

THE BOTTOM-UP LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE OF BITOLA, REPUBLIC OF NORTH MACEDONIA

*Violeta Janusheva, Faculty of Education, St. Kliment Ohridski University
Republic of North Macedonia, violeta.januseva@uklo.edu.mk*

Original scientific paper

DOI: 10.31902/fil.48.2024.10

UDC: 811.111'27(497.7)

Abstract: The present study examines the bottom-up linguistic landscape (LL), specifically the shop names in Bitola, a city in North Macedonia. The aim is to comprehend the hierarchy of the written languages and their script, the role of the English language, and the extent to which these signs reflect the city's language repertoire and sociolinguistic vitality. Thus, using selective observation, numerous signs are collected, then further coded in a coding protocol, according to these variables, and analyzed, exploiting the interpretative-inductive method which leads to the development of ideas from the gathered data. The research results showcase the presence of several languages in Bitola's bottom-up LL, among which Macedonian and English have the same prevalence. However, the results suggest that the languages of signs do not indicate Bitola's sociolinguistic reality, considering that all of the ethnic communities' languages are not visible in the public arena, but rather represent linguistic resources that are made use of in the public space, thus demonstrating a symbolic reality. Furthermore, Bitola's non official LL confirmed the absolute English language dominance in the public sphere as well. In addition, this scrutiny manifests that in order to obtain a more accurate image of the LL, the origin of words and the Cyrillic transcription of foreign languages names have to be taken into account.

Key words: Bottom-up linguistic landscape, Bitola, Republic of North Macedonia

1. Introduction

The notion of a linguistic landscape (LL) is defined as the visibility of the written languages in a particular public sphere, which provides a comprehensive perspective of the written languages in that sphere and demonstrates their relative power and status (Landry and Bourhis 1997; BenRafael, Shohamy, Amara and Trumper-Hecht 2006; Gorthier 2007). It is a concept that has gained a great amount of attention and still keeps provoking research interest. This written apparentness is notably relevant because in order to provide its sustainability, the language has

to be represented in the LL (Edwards 2012).

In fact, the LL is seen as providing a new approach toward the multilingualism, with regard to globalization, to the extended presence of English, and to the revitalization of minority languages (Gorter 2007). English, increasingly used in the public sphere, has taken on the role of a global *lingua franca*, something that is, surely, related to social meanings, such as prestige, modernity and associations with English speaking countries (Backhaus 2006; Torkington 2009; Blommaert and Maly 2016). The presence or absence of a language in a given LL is a strong indicator of its status in the particular society and each language present in the LL has not only an informative, but a symbolic function as well (Landry and Bourhis 1997).

Signs in the LL may be divided into top-down signs, which are created by the government and adhere to the national or regional language policy and bottom-up signs, which are created by citizens (for example, by different shop owners), and which are more flexible in their language choice (Ben-Rafael et al. 2006; Backhaus 2006; Cenoz and Gorter 2006; Huebner 2006). There is a distinction between primary signs, which refer to the shops' name and type and secondary signs, which encompass other information, such as the opening hours, or special offers (Nikolaou 2016). It is well known that linguistic landscape signs do not accurately represent the sociolinguistic reality or the linguistic repertoire of a given community, but rather show the linguistic resources which are used in a public space (Backhaus 2006; Ben-Rafael, Shohamy, Hasan Amara, and Trumper-Hecht 2006). Besides, as stated by Shohamy (2006), the language existence or nonexistence in the LL is always related to the language policy and practice.

With this in mind, using selective observation, a coding protocol, and an inductive method of analysis, the current research examines the bottom up signs in Bitola, to discover the written languages and their script in relation to social scale, the position of English, and these signs' presence in the city's language repertoire as instances of linguistic diversity. This work is the second to examine a city in North Macedonia (the first considered Veles) and demonstrates its specific LL features which can indicate large scale instances of this issue and introduce new insights, thus contributing to the current LL discussion.

1.1. Background

Prior to its independence, the Republic of Macedonia was an integral part of the Socialistic Federative Republic of Yugoslavia. The official language of the state was Macedonian. In 1993, due to a dispute with Greece regarding its name, the state becomes a member of the

United Nations under the name of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, although it was recognized under its constitutional name by many countries. In 1991, after Yugoslavia broke apart, the state gained its independence and the first Constitution was enacted.

As a sovereign country, on a path towards the European Union, it encountered many setbacks, which compromised the state's name and its language. In 2018, the name of the state was changed to the Republic of North Macedonia.

Through the course of history, North Macedonia has always been known as a multi language and multiethnic society as it is a home not only to Macedonians but to other ethnic communities as well, among which the most numerous are the Albanians, the Turks, the Vlachs, the Serbs, and the Bosniaks, alongside many other foreign citizen groups (Census 2021).

