DANIEL BUNČIĆ
SANDRA L. LIPPERT
ACHIM RABUS
(Eds.)

AKADEMIE-
KONFERENZEN

Biscriptality

A sociolinguistic typology

24

Universitätsverlag
WINTER
Heidelberg

AKADEMIEKONFERENZEN

Band 24

DANIEL BUNČIĆ

Biscriptality

A sociolinguistic typology

Edited by
DANIEL BUNČIĆ
SANDRA L. LIPPERT · ACHIM RABUS

with contributions by
Anastasia Antipova · Carmen Brandt
Ekaterina Kislova · Henning Klöter
Alexandra von Lieven · Sandra L. Lippert
Helma Pasch · Achim Rabus
Jürgen Spitzmüller · Constanze Weth

on behalf of the
Heidelberg Academy of Sciences and Humanities,
the State Academy of Baden-Württemberg

Universitätsverlag
WINTER
Heidelberg

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation
in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie;
detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet
über *http://dnb.d-nb.de* abrufbar.

Dieser Band wurde mit Mitteln des Ministeriums
für Wissenschaft, Forschung und Kunst
des Landes Baden-Württemberg gefördert.

COVER ILLUSTRATION

Street name signs in Novi Sad (Serbia),
displaying the name of one street (Zmaj Jova Street) in Cyrillic
and the name of another (Laza Telečki Street) in Latin letters –
but both in the same language
(photo taken by Daniel Bunčić in September 2008;
cf. fig. 77 on p. 238)

ISBN 978-3-8253-6625-4

Imprimé en Allemagne · Printed in Germany
Druck: Memminger MedienCentrum, 87700 Memmingen

Gedruckt auf umweltfreundlichem, chlorfrei gebleichtem
und alterungsbeständigem Papier.

Den Verlag erreichen Sie im Internet unter
www.winter-verlag.de

Foreword by Daniel Bunčić

This book is the work of many. It received its final shape through the joint efforts of its three editors as well as all its authors, but it is probably up to me to tell its long and rather complicated story. The initial idea was inspired by a guest lecture about "The two-script culture in the Norwegian Middle Ages", which Terje Spurkland from Oslo gave in Tübingen on 20 November 2008. When reading the announcement I had expected the linguistic situation in medieval Norway, where people used both Latin letters and runes, to be somewhat similar to the one in Serbia and Montenegro, where two scripts are still in use today, Latin and Cyrillic. During the talk I noticed rather more similarities to the situation in medieval Novgorod, where two orthographies were in parallel use, one for formal texts written on parchment and another one for letters written on birch bark. In the end I had to acknowledge that Scandinavia, Serbia and Novgorod are examples of three distinct phenomena exhibiting intriguing similarities but also telling differences. Trying to find more information on sociolinguistic situations like these in the scholarly literature, I found out that interactions of two or more writing systems within a single language are astonishingly widespread but that – although there is a certain amount of sociolinguistic studies on them – there are virtually no models or classifications for describing them. So I decided to devise something myself, which was first meant as a journal article and then gradually grew into a book. In expanding my initial idea into a full-fledged research project I was encouraged by Aleksandr Duličenko's observation that at least for the Slavic languages a monograph on this subject constituted an urgent desideratum:

> La problème du changement des alphabets (des systèmes graphiques) et des doubles alphabets dans les langues slaves orientales et dans les langues slaves en général a une histoire déjà ancienne et mériterait de faire l'objet d'une monographie spécialisée. (Duličenko 2001: 171)

> Проблема смены алфавитов (resp. графических систем) и двуалфавитности в восточнославянских и в славянских языках в целом имеет давнюю историю и давно заслуживает специальной монографии. (Duličenko 2009: 122)

> The problem of the change of alphabets (or graphical systems) and of bialphabetism in the East Slavic languages and the Slavic languages in general has a long history and has long deserved a special monograph.

The same applies to the phenomenon of biscriptality on a more general scale. Although three and a half decades ago Dale (1980: 13) called the study of socie-

tal influences on the choice of script "highly relevant" and biscriptality in this context "particularly interesting", according to Unseth (2005: 19) this is still "a neglected area within sociolinguistics".

