Daniel Bunčić, Sandra L. Lippert, and Achim Rabus, eds., *Biscriptality: A Sociolinguistic Typology* (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter GmbH, 2016), 425 pp.

This comprehensive study on the typology of biscriptality occurring in different languages places the script in the foreground of linguistic research and thus finally abolishes the injustice done by the father of modern linguistics, Ferdinand de Saussure, to script and written communication. The book, which the principal author describes as a collective monograph, is based on the empirical evidence that "interactions of two or more writing systems within a single language are astonishingly widespread" (p. 5), but models describing this phenomenon and allowing comparison between different script communities are still missing. Consequently, the scope of the study is twofold: first, to apply well-established methods from sociolinguistics to as many empirical situations as possible in order to compile typological account of the use of more than one script within one language; and, second, to use this heuristic model "to analyse, compare and understand better even those situations not mentioned in this monograph" (p. 19) and thus to extend scientific debate on biscriptality within the broadest circle possible.

In the foreword, Bunčić explains in detail how this "collective monograph" came into existence. It was originally submitted as a habilitation thesis and, after a scientific conference dealing with this topic on an international and interdisciplinary level, Bunčić and other authors decided to publish the outcome as a formally edited volume, but as a collective monograph. Five out of the six chapters were written solely by Bunčić ("Introduction," "History of theoretical research on biscriptality," "A heuristic model for typology," "Diachronic observations," and "Conclusion"). In the fourth and longest chapter, consisting of case studies classified according to nine types of biscriptality from Slavic and non-Slavic languages, ten more authors contributed studies: Anastasia Antipova ("Scriptal pluricentricity in Catholic and Orthodox Belarusian"), Carmen Brandt ("Scriptal pluricentricity in Hindi-Urdu"), Ekaterina Kislova ("Diglyphia in Russian"), Henning Klöter ("Orthographic pluricentricity in Chinese"), Alexandra von Lieven ("Bigraphism in Egyptian"), Sandra L. Lippert ("Scriptal pluricentricity in Late Egyptian and Bigraphism in Egyptian"), Helma Pasch ("Scriptal pluricentricity in Africa and Bigraphism in Africa"), Achim Rabus ("Diglyphia in Russian, Bigraphism in Rusyn and Old Church Slavonic"), Jürgen Spitzmüller ("Biglyphism in German"), and Constanze Weth ("Biorthographism in Occitan").

The short and clear introduction, presenting the scope of the study and some basic concepts on terminology and conventions, is followed by an extensive overview of theoretical research on biscriptality. Although the concept of simultaneous use of more than one script for writing one language was known already before the emergence of sociolinguistics, as Bunčić briefly illustrates, only within the context of sociolinguistics was it possible to deal essentially with scripts and their various occurrences. Studies of writing and script have adopted not only standard sociolinguistic concepts based on the multilayered relationship between language and society and between language and communication, but also particular terms such as diglossia, bilingualism, code switching, and speech community, and adjusted them to the specific object under investigation. This adjustment is, however, not always unproblematic. The most ambiguous and simultaneously most used term within the scope of sociolinguistics of script has

been digraphia, which Bunčić attests to have been "invented" six times independently (p. 40). Moreover, various synonyms used in the scientific literature on writing and scripts—like bigraphism, biscriptalism, or bialphabetism—have not brought any clarity either to the general classification of the phenomena or to the description of concrete scripts. In addition, the system level of examination is sometimes not clearly defined; that is, the differentiation is often not clearly made between script (e.g., Cyrillic), writing system (e.g., the Japanese *kanji-kana* system using three scripts), and orthography (spelling rules and variations, e.g., using the Latin alphabet in writing Greek on the World Wide Web). This study has systematically amended these shortcomings.

Consequently, the third chapter presents "a two-dimensional model consisting of three sociolinguistic types of distribution (privative, equipollent and diasituative) and three affected graphematic levels (script, glyphic variant and orthography), resulting in **nine basic types of biscriptal language situations** [emphasis added by A.S.]" (p. 66): **digraphia** (e.g., Serbo-Croatian[1] in the Poljica region of Dalmatia in the Middle Ages, p. 82), **diglyphia** (e.g., distinction between the Old Cyrillic and civic types of Russian, or Japanese men's and women's writing styles, pp. 102ff.), **diorthographia** (e.g., Czech in early modern times, p. 140), **scriptal pluricentricity** (e.g., Hindi-Urdu and Serbo-Croatian since the mid-20th century, p. 180), **glyphic pluricentricity** (e.g., Orthodox, Muslim, and Catholic Cyrillic in Bosnia, p. 198), **orthographic pluricentricity** (e.g., Croatian in the 16th century, new Montenegrin orthography, English, German, pp. 209ff.), **bigraphism** (e.g., Serbo-Croatian after 1991, Rusyn, Ajami, and Latin for African languages, pp. 231ff.), **biglyphism** (e.g., blackletter and roman in German, p. 282) and, finally, **biorthographism** (e.g., Taraškevica and Narkamaŭka in Belarusian or Albanian at the beginning of the 20th century, pp. 314ff.).

In the following (fourth) and longest chapter (248 pages), the case studies listed above as examples in parentheses, and a few more, are discussed in detail, very often in both diachrony and synchrony, which explains the fact that some languages with their respective scripts appear in several categories of the proposed typological model. Each case study is accompanied by visual material: illustrations of artifacts depicting scripts, orthographies, and glyphic variants; tables; and overviews—128 figures in total. The authors give insights into more than a hundred instances of biscriptality, thus successfully overcoming "an all too Eurocentric bias" (p. 19), although two of the three editors are affiliated with Slavic philology. Nevertheless, one can note that special attention is given to Serbo-Croatian since this is the most prominent example of biscriptality in overall sociolinguistic research on script choice and use.

In the conclusion, Bunčić undertakes an evaluation of his heuristic model, pointing out also some problematic spots: for example, the graphematic categorization and differentiation between scripts and gylphic variants of the same script or between some differentiation factors classified as privative and equipollent, such as gender in Japanese and Chinese writing systems (pp. 335ff.). He concludes that pluricentricity is the most widespread form of biscriptality as it does not require individual biscriptality; that is, every member of the script community needs to know only one script. Some of

---

1 In the Introduction, Bunčić explains that Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian, and Montenegrin are considered national varieties of a single Serbo-Croatian language and, thus, he uses this glottonym for all of them throughout the book (p. 25).

his arguments in favor of bigraphism of Serbian—for instance, that all literal Serbs are biscriptal (p. 51)—are questionable if one considers differences in writing and reading practice as further variations within the sociolinguistics of script. Nevertheless, Bunčić et al. in this truly revolutionary work cover many aspects of the field that are particularly interesting for further research, not only on sociolinguistics of script but also on language policy and linguistic landscape, just to mention a few relevant research areas.

This invaluable study on biscriptality is complemented not only by an index of personal names but also by indexes of languages and writing systems that allow one to search for a specific language without having to already know its typological classification. This is one instance of the book's success in advancing comprehensive discussion of the global phenomenon of using more than one script.

ALEKSANDRA SALAMUROVIĆ