1.2. The Law on Language Usage

According to the Law on Language Usage authorized in 2018, the official language on the whole territory is Macedonian, written in Cyrillic script (Article 1, Paragraph 1). However, this Law also states that any other language which is spoken by at least 20% of the population (for example, Albanian) and its script shall be recognised as an official language as well (Article 1, Paragraph 2). Therefore, North Macedonian is a partly diglossic society, given that in the country, there are municipalities where Albanian is an official language. As said in Paragraph 4 of Article 1, any languages which are spoken by less than 20% of the population of a municipality can be recognised, and their usage should be determined by the respective local self government units.

In agreement with Article 7, in municipalities in which at least 20% of the citizens speak an official language other than Macedonian, the institutions' names should be written in Macedonian and its Cyrillic script, in the language which is spoken by at least 20% of the population and its script and also in English. This article, further, specifies that the names should be written in the same size and font and the names in Macedonian should be written first.

In accordance with Article 16 Paragraph 1, in all units where at least 20% of the citizens speak a language other than Macedonian, the name of a street, square, bridge and other infrastructure should be written in Macedonian and its script, in the language spoken by at least 20% of the citizens and its script and in other languages generally accepted by the international community.

As seen from the background data above, the Law does not stipulates any requirement of code preferences regarding the names of

private shops, boutiques, markets, restaurants or other buildings or facilities.

The Government claims that this Law promotes the rights of all minority communities, that the Macedonian language remains the official language across the whole territory of the state and in its international relations, and that this Law does not derogate the Law on Macedonian Language Usage enacted in 1998, while pointing out that many unitary world states has two or more official languages. However, this Law has been criticized by opposition parties and many citizens believe that “Albanians have taken our language” or, even worse that “We have give our language to them”, arguing that the implementation of this Law will advance the use of Albanian over all the other languages in the state, meaning that the Macedonia’s integrity is jeopardized and that Macedonian language usage and protection are endangered.

1.3. The Cyrillic script

As seen from the Law’s stipulation (1.2.), in North Macedonia, the Cyrillic script is used in all of its territory. This causes a lot of difficulties, especially when there is a need to transfer words from foreign languages that use the Latin script into the Cyrillic script. In accordance with Macedonian language orthography (2017), all foreign language names should be transcribed into Macedonian using the Cyrillic script. Although transcription is defined differently worldwide and mostly its description does not differ from transliteration, these two terms should be distinguished. Translation simply means that the letters from one language are replaced with the letters of the other language. For instance, the Cyrillic script in the name of the city *Битола* will be transliterated into the Latin script as *Bitola*. However, transcription considers not only the letters’ change (from Cyrillic to Latin scripts), but includes the sounds’ pronunciation as well, meaning that the sounds from the foreign languages should be presented correctly as they are pronounced from the speaker. For example, following the English language pronunciation of *New York*, it will be transcribed as *Ньюјорк*. In this regard, the foreign languages names’ transcription in Cyrillic script may shed a light on the ongoing LL debate with respect to the represented languages.

1.4. The presence of English

The use of English in North Macedonia, has a long tradition and it is included in the primary, secondary, and higher education system as a compulsory subject. Further, besides its representation in the educational system, there is a wide spread practice of students of all

educational level and of mature citizens as well, taking courses in English at private schools to advance their proficiency. Indeed, many Macedonian linguists have shown the influence of English in Macedonian orthography, morphology, lexis, phraseology, and syntax (Janusheva and Jurukovska 2017; Janusheva, Ivanovska and Bosilkovska, 2018; Janusheva 2019; Janusheva 2020) and proposed solutions to avoid its impact, stating that this uncontrolled and unplanned entrance of English language words in the Macedonian language is not in accordance with the objective needs of Macedonian as a language (Janusheva 2015).

1.5. Bitola's specific features

Bitola, a city in the southwest of North Macedonia, has always been known as a relevant administrative, cultural, economic and educational center. It is called "the city of consuls" due to the fact that, here, European countries had their consular representatives during the Ottoman Empire. It is the third city in the Republic of North Macedonia in terms of population. In accordance to the State Statistical Office, on the last census in 2021, in Bitola there are 80.96% Macedonians, 5.34% Albanians, 1.40% Turks, 3.28% Romas, 1.41% Vlachs, 0.43% Serbians, and 0.06% Bosniaks. 0.91% of the population is formed of other non mentioned nationalities, of which 0.03% are those who do not declare their nationality, 0.06% are from unknown nationality and 6.11% are individuals whose data is taken from administrative sources.

One of the Bitola's specific features is that it is a city recognized by the fact that numerous of its citizens migrated abroad in the past, to countries, such as Australia, the USA and Canada, and Sweden as well. Nowadays, countless young people move to other European countries, mostly Germany. Still, each summer most of them return to the city on a regular basis. In addition, Bitola is located near the border with Greece and therefore, many Greek citizens visit the city, in particular, the market, cosmetic and hair studios, and dentist surgeries as well.