On 15 September 2011 I submitted my book to the Faculty of Humanities of Tübingen University under the title "Biscriptality in Slavic and non-Slavic languages: A sociolinguistic typology". It was formally accepted as a habilitation thesis in Slavic linguistics on 1 February 2012.

From 18 to 20 September 2011 the international and interdisciplinary conference "Biscriptality – sociolinguistic and cultural scenarios" took place in Heidelberg (cf. Bunčić, Lippert & Rabus 2012). It was organized by Sandra Lippert, Achim Rabus and myself and sponsored by the Heidelberg Academy of Sciences and Humanities. During the conference it was decided that instead of an ordinary collection of papers we would publish a collective monograph on the basis of my thesis. (Had we only known how much more work that would be.)

Of the participants of the conference apart from the organizers, which also edited the present volume, Anastasia Antipova, Carmen Brandt, Ekaterina Kislova, Henning Klöter, Alexandra von Lieven, Helma Pasch and Jürgen Spitzmüller contributed chapters to this book. Others gave inspiring talks, which have left their traces on this book even though for various reasons they could not directly participate in writing it: Sandra Birzer talked about "Sociolinguistic specificities of Russian transliterated e-mail messages", Marina Bobrik about "Language varieties and orthographic systems in ancient Novgorod" ("Sprachliche Idiome und orthographische Systeme im alten Novgorod", presentation prepared together with Aleksej Gippius), Yukiyo Kasai about "Multiscriptality in Old Turkish – Relationship between scripts and religions", Ihar Klimaŭ about "Taraškevica vs. Narkamaŭka – the case of a bicultural conflict in Belarusian and in Belarus" and Paul Rössler about "Variants in contemporary German orthography and their status in print media" (he also commented on section 4.6.4 of the book). Barbara Sonnenhauser asked whether "Crimean Tatars return to Latin?", and the title of Terje Spurkland's talk was "Runes and Roman script in medieval Scandinavia – complementary entities or cross-over phenomena?". Wolfgang Raible gave valuable advice as the mentor of the conference. Later, Constanze Weth kindly agreed to write a chapter on Occitan for this book.

In the course of the year 2012 the editors of the collective monograph received most of the contributions. However, at the same time I unexpectedly became a substitute for the chair of Slavic linguistics at Cologne University, which resulted in a considerable lack of time for this book. It is almost exclusively due to this that the present volume could not be printed in 2012 or early 2013 but took much longer. My apologies to all those who have been waiting so long for this book to be finally published – and to the editors' families and

friends for all the time we spent with our computers rather than with them. Thank you all for your patience and support.

Now that the work is done I hope that the readers will acknowledge that all the work that the authors and editors of this volume had in adapting their contributions to each other in order to produce a real collective monograph rather than ordinary conference proceedings was worthwhile. In the process we have learned so much from each other (as well as from the literature published in the meantime) that the outcome looks very different both from the original text of my habilitation thesis and from the papers presented at the Heidelberg conference. In any case we have a lot of people to thank for their direct or indirect improvements of the text. First of all, the four reviewers of my habilitation thesis gave a lot of valuable advice that I tried to follow as well as I could: Tilman Berger, Johannes Kabatek, Roland Marti and Jochen Raecke. The audience of the Heidelberg conference as well as people listening to various presentations about biscriptality have contributed greatly to the refinement of the theory – among them (apart from the aforementioned) especially Florian Coulmas, Helmut Keipert, Holger Kuße and Elton Prifti. Marco García García, Biljana Golubović, Béatrice Hendrich, Miranda Jakiša, Ulrich Mehlem and Jörg Schulte have also provided important additional information. Thomas Leurs, Temenuga Trampnau and Agnieszka Weißwange helped with the difficult task of proofreading, Bryan Ebel as a native speaker of English proofread the whole text twice. The present book also profited greatly from what I learned as a member of the network "LitCo – Literacies in Contact", which is organized by Manuela Böhm and Constanze Weth and funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG).

Furthermore, we would like to thank the Heidelberg Academy of Sciences and Humanities for their patience and their generous support of both the conference and the publication. The staff of Winter Verlag deserve special thanks for the great effort they took in accommodating the non-trivial layout demands of our book.

