin religiōn “bond, conscientiousness, obligation, piety, reverence,” coined from religiō “to bind, fasten, tie”)—a set of non-evidence-based beliefs in a supernatural (“beyond or above the nature, universe”) being(s) or force(s) that purportedly created all that exists, namely, the universe (or material reality), with special attention paid to humanity (or social reality). Religion is employed to postulate that beyond material reality and social reality another kind of metaphysical reality (beyond or above the material reality) exists where the aforementioned supernatural being(s) or force(s) reside, invisible and unknowable to humans. Obviously, such a religiously-based “explanation” of the creation of the universe and humanity does not account for the creation of this metaphysical reality with its supernatural being(s) or force(s). Religion’s explanation of the origin and character of the universe and humanity typically comes with a built-in norm enforcement principle, which provides that non-believers (and often the faithful of other “false” religions) must be censured, so that their lack of belief (“wrong” belief) would not endanger the existence of all that is by “angering” a “wrathful” supernatural being or force.

Religion is created and maintained by a class of specialists (clergy) who engage the faithful in a set of interactive practices (worship) for expressing, reinforcing and reproducing the basic tenets of a given religion, as a form of purported communication, or even “communion,” with a supernatural being or force.

The most important tangible function of religion is to provide, legitimize, and enforce an accepted set of social norms that underpin the social cohesion of a human group. Religions practiced by pre-modern (micro)-ethnic groups (Gemeinschaften) are usually non-scriptural (see non-scriptural religion), while those preferred by modern nations (Gesellschaften) tend to be scriptural (see scriptural religion).

religious diglossia (religious polyglossia) (etymology: see diglossia, religion)—practicing (professing) different religions in different aspects of social life by the same person or group of humans (not to be confused with polyreligionism or religious syncretism). For instance, in Japan people tend to celebrate the birth of a child with a Shinto ceremony, marriage in a Christian-style church wedding, while opting for a Buddhist funeral. The phenomenon of religious diglossia may be also spatial in its character. For instance, after the fall of communism in 1989, some groups of Muslim Roma from Bulgaria have engaged in a form of seasonal migration to Poland for the sake of earning living by commerce. In Bulgaria they practice Islam, however during their sojourn in Poland they switch to Catholicism. Furthermore, some Muslim Roma groups in Bulgaria and Macedonia practice the Muslim-style circumcision of newborn boys and Muslim funerals, but also celebrate the Christian feast of the Assumption of Mary into Heaven in a local Orthodox monastery. Recently, these Roma customs were made better known thanks to publications by Elena Marushiakova and Veselin Popov (Marushiakova and Popov 2018). See also diglossia, monoreligionism, polyreligionism.
religious homogeneity (etymology: see ethnolinguistic homogeneity, religion)—the normative (typically monotheistic) conviction that only a single religion should be allowed in a polity, meaning that religious heterogeneity as entailed by polyconfessionalism, is deemed illegal. This norm governed politics and state building in Western Europe from the Middle Ages to the early modern period. After the conclusion of the religious wars, it was codified in the Westphalian principle of cuius regio, eius religio (whose realm, his religion). This normative predilection for religious homogeneity within the boundaries of a single polity underpins Central European nationalism’s norm of ethnolinguistic homogeneity, namely, cuius regio, eius lingua (whose realm, his language). Interestingly, in 1830, the biconfessional (Catholic and Protestant) United Kingdom of the Netherlands was split, yielding the Catholic nation-state of Belgium and the Protestant nation-state of the Netherlands. Subsequently, with the rise of the ethnolinguistic nation-states of Italy (1861) and especially Germany (1871), language became an increasingly politicized issue, leading, in 1898 to the introduction of Flemish (Dutch) as Belgium’s second official language, alongside French. The growth of the Flemish ethnolinguistic national movement in 1962 brought about the demarcation of the official language boundary between the French and Flemish (Dutch) speech communities in Belgium. Since then the increasingly politicized question has been discussed whether Belgium should be split into two separate ethnolinguistic nation-states, which may remain independent, or join the ethnolinguistic kin national politics of France and the Netherlands, respectively.

religious syncretism (etymology: see religion. The term “syncretism” comes from the Neo-Latin term syncretismus, derived from Greek συνκρητισμός synkrētismós “alliance of two—typically, radically opposed—parties,” in turn from σύν συν “together” and Κρῆτες Kretes “Cretans”; ultimately derived from Plutarch’s first-century story on how Cretan city-states formed a union against a common external enemy)—the amalgamation of different religions or their elements into a new religion or way of worship. For instance, Sikhism emerged in the sixteenth century as an amalgamation of elements drawn from Hinduism and Islam. Alevism, which used to be practiced across the Ottoman Balkans and Anatolia, emerged in the thirteenth century as an amalgamation of Sunni Islam with elements of Shiism and of the traditional (non-scriptural) Turkic religion (so-called shamanism).

respect (from Latin réspicere “to look back, pay attention to”)—an attitude of admiration, esteem, or regard. In the sphere of language, attitudes (language politics), a favorable opinion expressed by the dominant (powerful) elite or nation toward the speech variety of a (formerly) subjugated (powerless) ethnic group (nationality, minority), recognizing it and supporting its development as an Einzelsprache, national language, official language, or a medium of education. This attitude is rarely observed in the Central Europe of ethnolinguistic nation-states, created and maintained in accordance with ethnolinguistic nationalism’s principle of the normative isomorphism of language, nation, and state. However, in 1938 Romansh spoken by some 80,000 people was recognized as the fourth national language in Switzerland, while in 2005 Poland recognized Kashubian as a regional language. Respect for potentially all ethnic groups’ speech varieties was observed and practiced only in the interwar Soviet Union during the period of korenizatsiia. Otherwise, post-apartheid South Africa’s 1997 Constitution, uniquely, recognizes the country’s nine main indigenous (non-Eurasian) languages as official (isiNdebele Sepedi, Sesotho, Setswana, siSwati, Tsivenda, Xitsonga, isiXhosa, and isiZulu), alongside English and Afrikaans. See also prejudice, prestige.