2. The broader research context

So far, all over the world, an immense body of research has concentrated on the LL of a range of cities and examined their top down or bottom up signs, approaching them from different standpoints. Some direct their attention to the interaction between the meaning in the text and the meanings available to the reader from his own cultural context (Lock 2003, Hong Kong Mass Transit Railway). Others address the signs in terms of power and solidarity, code mixing and language contact (Backhaus 2006, Tokyo; Huebner 2006, Bangkok; Bruyèl-Olmedo and Juan-Garau 2009, S'Arenal; Bharadwaj and Shukla 2018, Tezpur),

emphasizing the role of English as a *lingua franca* and the English language impact in the orthography, lexical borrowings, pronunciation, and syntax, which lead to new varieties of English. There are studies which see the LL as a symbolic construction of the public space in which English is a second or additional language in all areas of life (Ben-Rafael, Shohamy, Amara and Trumper-Hecht 2006, East Jerusalem; Lyons and Rodríguez-Ordóñez 2015, Chicago) and which relate the LL to language policy (Jingjing 2013, Beijing). There are also inquiries related to the informative and symbolic function of the signs, to the correct sign translation into English which may affect the city's image (Zeng and Luo 2019, Shenzhen), and to moderate English language presence as well (Ujvari 2021, Huwwara).

A vast amount of research examines shop front signs, revealing the relationship between language use and business type, the strategies deployed by the shop owner to identify and distinguish themselves, the shop owners reasons for choosing a particular language, the errors in the translation of bilingual shop signs, the word formation processes, the visibility of immigrant languages and the significant presence of English in them to attract consumers' attention, due to its associations with globalization and prestige (Dimova 2007, Veles; Coluzzi 2009, Milan and Udine; Bogatto and Hélot 2010, Strasbourg; Kasanga 2012, Phnom Penh; Amer and Obeidat, 2014, Aqaba City; Al-Athwary 2014, Sana; Coluzzi 2016, Kuala Lumpur; Shang and Guo 2017, Singapore; Lipovski 2019, Belleville; Ben Said 2019, Tunisia; Mohebbi and Firoozkahi 2021, Teheran; Qudeisat and Rababah 2021, Irbid; Alotaibi and Alamri 2022, Riyadh and Jeddah).

All these diverse perspectives indicate that various languages are present in a given public context. Despite the fact that there are monolingual language signs in these cities' LLs, which, primarily, concern the official language/s of the particular city, and regardless of the fact that in rare cases English has a moderate role, these studies confirm that majority of the signs are bilingual, trilingual, or multilingual encompassing the English language which illustrates English language dominance over the regional languages and adds a cosmopolitan air to the cities.

3. Methodology

The current research is not an exhaustive study of Bitola' LL, it rather accepts Huebner's (2006) view and aims to show its language heterogeneity. It reveals the written languages hierarchy (code preference), the function of English, these signs manifestation of the city's complex language repertoire, and these signs reflection on the

Government policy of promoting and protecting the standard Macedonian language and of promoting all languages spoken on its territory as well. The signs were collected through selective observation (Merriam 1998) of the non official signs all over the city and a coding protocol has been developed (Crabtree and Miller 1999). The protocol contains four variables (the language and the script used on the sign, i.e. The code preference and language patterns, English language representation, the extent to which these signs reflects the sociolinguistic reality, and the relationship between the government policy of raising the awareness for the Macedonian language endorsement and for the support of the other languages as well). The analysis rests upon the interpretative-inductive method, exploited, among others, by Kahlke (2016) and Harding and Whitehead (2016) who stress the inductive thinking which leads to generating ideas from the collected data. Following Backhaus (2006) the unit of this analysis is any piece of information “within a spatially definable frame”.

4. Results, analysis, and discussion

What follows are the results, their analysis and a discussion. The results showcase that in Bitola, there are various shop signs, regarding the language they exploit. The script is given in the exact form on the shop front.

4.1. Monolingual signs

Macedonian (Cyrillic script): БУТИК ЗА АЛКОХОЛ [Alcohol boutique]; КНИЖАРНИЦА [Bookstore].

Macedonian (Latin script): FRIZERSKO STUDIO [Hair studio]; IGNACIA NAJGOLEM IZBOR NA LAMINAT I VRATI [The biggest choice of laminate and doors].

English (Latin script): MY PET SHOP; COMPUTERS, Slot club.

Italian (Latin script): Fresco.

4.1.1. Dilemmas regarding the words’ origin (Monolingual, bilingual, or trilingual signs)

English or French + English: BOULEVARD KITCHEN.

English + English or French: Fancy boutique.

English, French or Italian + English, French or Italian: M Studio hair salon.

4.1.2. Dilemmas regarding the transcription (Monolingual or bilingual signs)

Macedonian (Cyrillic script – transcription from the Italian):

БАМБИНИ [Bambini], Ти амо [Ti amo].