Brühl (Rhineland), on Shrove Sunday 2016

Contents

1. Introduction (D. Bunčić)

1.1. Scope of this study

All over the world there are societies which use more than one language for communication. For about one and a half centuries such situations were viewed as marginal exceptions to the axiom *one nation – one language*, and cases like Switzerland were explained away as historical anomalies. (And of course the frequency of multilingualism in 'uncivilized' parts of the world was not taken into account at all.) Parents were even discouraged from bringing up their children bilingually, as this would inevitably lead to "double semilingualism". During the last few decades[1] both psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics have proved all this wrong and brought about a revolution in the study of bilingualism. We now understand that monolingual societies are merely a consequence of the invention of a rather influential artificial concept, the nation-state (cf. Auer & Li 2007a: 1–3); that children, given the right input, can achieve proficiency in two or even more languages without difficulty; and that there are in fact more bilingual speakers in the world than monolingual ones (cf. Auer & Li 2007a: 1, Tucker 1999). This new perspective on multilingualism is brilliantly expressed in the aphorism "Monolingualism is curable" (cf. e.g. Nelde 1997).[2] Sociolinguistics has developed sophisticated instruments

[1] There had been voices against monolingualism even before, e.g. Hauch (1941: 289) who claimed that "As a member of the grand orchestra of humanity, the monolinguist is in somewhat the same position as the musical amateur who has an ear for his own instrument alone".

[2] This sentence, in several variations, has become a linguistic proverb, appearing on posters, "a current bumpersticker" in the early 1980s (Reagan 1984: 17) and buttons advertising language learning but also prominently in the linguistic literature (e.g. Nelde 1997). It has been attributed to the Finnish sociolinguist Tove Skutnabb Kangas (Burman [1994] ²2008: 199), to the second-language pedagogue Anthony Mollica (Balboni 2004: 11), to (which?) "Todisco" (Arquint 2002: 35) and to the Mexican writer Carlos Fuentes (Stephens 2005: 208 f.), who in turn reports to have found "El monolingüismo es una enfermedad curable" ("Monolingualism is a curable disease") as a graffito on a wall in Texas (Fuentes 1998); Penn (2009: 20) calls it a "South-American saying". The earliest evidence of the notion of monolingualism as a disease that we have been able to find is from Duran & Bernard (1973: 508 f.): "Chicanos are bilingually *advantaged*, not disadvantaged. G[r]ingos suffer from a disease known as terminal monolingualism; they will go to their graves knowing only one language […]". The idea that this disease can be cured (in contrast to its characterization by Duran & Bernard as

[continued on p. 16]

for analysing multilingualism, with an appropriate terminology (e.g. *diglossia*, *ambilingualism*, *diaglossia*, *code-switching*, *non-convergent discourse, bimodal bilingualism*, *monopaidoglossic*, etc.).

In the discussion about multilingualism, the question of writing in two or more languages, possibly in different scripts, is sometimes addressed (see chapter 3.5.1, p. 68), but it is usually taken for granted that *within* a language only one script is used. While most histories of writing quote a handful of examples of languages written in more than one script and while there are some sociolinguistic studies of such phenomena and even a collection of articles on the subject (Grivelet 2001), the revolution that has taken place in the treatment of multilingualism is yet to come in its scriptal counterpart. The current situation in this field of research is that instances of using more than one script for one language are still viewed as curious cases, which has to do with a similar misconception as with bilingualism: Just as monolingualism was mistakenly considered normal because of the nation-state, the invention of the printing press made people think that every language had (and had to have) a uniform orthography. Accordingly, exceptions from this perceived rule have so far mostly been analysed with instruments and technical terms created *ad hoc*. Most of the time, students of such situations believe their cases to be so special that they do not even expect to find literature about similar cases. Yet if all the instances mentioned in the extant literature were collated, it would become obvious that this is not a marginal phenomenon at all. However, such a collation is further complicated by the heterogeneous terminology used to describe these situations: on the one hand, *digraphia, bigraphism, biscriptalism, orthographic diglossia, multiscriptality, multialphabetism*, *multigraphic situation* and others are all used more or less synonymously, while on the other hand, the term *digraphia* was invented several times independently – each time with a different definition, of course. The two linguistic situations frequently cited as "the two typical cases" (Grivelet 2001: 4) are Serbo-Croatian (with Latin and Cyrillic scripts) and Hindi-Urdu (with Nāgarī and Arabic), while in German philology *Zweischriftigkeit* is most often applied to the coexistence of blackletter *(Fraktur)* and roman type *(Antiqua)* in German until 1941. However, these three situations are in fact as different as chalk, cheese and chintz. Needless to say, no instruments comparable to the ones we have for describing multilingualism have been developed so far, and of course there can be no mention of any consequences in the fashion of 'Monoscriptality can be cured – learn Cyrillic!'. The present monograph wants to make a start.