Romanian (mid-twentieth century neologism formed from the Romani adjective Romani “the Roma or their language,” and the Persianate suffix –stan “state,” the latter derived from Persian خانه خانه “country, place of,” or actually from the Romani cognate word than “place”)—this term made its first appearances in English-language literature during the early 1970s. However, the idea of a Roma nation-state had appeared earlier in Poland in the 1930s and in France in the 1950s, proposed by early Roma “ethnic entrepreneurs,” who noticed that ethnolinguistically defined nations and their languages are accorded the full set of political and cultural rights only in their own nation-states. After World War Two the creation of the Jewish nation-state of Israel for the previously stateless nation of Jews might be an inspiration. Later, especially after the end of communism, the term Romanian became a commonplace rhetorical figure of anti-Tsiganism, rifle in today’s Central Europe. Anti-Tsigan politicians, commentators, and populations use the term Romanian as an “acceptable” synonym for “Gypsy menace,” proposing that a given town, city, region, or even nation-state faces the “danger of becoming a Romanian” when Roma and Romani-speakers become a visible group of inhabitants or citizens. Typically, this is a call for and justification of subsequent anti-Tsigan pogroms, expulsions and other discriminatory measures. From this perspective, as the spread of the generalized acceptance of anti-Semitism could define Central Europe before World War Two, after 1989 it is anti-Tsiganism, which can play the same definitional role for this region (notwithstanding the presence of anti-Tsiganism in other parts of Europe and across the world, though the majority of the globe’s Roma live in Central Europe). See also Yiddishland.

Romanization (sometimes known as Latinization; derived from the alternative name for the Latin alphabet, that is, “Roman alphabet,” in turn from Latin Rōmānus “Roman, of or pertaining to the city or empire of Rome”—transliteration of words and texts written in other writing systems into the “Roman” alphabet of Latin letters. Romanization is the most widespread form of transliteration since the world’s global languages and most large languages (lingua francas) employ the Latin alphabet. This is the legacy of imperialism (or the West’s colonial domination over the world), which nowadays continues in the form of linguistic imperialism, especially outside of Eurasia. Phonemically Romanization systems differ, given into which

---

2. I thank Elena Marushiakova and Veselin Popov for the difficult-to-reach information on this term and the idea of a Roma nation-state.
Latin script-based Einzelsprache transliteration is conducted. For instance, Russian or Greek are Romanized differently into English, French, German, or Czech.

roofing language (Dachsprache)—a term developed in the early 1960s by Heinz Kloss (in relation to his discussion on Abstand languages and Aufbau languages) for describing the socio-spatial dimension of creating and standardizing Einzelsprachen, especially in Europe (cf Kloss 1967). For instance, in France the Romance speech of the royal court at Paris was made into a French language. Subsequently, other Romance Einzelsprachen and speech varieties extant across the territory of France were redefined as “dialects” and unilaterally put “under the roof” of standard French, so nowadays it is popular to hear that they “belong to” French, that these are nothing but French dialects. Such “roofing” is a popular (though rarely acknowledged) instrument of language policy for downgrading and liquidating linguistic (dialectal) variety (dialect levelling) in quest for ethnolinguistic homogeneity in the national language across the length and breadth of a nation-state.

Russian World (from Russian Русский мир Ruskii mir, the name of the eponymous governmental foundation, established in 2007 in Moscow, in turn borrowed from the eponymous title of the conservative daily published at St Petersburg during the 1870s)—a preferred Russian-language synonym for “Russian civilization,” otherwise a highly ethnolinguistic in its character geopolitical concept (adopted by the Russian government since the mid-2000s) that equates the core of the “Russian civilization” with all the territories (states) compactly inhabited by Russian native speakers (L1 speakers of the Russian language), including today’s Israel. On the other hand, the broader area of Russian civilization, which Russia claims as its “natural” (or civilizational) sphere of influence, is comprised of the territories of the former Russian Empire and Soviet Union, alongside the Orthodox countries in the Balkans (such as Bulgaria, Greece, Montenegro, Romania, and Serbia). As an ideology, the Russian World is largely synonymous with today’s Eurasianism, which also draws at the 1813 Russian imperial formula of Orthodoxy, Autocracy, and Nationality. The triad’s last element is usually interpreted as the Russian language, while nowadays the first element seems to entail the Russian Federation’s sole dominion over the entire Russian civilization, both in the sense of territory and population. In this aspiration, the Kremlin wishes to emulate China, which numerous observers see as the world’s sole example of a civilization and empire coterminous with a religion (Confucianism, or now Chinese-style communism) and writing system that was successfully turned into a nation-state. The Russian governing elite openly aspires to emulate the Chinese model, encapsulated in the program of capitalism in economy and one-party totalitarianism in politics. This aspiration seems to be a modern-age implementation of the initial element in the aforementioned formula Orthodoxy, Autocracy, and Nationality

In the light of Lev Gumilev’s theory of ethnogenesis (Gumilev 1989 [1973]), the Russian-speaking multiethnic people (nation) of Russians is construed to be a superethnos (or supraethnos) coterminous with the Russian speech community, and/or the community of the Orthodox faithful. In addition, from the perspective of language politics, each superethnos (civilization), due to its large demographic size, is believed to be “destined” to make its Einzelsprache into a lingua franca, “global” (large) language of international (interethnic) communication, written in this Einzelsprache’s specific script (or Cyrillic in the case of Russian). Hence, the Russian World foundation’s concentrated efforts are toward reviving Russian as a global language franca and for securing for Russian an official status in each post-Soviet nation-state.

Russianization (обрусение obrusenie)—a synonym for Russification, when wanted and sought for by a non-Russian speaking ethnic group.

Russification (русификация ruisifikatsiia)—the Russian imperial or Soviet policy of imposing Russian as the sole (or leading) official language and medium of education on non-Russian-speaking ethnic groups, especially if these groups in question had their own standard languages and opposed this imposition. See also Russianization.

scientific(alness) (from “science,” as derived from Latin scientia “knowledge,” in turn from scrier “to know”)—the quality of being scientific in the meaning of natural sciences, or in other words, regarding discoverable and evidenced laws of the universe’s matter and energy, or material reality, which is fully independent of human will. Proponents of nationalism, philology, linguistics, eugenics, or racism (Rassenkunde or “racial hygiene”) often spuriously propose that they discover and follow “scientific” laws that govern ethnic groups, nationalities, nations, Gesellschaften, Gemeinschaften, Einzelsprachen, national languages, speech communities or states. In reality, they describe and (often unwittingly, though at times consciously) alter, mold, and co-create social reality, which is fully dependent on human will. Their invocation of the scientific character of their findings and opinions (not infrequently dubbed as “laws”) is nothing more than a potent rhetorical figure.

script (from Latin scriptum, in turn from scribere “to write”)—a synonym for writing system.