Macedonian (Cyrillic script) + English (transcribed into Macedonian in Cyrillic script): ПРОДАЖБА И СЕРВИСИРАЊЕ НА МОБИЛНИ ТЕЛЕФОНИ КОНЕКТ [Selling and servicing mobile phones Connect]; БУТИК ЗА ДЕЦА ПРИНЦЕС [Kids boutique Princess].

Macedonian [Cyrillic scripts] + German (transcribed into Macedonian in Cyrillic script): БОИ И ЛАКОВИ ШВАРЦ [Colours and varnishes Schwarz].

Macedonian (Cyrillic script) + Greek (transcribed into Macedonian in Cyrillic script): ЗЕМЈОДЕЛСКА АПТЕКА [Agricultural pharmacy] ГЕОРГИКА ФАРМАКА < Γεωργικά Φάρμακα.

4.2. Bilingual signs (Cyrillic + Latin script)

Macedonian (Cyrillic script) + English (Latin script): ЗЛАТНА КОПАЧКА [Gold cleat] ВЕТ & GET; БЕРБЕР [Barber] GOOD FELLAS BARBER SHOP; РИБАРНИЦА [Fish store] Big Fish.

English (Latin script) + Macedonian (Cyrillic script): FLEX CREDIT ПАРИ ЗА СЕКОГО [Money for all]; МАХВЕТ Животот е игра [Life is a game].

4.3. Bilingual signs (Latin script)

Macedonian (Latin script) + English: Frizersko Kozmeticko Studio [Hair and cosmetic studio] UNIQUE; ZLATARA [Jewelry store] Only for you.

Macedonian (Latin script) + English (transcribed into Macedonian but given in Latin script): ALFA ELEKTRONIK.

Italian + English: Bella Clothing brand, Belleza nails and beauty.

French + English or French: NOIR BY DE LUXE ART beauty shop.

4.4. Signs in mixed script (Cyrillic and Latin): ФИЛИП [Philip].

Noticeably, in the monolingual group signs (4.1.), both Macedonian (Cyrillic script) and English (Latin script) have almost the same prevalence. With respect to the Macedonian monolingual signs, this situation is as expected, considering that these signs are usually the ones containing the official languages, for instance, Macedonian in Veles, French in Strasbourg, Roman in Milan and Udine, or Arab in Aquaba (Dimova 2007; Bogatto and Hélot 2010; Amer and Obeidat 2014).

Besides the fact that the Law on the Use of Languages does not impose rules for the private shop names with regard to the languages that should be represented in them, it appears that commonly what has been recommended for the top-bottom signs in Article 7 (languages that should be used on institutions' names in municipalities where at least

20 % of the citizens speak other languages than Macedonian, referring only to Albanian) is accepted for the private signs as well. Consider that, according to the Census (2021), Bitola does not have at least 20 % of the population, who speak other language than Macedonian, the Macedonian language usage in these signs reflects this article's content. Furthermore, these signs demonstrate that for the majority of the shop owners, Macedonian is the preferred code and this choice reflects the government strategies to promote and upgrade the Macedonian language in each area of life and society.

However, English signs have the same prominence and this is not a surprise knowing the role of English as a *lingua franca* and the desire for the creation of an overseas atmosphere (Backhaus 2006; Shang and Guo 2017; Bharadwaj and Shukla 2018). This also relates to the shop owners care to address the needs of all customers, especially those Macedonians who visit Bitola in the summer and who come from different states. Of course, these Macedonians speak the Macedonian language, but the English language use shows that the shop owners follow the current trend, that they are modern and not far away from what these citizens experience in foreign countries. Therefore, these results showcase no difference regarding the other cities' LL which display the English language presence (Grbavac 2013; Amer and Obeidat 2014). Given that many citizens who live just across the border in Greece come to the city on a regular basis, mostly on Tuesdays and Fridays when the open market is full of people from the city and neighboring villages, obviously the English language has not only a symbolic, but an informative function as well. However, consider that there is no English language community in Bitola, the English language usage cannot be interpreted as an expression of solidarity (Backhaus 2006).

What surprises the most is the presence of Italian, bearing in mind that there is no Italian community in Bitola. This can be explained only by the prestige Italy has in the areas of fashion and cuisine.

As it can be discerned (4.1.1.), the signs contain the words: boulevard, boutique, studio, and salon and their Latin script. When attempting to determine the language used in them, one cannot tell which language is in question, considering that the words *boulevard* and *boutique* are written identically in Latin script in English and French, and that the words *studio* and *salon* are written identically in Latin script in English, French, and Italian. Thus, which language is represented on these signs? This imposes the inference that in order to get more accurate image on the languages in the public space, the words' origin have to be considered. According to Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, all three words originate from French, and the word *studio* originates

from Italian. If this is taken into account, then, in this particular case, the two signs would be bilingual: French + English > *Boulevard Kitchen*; English + French > *Fancy boutique* and the third would be trilingual > Italian + English + French > *M Studio hair salon*. However, the shop owners' awareness of the words' origin has to be further examined in order to depict their code choice.