[continuation from p. 15]

"terminal") might have been born in 1980, when Joshua Fishman and Dorothy Goodman founded an "Association to Cure Monolingualism" (cf. Linguistic Reporter 1981: 23).

It is no coincidence that the research on a phenomenon of written communication lags behind the one on a similar phenomenon pertaining primarily to oral communication. After all, the father of modern linguistics, Ferdinand de Saussure, argued that generations of linguists (he mentions Bopp and Grimm, among others; Saussure 1916: introduction, ch. VI, § 2) had mistaken the letter for the sound.[3] Studying written language in order to understand language, according to Saussure, "is as if one believed that, in order to get to know someone, it is better to look at his photograph rather than his face" ("C'est comme si l'on croyait que, pour connaître quelqu'un, il vaut mieux regarder sa photographie que son visage", ibid.). Saussure's view of writing as an external representation of language was deconstructed by Jacques Derrida (cf. Kußе 2008: 85):

> Le système de l'écriture en général n'est pas extérieur au système de la langue en général, sauf si l'on admet que le partage entre l'extérieur et l'intérieur passe à l'intérieur de l'intérieur ou à l'extérieur de l'extérieur, au point que l'immanence de la langue soit essentiellement exposée à l'intervention de forces en apparence étrangères à son système. Pour la même raison, l'écriture en général n'est pas « image » ou « figuration » de la langue en général, sauf à réconsidérer la nature, la logique et le fonctionnement de l'image dans le système dont on voudrait l'exclure. L'écriture n'est pas signe de signe, sauf à le dire, ce qui serait plus profondément vrai, de tout signe. (Derrida 1967: 63, I.2.[1])

> The system of writing in general is not exterior to the system of language in general, unless it is granted that the division between exterior and interior passes through the interior of the interior or the exterior of the exterior, to the point where the immanence of language is essentially exposed to the intervention of forces that are apparently alien to its system. For the same reason, writing in general is not "image" or "figuration" of language in general, except if the nature, the logic, and the functioning of the image within the system from which one wishes to exclude it be reconsidered. Writing is not a sign of a sign, except if one says it of all signs, which would be more profoundly true. (Derrida 1997: 43, I.2.[1])

Nonetheless, apart from several notable exceptions modern linguistics has tended to neglect written language for the sake of speech until today.

One might object that the bias in linguistics towards the spoken word is perfectly justified because oral communication is 'primary' both phylogenetically and ontogenetically (that is, mankind had language before the invention of writing and children learn to speak before they are taught to write). Or, as

[3] It is true that in linguistic texts before Saussure the words *letter* and *sound* are often used interchangeably. However, it is not quite so clear whether all of these linguists were really unaware of the fact that their object of study were actually sounds and not letters. The problem is that the exact sounds of Latin, Ancient Greek, Gothic, Sanskrit, etc. were unknown, the only traces of their existence being the letters in the extant texts.

Unger (1996: 9) puts it: "Strictly speaking, language is – strictly – SPEAKING." This is of course correct, and with respect to the fundamental structure of languages we would certainly agree that, for example, the 'real' forms of the present tense of the French verb *aimer* 'love' have a zero ending in all the singular forms and the third person plural (all of them are pronounced /ɛm/), whereas the written forms ⟨aime⟩, ⟨aimes⟩, ⟨aiment⟩ are just an orthographic device to differentiate homophones.[4] Therefore, linguistic disciplines like morphology and syntax primarily have to deal with forms like /ɛm/.