script status planning (etymology: see estate, language planning, script, state)—an element of language engineering, the politics of script, and language politics; namely, an official decision on the role which a given script (writing system) should play in relation to an officially recognized Einzelsprache. For instance, in the Russian Empire, in the mid-nineteenth century, specific forms of Cyrillic and Latin alphabet (popularity dubbed then as “Russian” and “Polish” letters, respectively) were developed for writing White Russian (Belarusian). In 1864 the employment of White Russian was banned in writing and publishing, while any limited scholarly uses of this Einzelsprache had to be conveyed only in the Russian-style Cyrillic. In 1905 the lifting of the ban on the use of Belarusian in publishing contributed to the coalescence of the two coordinated Cyrillic and Latin national alphabets for Belarusian as a national language. The German occupation of the
northwestern provinces of the Russian Empire led to the ban of Cyrillic, which left Belarusian a monoscriptal language written in Latin letters. Both scripts were revived as equal and official for Belarusian in briefly independent Belarus in 1918. Afterward in Soviet Belarus, only Cyrillic was employed for writing and publishing in Belarusian, while émigré intellectuals and ethnic Belarusians continued using the Belarusian Latin alphabet in interwar Latvia, Lithuanian, and Poland. Furthermore, Soviet Belarus was officially quadrilingual (with Belarusian, Polish, Russian, and Yiddish as its official languages) and triscriptal (Cyrillic for Belarusian and Russian, the Latin alphabet for Polish, and the Hebrew script for Yiddish). In 1991–1994 the Latin Belarusian alphabet was revived to a very limited degree in post-Soviet Belarus but was de facto banned from any public use after 1995. In its stead a closely related Latin alphabet-based transliteration system was adopted, which differs in a couple of letters from the traditional Belarusian Latin alphabet. See also language status planning.

scriptal apartheid (etyymology: see script. The term “apartheid” stems from Afrikaans apartheid “separateness”)—the prescribed or de facto use of two or more different scripts (writing systems) in a country (see multiscriptalism), but with each script contained to “its own” scriptally homogenous region (see monoscriptalism), and without the legal possibility of employing another region’s script in this region. For instance, the post-Yugoslav state of Bosnia-Herzegovina is composed of the two entities of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the Republika Srpska. In the Republika, the Serbian language is official, invariably written in Cyrillic. On the other hand, in the Federation, Bosnian and Croatian are the entity’s official languages, both written in Latin letters. Each entity of Bosnia-Herzegovina is radically monoscriptal, though officially the state is multiscriptal. Script became weaponized for mobilizing ethnonationally and ethnolinguistically defined electorates (see language conflict). In Bosnia-Herzegovina the phenomenon of multiscriptalism at the level of everyday life, namely, on information and shop signs, is observed only in the principle of divine right. Hence, through the privileged status made visible to the faithful by clergy’s literacy in a religion’s Einzelsprache, clergy wielded much power, often in competition with temporal (secular) rulers. The tension between ecclesiastical and temporal wielders of power used to be settled by a “division of work,” as illustrated by the principle of divine right, namely temporal rulers vanished resources on clergy, who in return, legitimized the former’s reign in a polity with a given religion. See also non-scriptural religion.

scriptural religion (etyymology: see religion, script)—a religion of large non-face-to-face human groups (Gesellschaften) with a prescribed set of beliefs and practices recorded, regulated, and standardized in a corpus of approved texts (canon). This canon is typically recorded in a specific “holy tongue” (Einzelsprache) with the use of a specific “holy scripture” (writing system). The class of specialists (clergy) who maintain a religion are separated from the rank-and-file faithful by their command of the “holy tongue” and its “holy script,” enabling them to explain (“translate”) the religion and its teachings to the faithful in their varied speech varieties. Until the mid-twentieth century, the cleavage between clergy and laity was deepened by the latter’s illiteracy. Hence, through the privileged status made visible to the faithful by clergy’s literacy in a religion’s Einzelsprache, clergy wielded much power, often in competition with temporal (secular) rulers. The tension between ecclesiastical and temporal wielders of power used to be settled by a “division of work,” as illustrated by the principle of divine right, namely temporal rulers vanished resources on clergy, who in return, legitimized the former’s reign in a polity with a given religion. See also non-scriptural religion.

sectarianism (early nineteenth-century neologism, from Medieval Latin sectārius “pertaining or belonging to a sect,” in turn from secta “sect,” formed from seco “cut” [off])—ostensibly the phenomenon of creating a sharp difference between cohabiting groups through the politicization of religion. Hence, nowadays, another name for ethnoreligious nationalism. In Britain, at the height of the ethnic civil war (“the Troubles”) in Northern Ireland, this term, especially in the journalistic collocation of “sectarian violence,” became a popular discourse ploy to deny the possibility of any ethnic conflict. Ethnic (ethnolinguistic) conflict would be an anathema in such a “developed democracy,” like the United Kingdom, because the theory is that democracy prevents conflicts of this type. Hence, a very similar ethnoreligious conflict in post-Yugoslav Bosnia can be qualified as “ethnic” or “ethnorealistic,” but not the ethnoreligious nationalism.
igious conflict in Northern Ireland, which is "just a case of sectarian violence." See also communalism.

semiosphere (see also noosphere)—in the early 1980s, the Soviet-Latvian scholar of Russian origin, Yuri Lotman, developed this term (Lotman 1984) (in Russian семиосфера semiosfera) for referring to the space where semiosis (from the Greek verb σημείο semeiô "to [draw or write] a mark [sign]") takes place, or the generation of meaning through the development and manipulation of signs, in other words, where Ø language is employed for generating social reality. See also extrasemiotic sphere.

serf (from Latin servus "slave")—a legal term for a peasant, who under the system of serfdom, is obliged to render free (unpaid) labor to a typically noble landowner who is a member of a nation. In Central and Eastern Europe, serfs—or the vast majority of the population—were excluded from a polity’s estates.

serfdom (derived from the term serf and the suffix "-dom," which stems from Old English -dum "state, condition, power, dominion, authority," and is cognate with German -tum)—a feudal institution of extracting free (unpaid) labor from peasantry (serfs) for a typically noble landowner. In Western Europe serfdom disappeared in the fourteenth century, while in Central Europe, with a qualified exception of Scandinavia and the Ottoman Empire, it persisted through the nineteenth century. From the legal perspective serfdom differed from slavery, that is, a serf could not be sold or bought as a chattel, but a land with a village of serfs could be sold and bought. Obviously, the purchaser also acquired the right to the serfs’ free labor.