The majority of the signs are transcribed from several foreign languages which use the Latin script into Macedonian in the Cyrillic script (4.1.2). The transcription in Cyrillic script is prescribed in Macedonian orthography, and hence, these signs are in accordance with that Orthography (2017), showing the shop owners' inclination towards the Macedonian language and its Cyrillic script, and contributing to their preservation and promotion.

Nevertheless, from the LL perspective, the transcription into Cyrillic script leads to some difficulties regarding the languages present in the Bitola's LL. Here, one cannot be sure whether the signs should be treated as monolingual or as bilingual as well. The script is Cyrillic indeed; still the words are from foreign languages. Accordingly, the logic goes in favor of the view that despite the Cyrillic script, the words are still foreign and thus, these signs should be treated as bilingual. In case when the transcription refers only to one language, such as the instance *Tu amo < Ti amo* (Italian), the signs should be recognized as monolingual ones. In relation to German, it can only be assumed that the color (Schwarz) is chosen coincidentally, bearing in mind that the shop sells colors and varnishes. The Greek language presence is motivated by the market and potential customers: it is not a secret that many of the shop products are cheaper in Bitola than in Greece.

A great number of the bilingual signs (4.2.) display the same Macedonian and English language occurrence, which indicates the shop owners' affection towards the mother tongue using the Cyrillic script, which shapes their identity as Macedonians and the English language using the Latin script, which brings them closer to Western culture and its values.

In the next group of bilingual signs (4.3.), the same affinity towards the Macedonian and English language can be observed. The only difference is that the Macedonian Cyrillic script is replaced by the Latin script, i.e. the shop names is written in the Latin script. It should be mentioned that using the Latin script in North Macedonia is prescribed in Macedonian orthography (2017) but only in official written forms, such as names, road signs, companies, plates and so on. There are strict rules and each Macedonian Cyrillic letter has its Latin counterpart. Given that these signs are not official, the Latin script should not be used.

However, its appearance can only be explained by the shop owners' aspirations to be more visible and identified. These instances contain a lot of errors in all language segments, which can be further used in the teaching and learning processes. The existence of both French and Italian demonstrates the shop owners' tendency to be in line with the world trends given that France and Italy are the masters of the fashion and cuisine.

The last group (4.3.) represents those signs which consist of mixed script (Cyrillic and Latin) in the same name, indicating the shop owners' creativity and wish to be differentiated among others and to attract the attention.

Following the results from the analyses, it can be confirmed that the Macedonian language is widely expressed in the LL of Bitola, thus presenting its stability, steadiness, and cohesion (Edwards 2012). Besides the function of informing, the Macedonian language on these signs has a symbolic function as well, specifying its sizeable reputation, thus suggesting the Macedonian speakers' dominance over the languages of the other ethnic communities who live in the city (Landry and Bourhis 1997) and the consciousness of their identity. At the same time, this LL illustrates the increased usage of the English language, which verifies its social significance and its associations with Western culture and values. This expanded English language superiority is also seen in a substantial amount of previous research, showcasing its prominence as a *lingua franca* worldwide and its connection with respect and admirations toward the advantages it brings (Backhaus 2006; Huebner 2006; Bruyèl-Olmedo and Juan-Garau 2009; Torkington 2009; Blommaert and Maly 2016; Bharadwaj and Shukla 2018). However, this LL does not contribute to the visibility and the identity of the other ethnic communities' languages in Bitola, and hence, their absence indicates their inferiority and their lower status in relation to the Macedonian language. This Macedonian language presence and the absence of the other languages in the LL of Bitola, surely, reflect the Macedonian Government's language policy (Shohamy, 2006; Jingjing 2013). In addition, the LL in Bitola asserts that these signs are illustration not of whole linguistic repertoire in Bitola, but rather of the linguistic resources which are used in a public space (Backhaus 2006; Ben-Rafael, Shohamy, Hasan Amara, and Trumper-Hecht, 2006).

In spite of the fact that the research outcomes, regarding the LL of Bitola, showcase no dissimilarity with various other explored cities, the findings reveal some fresh insights which may be useful in the novel research on this topic. In particular, it appears that word origin has to be taken into account when determining the languages present in the

public signs, given that many foreign words are written identically in two or three languages (*boulevard* is written the same in English and in French, but its origins are French). Accordingly, the French language should be taken into account in such signs and not the English one. In particular, this refers to the languages which use Cyrillic script, just as Macedonian does.