social reality (see also noosphere, semiosphere; etymology: see material reality, society)—humanity’s “social world,” generated through Ø language use in its primary function, that is, for group bonding. Elements of social reality (also known as institutional reality, fictitious reality, declarative reality, or nomoreal reality), such as, states, nations, universities, ideologies, qualities, money, numbers, or Einzelsprachen, do not exist in the material sense of this word. They cannot be perceived with the use of the senses of hearing, sight, smell, taste or touch, or detectors to enhance these senses (for instance, a microscope, telescope, weighing machine, or spectrometer). It is impossible to take a photo of a nation or Einzelsprache, embrace it, hear it, taste it, smell it, or weigh it. One can “see” elements of the social reality only in one’s “mind’s eye.” Social reality is available only to those “in the know,” that is humans who generate, maintain, and change it through the use of Ø language in its primary, bonding, group cohesion-producing function. Specific elements of social reality, as practiced by a given human group, are accessible only to humans who share the same ideas of social reality in their minds, that is, in the brain. For instance, the nation or Einzelsprache is such an idea. Hence, the (human) social reality is not “visible” to animals and other living creatures, or hypothetical extraterrestrials. If in doubt, whether an element is part of social or material reality, it is sufficient to run the test whether this element is detectable through one of the senses. If yes, it is part of material reality. And if not, and such an element is only “visible” in the “mind’s eye,” then it is part of social reality.

Obviously, social reality is a subcategory of material reality. These invisible and otherwise undetectable (with the senses) elements of social reality are none other than certain physical states and configurations in the brain’s neocortex. Furthermore, it is important to add that social reality, as a product of the human use of Ø language, is entirely dependent (non-autonomous) on human will. On the contrary, material reality is fully independent (autonomous) of human will.

What humans see as “magic” or “miracle” is a mistaken belief that social reality may change and otherwise influence material reality. That a prayer or incantation (that is, words, or elements of social reality) can move stones or cure the body of a disease (all elements of material reality). See also material reality and reality.

society (from Latin societás, in turn from socius “associate, friend, comrade”)—see Gesellschaft.

social variety, language variety (from Old English spreac, cognate with Dutch spraak or German Sprache)—biological (natural) capacity for oral articulation (speech), or more commonly actualization of this capacity, hence, Ø language.

soft power (etymology: see power. The adjective “soft” stems from Old English sōf, cognate with Dutch zacht and German sanft)—a manner of wielding power in the international relations between states (nation-states), in the course of which stronger polities (usually former imperial powers) use all forms of economic, technological, educational, or cultural (including language) cooption, persuasion, or coercion (however, stopping short of the employment of military and warfare) in order to ensure that the government of a target nation-state follows the stronger state’s wishes. Typically, from the purely financial perspective, the use of soft power for achieving prescribed objectives is much cheaper than warfare.

sovereignty (from Old French souverain “sovereign,” derived from Latin super “above [other people]”)—a sixteenth-century European idea that only a single legitimate ruler or government has the right to govern within a polity’s boundaries, while rulers (governments) of other polities have no right to influence (“meddle” or “interfere”) in the internal matters of the polity in question. In 1648 sovereignty was adopted as a foundational norm of the Westphalian (modern) statehood and international relations. Hence, this norm also underpins the model of nation-state as defined by the infrastructural ideology of nationalism.

speech (from Old English speac, in turn from speacan “to speak”; cognate with Dutch spreken or German sprechen)—biological (natural) capacity for oral articulation (speech), or more commonly actualization of this capacity, hence, Ø language.
speech community (etymology: see communism, speech)—all the speakers of a language (Einzelsprache) or dialect, seen by the speakers (that is, from the emic, intragroup perspective) as a group-forming element. A speech community, like an Einzelsprache, may be also created by outside imposition, when typically a colonial power or state, from the etic (outside) perspective arbitrarily decides that a predefined population are a speech group. Subsequently, the colonial administration standardizes (linguistically engineers) a language for this population, the use of which is enforced through education and state offices.

speech variety (etymology: see speech. The noun “variety” stems from Latin varietas in turn from varius “manifold, different, various, changeable, fickle”—spatial and/or social isolation between human groups leads to the rise of linguistic difference, also known as lects. With the rise of writing this difference is often systematized and construed as languages (Einzelsprachen). See also dialect vs language (Einzelsprache) dichotomy, ethnic language.

spelling system (etymology: see writing system. The verb “spell” stems from Old French espellier, but it is a Germanic word, attested in Old English spellan “to talk,” Old High German spellon, and Old Norse spølja)—the usual manner of using a given script (writing system) for writing a given Einzelsprache in a typical or standardized manner. See also orthography.

Sprachbund (pl Sprachbünde “federation of languages”; from German Sprach “language,” and Bund “union, federation, league”—see linguistic area.

Stammbaum (from German Stamm “trunk of a tree, stem, tribe” and Baum “tree”—German term, literally, “family tree,” “genealogical tree,” or “ancestry chart” until the early modern period a diagram of one’s (male) lineage executed for proving one’s legitimate claim to the status of a noble. In politics of estates where political power and land ownership were overwhelmingly placed in the nobility’s hands, the Stammbaum constituted the legal basis for obtaining political and socio-economic order in a state. Hence, the legitimizing biblical imagery was lavish on such diagrams, drawing at the myth of Eden’s garden, including its “tree of life.”

In the mid-nineteenth century, Europe’s Einzelsprachen were imagined as “living organisms,” whose origin and relationships with one another can be represented in the form of a language family tree. This classificatory representation of languages as related but clearly delineated and separate entities corresponded well with the novel ideology of ethnolinguistic nationalism, especially in light of its governing principle of the normative isomorphism of language, nation, and state. On the one hand, the implied relatedness of Europe’s Einzelsprachen underpinned the unity of Western civilisation, in line with the ideology and practice of imperialism, thus emphasizing this civilization’s supposed superiority. On the other hand, in accordance with the ideology of ethnolinguistic nationalism, each nation in Central Europe could have its own unique and unshared national language. In turn, all these Einzelsprachen were notionally equal as “sister languages,” because “their” “parent languages” of Latin, Ancient (Hellenic) Greek, Old (Church) Slavonic, Proto-Germanic, Proto-Balto-Slavic, Proto-Ugric, Old Albanic, or Proto-Turkic had been already safely “dead” (see language death), so their elevated (antique) status could not be credibly claimed for any single present-day national (sister) language.

In addition, the metaphor of linguistic Stammbaum also strengthens the nationally useful idea of native speaker, entailing that each person can naturally know exclusively his or her mother tongue (L1). In turn, this suggests that bilingualism (multilingualism) or diglossia (polyglossia) are an unnatural state of things social and political. Hence, only ethnolinguistic (national) homogeneity within a true nation-state—in line with the rarely explicitly declared principle cuius regio, eius lingua (whose realm, his language)—is normatively seen as desirable, “normal,” or even “natural.” Since the 1870s, this normative belief was forced on Central Europe’s populations by asking, in censuses, the (in)famous language question as the measure (indication) of a person’s nationality, that is, the “natural” state of belonging to a nation. Census-takers were instructed that a single person could declare only one Einzelsprache, polyglotism was to be disregarded, and some special ad hoc regulations were developed for census-takers to establish the “real” mother tongue of a recalculant interlocutor, who persisted in the “error” of claiming more Einzelsprachen than one, or none. In the latter case, illiterate peasants were flabbergasted when faced with the alien concept of national Einzelsprache, and tended to reply that they “speak in a simple manner” or that they are just “simple Catholics” (see also Kinderaus tausch).

Furthermore, in the present-day age of cyberspace, the misleading metaphor of language family tree is reinforced by the ISO 639-5 standard for registering and endowing language families and groups with machine readable three-character codes. This standard was published in 2008 and is maintained by the Library of Congress, Washington DC (ISO 639-5 Registration Authority 2008).

(language) standardization (etymology: see standard)—the typical European (Western) way of excising a speech variety from the continuous linguistic (dialect continuum, language) and making it, with the use of writing, into a recognized Einzelsprache (standard language). Usually, such a standardization of a language is executed by writing and adopting an authoritative spelling system, grammar, and dictionary for a given Einzelsprache. See also (language) codification.

standard (language) (from the Old French estendant “gathering place, battle flag,” cognate with German Standort “location, place, site, position, base,” ultimately from stehen “to stand” and Ort “place, spot”—the end product of language standardization or language engineering, either a fragment of a dialect continuum made into the basis of an Einzelsprache through the use of writing, or an Einzelsprache with its vocabulary, syntax, usages, and pronunciation normativized by a state-approved authoritative dictionary and grammar. See also language politics, politics of script.
state (polity) (from Middle English stat, a variant of estate, in turn from Latin status “condition,” in the meaning of Latin status [rei pública] “state [of the republic]”—the 1914 Montevideo Convention defines “the state as a person of international law [that] should possess the following qualifications: (a) a permanent population, (b) a defined territory, (c) government, and (d) capacity to enter into relations with the other states (Convention 1953)”

statehood (etymology: see state)—idea, quality, or condition of being a state. Hence, states are specific actualizations of this idea, and as such are seen to be units (quanta) of this quality (condition), imagined as an “uncountable abstract substance.” See also national statehood.

state (official) language (etymology: see language, state)—Einzelsprache used for all official written business in a state’s administrative institutions, educational system, politics, economy, and culture. Nowadays, a state typically has a single designated official language. States with multiple official languages (for instance, Finland or India) are exceptions. In the Anglophone world, many states have no legally designated official language (for example, Australia, Britain, and the United States), but usually the practice of written use makes an Einzelsprache (that is, English, or a regional variant of this language, such as US English) into a de facto official language.

Sun Language Theory (from the official Turkish name Güneş Dil Teorisi)—the establishment of a Republic of Turkey in 1923 was followed by the radical (revolutionary) fear of language engineering, which “purified” (see purism) Osmanlıca (Ottoman Turkish) from Arabic and Persian lexical and syntactical loans, yielding a thoroughly Turkic in its character (Modern) Turkish language. In 1928 this overhauling was graphically emphasized with the change from the Arabic to Latin script for writing and publishing in Turkish (see politics of script). Subsequently, it turned out that it was impossible to avoid “foreign” linguistic loans, especially from Western (“civilized”) languages. During the 1930s, their use was justified with the Sun Language Theory, in the framework of which, it was claimed that all the world’s (“civilized”) Einzelsprachen stem from Turkish, so none of these linguistic loans is really foreign, because users of the Western languages had borrowed all their words and syntactical structures from Turkish in the first place (Laut 2000). National philology firmly replaced any scientific norms of linguistics, and the Sun Language Theory became the core of Turkish “national linguistics” at the Faculty of Language, History and Geography, as founded at Ankara in 1935. This radical language engineering, as pursued in interwar Turkey was quite similar to the Soviet Union’s policy of korenizatsiya, especially in its aspects of language building and the politics of script.

suprastandard bilingualism (from the Czech and Slovak specialist term, that is, nadstandardní bilingvizmus and nadstandardné bilingvizmus, respectively. Etymology: see monolingualism. The prefix “supra-” comes from Latin supra “on top of, above, exceeding”—a form of bilingualism in which interlocutors successfully communicate with one another, each using their own [ethnic] Einzelsprache, and without the necessity of switching to the Einzelsprache of her or his interlocutor. This phenomenon was widespread in federalized Czechoslovakia (1969–1992), where both Czech and Slovak enjoyed equal official status and were employed interchangeably and equitably in all aspects of public and private life. Suprastandard bilingualism seems to have largely disappeared among the younger generations of Czechs and Slovaks who were born and raised after the 1993 breakup of Czechoslovakia into the separate nation-states of Czech Republic and Slovakia. A similar phenomenon of suprastandard bilingualism (or bidualistic) has developed in Norway since 1885, when Bokmål and Nynorsk were recognized as equal official written standards of the Norwegian language. However, in speech Norwegians tend to mix both standards, while in federalized Czechoslovakia Czechs and Slovaks were taught at school to keep their national Einzelsprachen separate also in speech. At present, suprastandard bilingualism (or even multilingualism) tends to develop among the speakers of the post-Serbo-Croatian languages of Bosnian, Croatian, Montenegrin, and Serbian, especially in Bosnia, where Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbian enjoy the same equal official status. See also composite language.

totalitarianism (1930s neologism, borrowed from the 1920s Italian and German neologisms totalitarismo and Totalstaat “total state,” all derived from Medieval Latin totalis “total,” in turn from totus “entire”—a single-party political system characterized by the highly centralized government’s (or the dictator’s) aspiration of total arbitrary control over public life in a state, and ideally over citizens’ private life, too. See also authoritarism, tyranny.