Furthermore, the transcription of the foreign names into Cyrillic script introduces a new understanding of this subject. As shown above (4.1.3.), the transcription showcases certain dilemmas when deciding on the languages presented in the LL as well. The names are foreign, yet the script is Cyrillic; thus, the argumentation supports the view that in such cases, even if the signs are written in Cyrillic script, they should be treated as monolingual, as in the example *Tu amo < Ti amo* (Italian), or bilingual, as in the example *БУТИК ЗА ДЕЦА ПРИНЦЕС < Kids' boutique Princess* (Macedonian and English).

5. Conclusion

The LL of Bitola demonstrates the presence of various languages, among which, Macedonian and English have the same prevalence. Macedonian language usage suggests the shop owners' inclination toward their mother tongue and its Cyrillic script, which is connected to their identity and reflects the Government policy for the promotion and protection of the language. English language usage indicates the shop owners' desire to show prestige and modernity, and confirms its status as a global *lingua franca*. Both languages have an informative and a symbolic function. In terms of the appearance of French and Italian, it points out to the shop owners' affection towards foreign fashion and cuisine trends as well. In With regards to German, it seems that its use is accidental, while the use of Greek is motivated by commercial considerations. However, this use of foreign languages is not an articulation of solidarity in any of the cases.

Hence, it is obvious that this LL does not advance the languages of the other ethnic communities who live in Bitola, primarily the Albanians, and then the Turks, Vlachs, Serbians and Bosniaks, given that these languages are totally absent from the shop names. Accordingly, the LL of Bitola manifests the dominance of Macedonian and other foreign languages over the languages spoken by the ethnic communities present in Bitola, meaning that this LL does not mirror the city's language repertoire, that is its sociolinguistic vitality, but rather represents a symbolic reality. In this sense, if we want the LL in Bitola to reflect the sociolinguistic vitality of the city, necessary steps regarding the language policy should be undertaken.

With respect to these findings, the research suggests that two novel aspects have to be considered when examining the LL of cities. Firstly, when determining the languages present in an LL, the origin of words has to be examined, and secondly, the transcription from foreign languages using the Latin script into the Cyrillic script has to be observed. Bearing this in mind means the LL provides a more precise and authentic picture of the various languages representation.

References:

- Alotaibi, J. Wafa, and Alamri, Ohoud. "Linguistic Landscape of Bilingual Shop Signs in Saudi Arabia". *Arab World English Journal* 13.1 (2022): 426-49. Doi: 10.24093/awej/vol13no1.28. <https://tinyurl.com/37t796ed>. 13 April 2023.
- Al-Athwary, H. A. Anwar. "Translating Shop Signs into English in Sana'a's Streets: A Linguistic Analysis". *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 4.12 (2014): 140-56. <https://bit.ly/3qVekA9>. 15 April 2023.
- Amer, Faten, and Obeidat, Rasha. "Linguistic Landscape: A Case Study of Shop Signs in Aqaba City, Jordan". *Asian Social Science* 10.18 (2014): 246-52. Doi: 10.5539/ass.v10n18p246. <https://tinyurl.com/2vmzhp4t>. 14 March 2023.
- Backhaus, Peter. "Multilingualism in Tokyo: A Look into the Linguistic Landscape". *International Journal of Multilingualism* 3 (2006): 52-66. Doi: 10.1080/14790710608668385. <https://bit.ly/3CBU6Om>. 10 January 2023.
- Ben-Rafael, Eliezer, Shohamy, Elana, Amara, M. Hasan, and Trumper-Hecht, Nira. "Linguistic landscape as symbolic construction of the public space: The case of Israel". *Linguistic landscape: A new approach to multilingualism*. Ed. Durk Gorter. Multilingual Matters Ltd: Great Britain, 2006. 52-66. <https://tinyurl.com/58cj9h2t>. 11 January 2023.
- Ben Said, Selim. "Representations of Multilingualism in Urban Space: An Analysis of the Linguistic Landscape of Tunisia". *Jadavpur Journal of Languages and Linguistics* 3.1 (2019): 55-66. <https://tinyurl.com/bddu5nzj>. 14 March 2023.
- Bharadwaj, Samhita, and Shukla, Priyanka. "Linguistic Landscaping in North-East India: A Case Study of Tezpur Town in Assam". *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics* 44. 1-2 (2018): 83-112. <https://tinyurl.com/2ue9zv3r>. 23 April 2023.
- Blommaert, Jan, and Maly, Ico. "Ethnographic linguistic landscape analysis and social change: A case study". *Language and Superdiversity*. Eds. Arnaut Karel, Blommaert Jan, Rampton Ben, and Spotti Massimiliano. Routledge: New York, 2016. <https://bit.ly/3NHlyzC>. 16 January 2023.
- Bogatto, François & Hélot, Christine. "Linguistic Landscape and Language Diversity in Strasbourg: The « Quartier Gare »". *Linguistic Landscape In The City*. Eds. Elana Shohamy, Eliezer Ben-Rafael and Monica Barni. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. 2010. 275-91.
- Bruyèl-Olmedo, Antonio and Juan-Garau, Maria. "English as a Lingua Franca in the Linguistic Landscape of the Multilingual Resort of S'Arenal in Mallorca". *International Journal of Multilingualism* 6.4 (2009): 386-411. Doi:

- 10.1080/14790710903125010. <https://tinyurl.com/53pknyvc>. 17 January 2023.
- Cenoz, Jasone, and Gorter, Durk. "Linguistic Landscape and Minority Languages". *International Journal on Multilingualism* 3.1 (2006): 67-80. Doi: 10.1080/14790710608668386. <https://tinyurl.com/32vps75u>. 21 February 2023.
- Census. (2021). Republic of North Macedonia State Statistical Office. <https://tinyurl.com/36k9xfh2>. 28 January 2023.
- Coluzzi, Paolo. "Italian in the Linguistic Landscape of Kuala Lumpur (Malaysia)". *International Journal of Multilingualism* 14.2 (2016): 1-15. Doi: 10.1080/14790718.2016.1151883. <https://bit.ly/43RjlyX>. 16 May 2023.
- Coluzzi, Paolo. "The Italian Linguistic Landscape: The Cases of Milan and Udine". *International Journal of Multilingualism* 5.3 (2009) 298-321. Doi: 10.1080/14790710902935930. <https://tinyurl.com/yc63z9bh>. 18 March 2023.
- Dimova, Slobodanka. "English Shop Signs in Macedonia". *English Today* 23.3-4 (2007): 18-24. Doi: 10.1017/S0266078407003057. <https://bit.ly/46n7pjs>. 25 February 2023.
- Edwards, John. *Minority Languages and Group Identity: Cases and Categories*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 2010.
- Gorter, Durk. "The Linguistic Landscape in Rome: Aspects of Multilingualism and Diversity". *Working Paper of the IPRS (Istituto Psicoanalitico per le Ricerche Sociale), Roma*. Fryske Akademy/Universiteit van Amsterdam: The Netherlands. 2007. <https://tinyurl.com/yymx7b87>. 18 March 2023.
- Grbavac, Ivana. "Linguistic Landscape in Mostar". *Jezikoslovlje* 14.2-3 (2013): 501-15. <https://tinyurl.com/4p5kehza>. 23 May 2023.
- Huebner, Thom. "Bangkok's Linguistic Landscapes: Environmental Print, Codemixing and Language Change". *Linguistic landscape: A new approach to multilingualism*. Ed. Durk Gorter. Multilingual Matters Ltd: Great Britain, 2006. 31-51. <https://tinyurl.com/58cj9h2t>. 11 January 2023.
- Janusheva, Violeta. "Substitution of International Words with Domestic words in Macedonian standard Language". *Horizons* 17 (2015): 209-18.
- Janusheva, Violeta, and Jurukovska, Jana. "Phraseological Expression in the Macedonian and the English Language (Comparative Insights)". *International Journal of Language Academy* 14.5.1. (2017): 410-25 doi: 10.18033/ijla.3495
- Janusheva, Violeta, Ivanovska, Aleksandra, and Bosilkovska, Stela. "The Orthography of the Compound Nouns in the Macedonian and the English Language". *International Journal of Education "Teacher"* 18 (2018): 18-26. Doi: 10.20544/teacher16.02.
- Janusheva, Violeta. "The Features of the Macedonian Standard Language in the Journalistic Sub Style (Columns)". *Thesis* 8.2 (2019): 277-93.
- Janusheva, Violeta, and Ivanovska, Aleksandra. (2020). "Solid/Closed Compound Nouns Orthography (English vs Macedonian)". *International Journal of Education "Teacher"* 20 (2020): 5-15.
- Jingjing, Wang. "Linguistic Landscape of China: A Case Study of Shop Signs in