traitor of one’s nation (word “traitor” stems from Old French traidor, in turn from Latin traditor, ultimately from trādere “to give over, impart, betray,” formed from trāns “over” and datus “given.” Interestingly, this etymology is shared by the term “traditional,” derived from Latin trādītūs—in the vocabulary of the ideology of (ethnolinguistic) nationalism a popular accusation typically levelled against a person who does not blindly believe in and follow a given national master narrative. The functional usage of this phrase can be traced back to blasphemy and lése-majesté. The accusation of being a “traitor of one’s nation” can be also expressed by saying that an action or opinion of the person in question “breached raison d’État.”

transcription (etymology: see script, transnationalism)—when two Einzelsprachen are written in scripts that map out speech at different levels (of phonemes, syllables, or morphemes) classical transliteration between their writing systems is impossible. A word or phrase in the source language is transcribed from one script to another via the way of pronunciation. A word written in the phonemic script (for instance, Cyrillic) of a source language (for instance, Macedonian) is reassembled in a syllabary (for example, Devanagari) in accordance with its syllabic structure, and into a morphemic script (for instance, the Chinese writing system) in line with its morphemic structure. In addition, such transcription is attuned to the pronunciation and orthographic patterns as typically employed in the target languages written with
the employment of these scripts, be it Hindi in Devanagari or
Chinese in the Chinese script.

For instance, the surname of the famous English play-
wright William Shakespeare is transcribed into Chinese as "Shakespeare," in Japanese as "シェイクスピア Sheikusupia," into Amharic as " лидיפписание Shheksipur," into Hindi as "शेक्सपीयर Sheksiphery," into Burmese as "စားဖာရမ်း Shatehcaperyar," into Khmer as "អ៊ីស្រីរ Haeskipor, or in Tamil as "சேக்சுபி Sheksp'ir.

transliteration (etymology: see letter, nationalism)—representing, letter by letter, words and texts of an Einzelsprache A written in script X in Einzelsprache B written in script Y. For instance, the Latin alphabet-based language of Romanian can be converted in this manner into the Russian- or Macedonian-style Cyrillic. This form of transliteration is known as Cyrillicisation (not to be confused with Cyrillicisation). But when, for instance, Greek or Ukrainian is transliterated into the German- or Slovak-style Latin alphabet, the process is referred to as Romanianisation. The standard letter-by-letter form of transliteration is usually conducted from alphabet- or abjad-based languages to other alphabet- or abjad-based languages. Basically, such transliteration is possible only between scripts that map out speech at the same level, namely from a phonemic (abjad, alphabetic) script to another phonemic script, from a syllabary to another syllabary, from a morphemic writing system to another morphemic writing system. Otherwise, transcription must be used.

For instance, the surname of the famous English playwright William Shakespeare is Cyrillicized into Belarusian as Шэкасіпір, Traditionally, Belarusian is written in two scripts, Cyrillic and the Latin alphabet. Typically, the Belarusian Cyrillic form in forms the Latin script form, hence, Сэйкіпір. In Greek this surname is rendered as Σαίξπιρ Σαίξπιρ; in Armenian as Շեքսպիր SHeksipur, in Hebrew as רְשָׁעִית Fiqspir, in Arabic as شكسبیر Shaksib, or in Georgian as შექსპირ Sheksp’ir.

translation (from Latin translatio, translatus, the latter form being the past participle of transfere “to transfer, carry across,” equivalent to trāns “across” and lātus the suppletive past participle form of ferre “to carry”)—the act of rendering a written text in a given Einzelsprache (noted in its specific script) into another Einzelsprache (often recorded in a different writing system). The Western tradition of translation arose in the Middle East and the Mediterranean region, first, for translating written texts between mutually incomprehensible (see mutual comprehensibility) codified Einzelsprachen belonging to different language families, that is, from Hebrew into Greek, from Greek into Latin, from Greek into Arabic, from Arabic into Latin, and from Greek into Gothic and (Old Church) Slavonic. Typically, all these languages functioned as the holy tongues of this or that religion or church, and were also official administrative languages of empires, with the qualified exceptions of Hebrew and Slavonic. Translation practically was not practiced between cognate Einzelsprachen (speech varieties) of a single language family (though some translation of religious texts between the Semitic languages of Hebrew and Arabic occurred) until the rise of written vernacular languages in the wake of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation. Because translation is overwhelmingly text- and writing-based, in practice, it is nowadays limited to Eurasia’s standardized (codified) Einzelsprachen, mainly to these 180-odd languages registered under the ISO 639-1 standard. However, regular translation takes place in only around 100 languages, as evidenced by the Google Translate (founded in 2006) automatic translation online service that currently (2018) allows for pairing 103 Einzelsprachen. Potentially, cyberspace-based translation is possible for all the ISO 639-2 standard’s 600 Einzelsprachen, their 150 writing systems supported by Unicode’s ISO 15924 standard. In reality, the bulk of all translations is conducted between the world’s eight languages (Arabic, Chinese, English, French, German, Russian, Portuguese, and Spanish) and the official Einzelsprachen of the ethnolinguistic nation-states, mainly located in Central Europe and Southeast Asia. Obviously, the steep gradient of “translation flows” is from the large languages into the aforementioned national languages, the rest of the volume of translations made up by translations from one large language into another and from one national language to another. About 99 percent of the ISO 639-3 standard’s 8,000 languages (speech varieties) are excluded from the globalized world’s “translation-sphere,” though their speakers are not excluded from bearing the sheer brunt of cultural imperialism, namely, the fact that often the sole book available in these 99 percent of excluded languages is the Bible. This rarely noticed and commented stark cyber inequality is a clear sign that at present cyberspace imperialism is the leading form of linguistic imperialism and cultural imperialism. As a result, in (Central) Europe the as yet unstandardized (though quite a bit codified) language of Romani, spoken or comprehended by about 10 million Roma, continues to be excluded from publishing and the translation-sphere, which can be interpreted as a form of unacknowledged discrimination, that is, cultural and linguistic anti-Tsiganism.

Interestingly, in the Soviet Union transcriptions of books from the Arabic script-based Persian (Farsi) into the Cyrillic-based Tajik, and similar transliterations of books from the Latin alphabet-based Romanian into the Cyrillic-based Moldavian (Moldovan) were classified as “translations.” Obviously, for all practical reasons, Persian and Tajik, and Romanian and Moldovan, are (near-)identical, ensuring full mutual comprehensibility. However, in the case of the post-Serbo-Croatian Einzelsprachen of Bosnian, Croatian, Montenegrin, and Serbian (employed in official capacity in the post-Yugoslav nation-states of Bosnia, Croatia, Kosovo, Montenegro, and Serbia, and variously written in Cyrillic and Latin letters), books are neither translated from one Einzelsprache into another, nor from one script into another. The language in which a given book was published is either declared, or established on the basis of the place of its publication, that is, if a book was produced in (a Bosniak canton of) Bosnia it is in Bosnian, if in Croatia it is in Croatian, if in Montenegro it is in Montenegrin, and if in Serbia it is in Serbian. Although Bosnian- and Croatian-language books are invariably published with the use of the Latin alphabet (see monoscriptalism), while their Montenegrin and Serbian counterparts, both in Cyrillic and Latin letters (see biscriptalism), the publishing of the same book in one writing system and then in another is not considered
either an act of translation, or of transliteration. The tradition of bispical language of Serbo-Croatian with its two fully equivalent Cyrillic and Latin scripts continues unacknowledged to this day. Hence, a book in a post-Serbo-Croatian Einzelsprache (usually, in Montenegrin or Serbian) once printed with the employment of Cyrillic and at another time of Latin letters are seen as “editions” or “(scriptal) variants” of the same book, the production of these variants dictated by market demand, since some readers prefer Cyrillic while others the Latin alphabet.

transnational (etymology: see nation. The prefix “trans-” stems from Latin trāns “across”—characteristic of social, economic, political, cultural, or historic processes that take place between or across numerous states. The Latinate prefix “trans-” means “across, beyond, through,” but the term “nation” in this compound word confusingly refers to “state,” not the nation in the meaning of a group of people with the recognized right to separate statehood. In the international languages of English and French the term “nation” is often used as the preferred synonym for “state.”

tribe [from Latin tribus “one of the three political or ethnic divisions [of the original Roman polity],” typically identified with the Latins, Sabines, and Etruscans; perhaps ultimately derived from the numeral trēs “three”—in anthropology, an obsolete synonym for “ethnic group,” preferable to the more popular term until the 1950s, but ideologically implicated “race.” In medieval and early modern Latin (Latinate) usage a synonym for gens. During the nineteenth century, in Central Europe’s political lexicon, “tribe” (Volkstamm) used to be a synonym for nationality to refer to “somewhat” developed ethnic groups with their own standardized Einzelsprachen, but not sufficiently developed enough to be recognized as “nations” with the entailed right to separate statehood (nation-state).

However, in colonial and imperial usage that persists to this day, the term “tribe” is typically employed for ethnic groups and nations whose ancestors, prior to colonization, had no written Einzelsprachen, that is, did not know or did not use (or were considered by Western colonizers not to know or use) the technology of writing (were “illiterate”). In spatial terms such ethnic groups used to be contained to sub-Saharan Africa, both Americas, Australasia, and Siberia, or where European (Western) colonies and colonial empires were founded. Hence, when talking about them even now, in popular speech they are referred to, or rather unthinkingly denigrated, as “tribes” and their Einzelsprachen as “dialects” (“jargons,” “lingoes,” “vernaculars”).

In English, German, or Russian popular usage, an African “tribe” (Volkstamman in German, племя plienia in Russian)—never a nation—speaks (and sometimes writes) a “dialect” (Mundart in German, народній наречні in Russian) of their own, never a “language” (Sprache in German, иazyk iazyk in Russian). This usage is sometimes extended to “illiterate” traditional ethnic groups in Asia (for instance, India’s “scheduled tribes”). See also tribalism.

tribalism (etymology: see tribe)—in postcolonial sub-Saharan Africa, a pejorative synonym for ethnolinguistic nationalism.

In the process of decolonization this region’s colonies were overhauled into nation-states with (almost) no change in the colonial frontiers. The colonial borders as imposed arbitrarily by European (Western) colonizers in the late nineteenth century with complete disregard for the wishes and needs of the colonized peoples, are to be preserved at whatever cost. This is the rarely acknowledged normative principle of nationalism in postcolonial sub-Saharan Africa, meaning that exclusively the colony-based form of civic nationalism is considered to be the legal ideology of statehood formation, legitimation, and maintenance. Hence, in Nigeria only the Nigerian nation is recognized, that is, the country’s entire population. The Igbo, numbering about 34 million in 2018, are seen as a “tribe” with no right to national autonomy, let alone statehood. That is why their attempt at establishing their own Igbo nation-state of Biafra (1967–1970) was seen as a radical (backward, unacceptable) form of “tribalism,” not a genuine or legitimate Igbo ethnolinguistic nationalism. While the West encouraged ethnolinguistic nation-states across Central Europe after World War One, their re-establishment after World War Two, and accepted the late twentieth-century breakups of Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union, and Yugoslavia into such ethnolinguistic nation-states; the same form of ethnolinguistic national statehood is strictly and normatively forbidden in post-colonial sub-Saharan Africa, also entailing that only non-native, European (former colonial) Einzelsprachen have to be used there as state (official) languages and/or national languages.

tyrranny (dictatorship) (term “tyranny” stems from Medieval Latin tyrannia, in turn from Greek τυραννία tyrannía, ultimately from τύραννος tyrannos “lord, master, sovereign, tyrant.” The word “dictatorship” comes from “dictator,” stemming from Latin dictator “chief magistrate,” in turn from dictō “dictate, prescribe,” ultimately from dicō “say, speak”—illegitimate (illegal) exercise of power, usually with the use of violence, by a ruler who failed to secure the consent of the governed to his or her rule (governance). See also authoritarianism, totalitarianism.

violence (from Anglo-French violence “physical force used to inflict injury or damage,” derived from Latin violentus “vehement, forcible”; the sense of “improper treatment” attested since the turn of the seventeenth century)—the use of physical and/or psychological force to make another person or a group of people to follow the abuser’s (tyrant’s) orders and wishes. In politics, the dictatorial use of force is the hallmark of the illegitimate exercise of power.

weaponization (from “weapon,” stemming from Old English wæpen, cognate with German Waffe)—the use of elements of soft power, that is, of social reality, as instruments or weapons of offensive attack in cyberwarfare, and especially in hybrid warfare, for instance, such an employment of a language as a weapon (instrument) of power. This was observed in the case of the Russian language, especially deployed in line with the ideology of the Russian World for attack against Ukraine and as a justification of Russia’s 2014 annexation of Ukraine’s Crimea. Until the first decade of the twenty-first century, the common belief was that it was impossible to use elements of soft power for
waging war. But the rise of **cyberspace** made it possible, given that in the West (that is, the rich global North) “real life” economy, administration, services, medical healthcare, mass media, education, and communication became heavily dependent on the internet (cyberspace) during the 2010s.