- Beijing". *Studies in Literature and Language* 6.1 (2013): 40-7. Doi: 10.3968/j.sll.1923156320130601.1449. <https://bit.ly/3CxG4NM>. 12 February 2023.
- Kasanga, L. Adrien. (2012). "Mapping the Linguistic Landscape of a Commercial Neighbourhood in Central Phnom Penh". *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 33.6 (2012): 553-67. Doi: 10.1080/01434632.2012.683529. <https://bit.ly/465m6rj> 22 March.
- Landry, Rodrigue, and Bourhis, Y. Richard. "Linguistic Landscape and Ethnolinguistic Vitality: An Empirical Study". *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 16.1 (1997): 23-49. Doi: 10.1177/0261927X970161002. <https://tinyurl.com/mw58wmzx>. 10 January 2023.
- Lipovsky, Caroline. (2019) "Belleville's Linguistic Heterogeneity Viewed from Its Landscape". *International Journal of Multilingualism* 16.3 (2019): 244-69. Doi: 10.1080/14790718.2018.1439494. <https://tinyurl.com/2rdp2mv3>. 13 May 2023.
- Lock, Graham. "Being International, Local and Chinese: Advertisements on the Hong Kong Mass Transit Railway". *Visual Communication* 2.2 (2003): 195-214. Doi: 10.1177/1470357203002002005, <https://bit.ly/42OCXMB>. 25 February 2023.
- Lyons, Kate, and Rodríguez-Ordóñez, Itxaso. "Public legacies: Spanish-English (in)authenticity in the linguistic landscape of Pilsen, Chicago". *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 21.2 (2015). <https://bit.ly/43K6MP9>. 20 May 2023.
- Mohebbi, Ahmadreza and Firoozkohi, F. Amirhossein. "A typological investigation of errors in the use of English in the bilingual and multilingual linguistic landscape of Tehran". *International Journal of Multilingualism* 18.1 (2019): 24-40. Doi: 10.1080/14790718.2019.1582657. <https://tinyurl.com/4vzz8ct4>. 13.6.2023.
- Orthography of the Macedonian language. (2017). <https://tinyurl.com/585st6ft>.
- Qudeisat, Lana, and Rababah, Luqman. "A Linguistic Landscape Study Of Shop Signs In The Northern Part Of Jordan". *Multicultural Education*, 7.11 (2021): 538-48. Doi: 10.5281/zenodo.5759974. <https://tinyurl.com/yc3b5hst>. 18 March 2023.
- Shang, Guowen, and Guo, Libo. "Linguistic Landscape in Singapore: What Shop Names Reveal about Singapore's Multilingualism". *International Journal of Multilingualism* 14.2 (2017): 183-201. Doi: 10.1080/14790718.2016.1218497. <https://bit.ly/3Pewffa>. 21 March 2023.
- Shohamy, Elana. *Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and New Approaches*. London: Routledge. 2006. <https://tinyurl.com/2e9dh4ve>. 25 January 2023.
- Torkington, Kate. "Exploring the Linguistic Landscape: the case of the 'Golden Triangle' in the Algarve, Portugal". *Papers from the Lancaster University Postgraduate Conference in Linguistics & Language Teaching* 3 (2009): 122-45. Eds. Steve Disney, Bernhard Forchtner, Wesam Ibrahim and Neil Miller. <https://bit.ly/447wjBF>. 13 February 2023.

- Ujvari, M. Montaser. "The Linguistic Landscape of Palestinian C Towns: The Case of Shop Signs in Huwwara". *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation* 4.4 (2021): 160-71. Doi: 10.32996/ijllt.2021.4.4.17. <https://tinyurl.com/y654cv8h>. 22 March 2023.
- Zakon za upotreba na jazicite [Law for languages usage]. <https://tinyurl.com/3cfkh63d>. 26 February 2023.
- Zeng, Wenxia, and Luo, Jing. "The Influence of Linguistic Landscape on the Image of Shenzhen". *Open Journal of Social Sciences* 7 (2019): 112-25. Doi: 10.4236/jss.2019.73008. <https://tinyurl.com/rxdp4zck>. 25 February 2023.

RESÜMEE: DIE LINGUISTISCHE SPRACHLANDSCHAFT IN BITOLA, REPUBLIK NORDEN MAZEDONIEN

Diese Forschung erarbeitet den Boden der Sprachlandschaft u.a. die Namen der Geschäfte in Bitola, eine Stadt in Republik Norden Mazedonien, in Beziehung der Hierarchie der schriftlichen Sprachen und deren Transkription, die Rolle der englischen Sprache, und wie sich diese Zeichen auf den Stadtspracherepertoire reflektieren, u.a. sociolinguistische Vitalität. Durch Benutzung von einer selektive Observation, eine große Zahl von Zeichen sind gesammelt, dann kodiert in einem Kodierungsprotokoll, in Beziehung mit den oben genannten Variablen, dann sind sie mit dem interpretativ-induktiven Method analysiert, und von den Angaben haben sich verschiedene Ideen erstellt. Die Forschung resultiert mit der Anwesenheit von mehreren Sprachen in Bitolas Sprachlandschaft, aber die mazedonische und die englische Sprache sind am meisten benutzt. Die Resultaten zeigen dass die Zeichensprache nicht Bitolas sociolinguistische Realität indiziert. Das heißt dass man alle ethnische Gemeinschaftsprachen in die Öffentlichkeit nicht sehen kann, aber sie representieren die linguistische Quellen die in die Öffentlichkeit benutzt werden mit dem demonstrieren von einer symbolischen Realität. Noch mehr die nicht offizielle Sprachlandschaft bestätigt die absolute Dominanz der englischen Sprache in der Öffentlichkeit. Als Beitrag, diese Forschung manifestiert dass um Ziel den Image der Sprachlandschaft zu behalten, müssen die offiziellen Wörter und die kyrillische Schrift in Sicht genommen werden.

Keywords: Linguistische Sprachlandschaft, Bitola, Republik Norden Mazedonien