**Westphalian (modern) statehood** (also “post-Westphalian”; etymology: see state. Westphalia—a historic region in today’s Germany)—the peace treaties concluded in the wake of the Thirty Years’ War (1618–1648) are usually, though incorrectly, collectively known as the Peace of Westphalia. The decisions taken in these treaties transformed the traditional model of statehood (polity of estates) and are the beginning of modern international relations, as created and still dominated by the West to this day. For instance, these treaties that confirmed (granted) independence (from the Holy Roman Empire) to the Netherlands and Switzerland are the world’s oldest “international” (this term was not yet invented in 1648) treaties still in power.

The new model of statehood developed due to the official espousal of the principle of **sovereignty** and by normatively declaring that only confessionally (religiously) homogenous polities are legitimate, in accordance with the principle *cuius regio, eius religio* (whose realm, his religion). With the addition of the concept of the **nation** to the Westphalian model of the sovereign homogenous territorial state, it was transformed into that of the nation-state. In civic-style nation-states, religious homogeneity was replaced with the principle of equality before the law and the democratic norm of one vote for one citizen (suffrage). On the other hand, in ethnolinguistic nation-states, apart from equality before the law and suffrage for all, the principle of religious homogeneity was replaced with that of ethnolinguistic homogeneity, or *cuius regio, eius lingua* (whose realm, his language).

Like the Western concept of **Einzelsprach**, the model of Westphalian statehood developed in and spread across Europe before it was imposed on, or more rarely, voluntarily accepted by, the rest of the world in the high age of imperialism. In the wake of **decolonization** during the twentieth century, all postcolonial states follow this model. Hence, the model of Westphalian statehood is part and parcel of the **infrastructural ideology of nationalism’s** package of national statehood building, **legitimation**, and maintenance.

**writing** (from Old English *writan* “to score, outline, draw the figure of,” cognate with Old Saxon *writan* “to cut, write,” German *reissen* “to tear, draw,” or Old Norse *vita* “to score, write”)—a technology of graphic representation of speech (*Ø* language). Popularly writing is believed to be part of *Ø* language, and even primary to it. In reality, writing is not part of *Ø* language, as a photograph of a person is not part of this person. This rife, but incorrect, belief equating writing with *Ø* language stems from the fact that writing is the main method of breaking up the continuous linguistic into discrete quanta of the linguistic, that is, **Einzelsprachen** (languages). The application of writing to speech produces, or makes it possible to produce, Einzelsprachen. The rise of written **standard languages** (Einzelsprachen) alongside the phenomenon of popular literacy leads to increasing influence of a written language on the speech of its speakers, leading to a co-evolution of writing and an Einzelsprache. This increasingly intimate interweaving of writing with numerous Einzelsprachen and allows for us to see the technology of writing as “**perilinguistic**” in its character. The Greek prefix *peri-* for “about,” “around,” or “toward,” indicates this present-day intimate (co-evolutionary) relation between writing and Einzelsprachen, while on the other hand, signals that this technology is not part of *Ø* language. See also bureaucracy, cyberspace, ISO 639, language politics, politics of script.

**writing system (script)** (etymology: see script, writing. The term “system” stems from Neo-Latin *systēma* “system, harmony,” in turn from Greek σύστημα “whole made of several parts,” ultimately formed from σύν *sūn* “with, together,” and ἱστήμι *histēmi* “to stand”)—a form of graphic representation of speech. Usually writing systems “map” speech at the **level of phonemes** (“sounds”), syllables, or morphemes (simple words, roots). Alphabets (Cyrillic or Latin) represent the first approach, while the Arabic or Hebrew script constitute a subcategory. They are abjads (consonantries) that map only consonants, the reader must insert appropriate vowels in the text when she reads. Most of scripts in India and Southeast Asia reflect speech at the level of syllables, hence they are known as syllabaries. The world’s sole widespread morphemic writing system is the Chinese (morphemic, logographic) script. The Japanese writing system is unique in the fact that it mixes elements of the phonemic, syllabic, and morphemic scripts. Popularly, but incorrectly, writing systems tend to be identified as characteristic or even inherent of this or that language, for instance, Cyrillic of the Russian language or the Chinese script of the Chinese language. However, each Einzelsprache may be written in each script, as amply evidenced by the 1920s replacement of the Arabic abjad with the Latin alphabet for writing Azerbaijani (Azeri) or Uzbek in the Soviet Union. At the turn of the 1940s, both Einzelsprachen’s Latin alphabets were replaced with Cyrillic. Subsequently, after the breakup of the Soviet Union, the Latin alphabet was reintroduced for writing and publishing in Azerbaijan and Uzbek. Similarly, Dungan (a variety of Chinese, or a Sinitic language), used in today’s Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan is written in Cyrillic, though its users in China employ the Chinese script for writing.

**Yiddishland** (יידישלאַנד), twentieth-century neologism, formed from “Yiddish” and “land.” The former stems from Middle High German *jūdisch Diutsch* “Jewish German,” and is cognate with the German adjective *jüdisch* “Jewish.” The noun “land” is shared with other Germanic languages, be it German *Land* or Swedish *land*—after the founding of ethnolinguistic nation-states across Central Europe in the wake of the Great War, the region’s (especially Yiddish-speaking Ashkenazic Jews found themselves to be “foreigners” in the countries of their birth, in towns and cities where they had lived for a millennium. In reply to this ethnolinguistic exclusion, which was highly anti-Semitic in its character, they developed political parties, schools, cultural foundations, and scholarly organizations, which successfully emulated all the aspects of a Jewish Yiddish-speaking ethnolinguistic nation-state (or Yiddishland), bar a central government and political frontiers. In addition, during the Great War the Hebrew
script-based Yiddish was recognized as an official language and medium of instruction in the German Empire’s semi-colony of Ober Ost (that is, in today’s Latvia, Lithuania and Belarus), and between 1924 and 1938 it was a co-official language in quadrilingual Soviet Belarus (alongside Belarusian, Polish, and Russian). During the Holocaust planned and carried out by wartime Germany, most of Central Europe’s Jews were exterminated. As a result, Yiddishland was also annihilated. The remnants of Yiddish-speaking Jews survived in the United States, and until 1991, especially in those parts of the Soviet Union that had not been under German occupation during World War Two. See also Romanistan.