However, writing acquires a different significance if we are talking about the setup of communication, e.g. in pragmatics or sociolinguistics.[5] For instance, it is much easier to communicate face to face with someone speaking an unknown language than to read a text in an unknown script: Apart from the help of gesture, facial expression and the situational context, in oral face-to-face communication, say, with a Russian you might even be able to identify words like *viza* as 'visa' and *pasport* as 'passport', but in a foreign script (like Cyrillic) even such internationalisms might still turn out completely incomprehensible for someone who does not know the script: ⟨виза⟩ and ⟨паспорт⟩. Furthermore, there are still undeciphered scripts in the world, but there are no 'uncomprehended' spoken languages. And many people have learned a foreign language just by living in a foreign country, but nobody learns even their 'native' writing system without formal instruction. (The Cherokee silversmith Sequoyah, who tried to learn to read and write just by watching European immigrants reading and writing, eventually came up with his Cherokee syllabary, not with the Latin alphabet.) So it seems to be just the secondariness of writing and the ensuing *complete* arbitrariness of its signs that makes the difference of writing systems an even greater obstacle to communication than the difference of languages. This alone is reason enough to investigate how speech communities cope with different scripts and how their strategies differ from those developed for coping with different languages. And therefore written communication ought to take an important position in sociolinguistics and pragmatics.

Another point is that, as Stubbs (1980: 25–32) puts it, while spoken language is chronologically primary, writing has "social priority" – at least in literate societies, where "really important things (law codes, tax tables, Supreme Court decisions, intelligence reports, etc.) are always written down" (Collin

[4] Deutscher (2006: 162), who has inspired this example, goes a step further in interpreting the clitic forms of the personal pronouns as a new (prefixed) inflection emerging in colloquial speech, so that ⟨moi, j'aime⟩ becomes /mwa ʒɛm/, ⟨toi, tu aimes⟩ /twa t(y)ɛm/, etc.

[5] Incidentally, most of the factors influencing communication that are examined in these relatively recent disciplines were dismissed as "external" to language by Saussure (1916: introduction, ch. V) just as well as writing.

2005: 4). Or in Peter T. Daniels' (1996: 2) words: "Humankind is defined by language, but civilization is defined by writing". This connection to society, civilization and culture makes it especially important for *socio*linguistics to address problems of writing.

Thus, the basic idea of this monograph is to take some well-established descriptive methods from sociolinguistics (or, more specifically, the sociology of language) and other fields of linguistics and apply them to as many empirical situations as can be found in order to make up a typology of societies employing two or more writing systems for (varieties of) one language. The aim of this is to find universal principles and patterns governing the use of more than one script. Although attempts at finding extralinguistic factors determining the emergence of biscriptality have already been undertaken (cf. Dale 1980: 12–13), they enjoyed little success because the sociolinguistic situations subsumized under one heading were too heterogeneous. However, it is neither possible here nor necessary for our purpose to describe *all* the situations of biscriptality that exist or ever existed in the world. While the authors of the present volume represent different fields of research – among them Chinese, South Asian and African studies, in an effort to prevent an all too Eurocentric bias –, we are sure that the number of biscriptal situations discussed here only scratches the surface of the whole phenomenon, and that we have overlooked many important cases of biscriptality. However, we hope that the heuristic model presented here will help to analyse, compare and understand better even those situations not mentioned in this monograph, and that researchers of biscriptality all over the world will help refine our model on the basis of their cases.

Consequently, after an overview of the research history (part 2) we will propose a heuristic model for distinguishing different types of biscriptality (part 3). This model will then be tested against the empirical data of a sufficiently large number of attested language situations (part 4). On the basis of the empirical data gathered in part 4, a diachronic observation will help to find the extralinguistic factors and general principles underlying biscriptal situations (part 5). In the end, our linguistic model will be re-evaluated (part 6).

In a book dealing with writing, images conveying the visual appearance of writing systems are not just illustrations but a vital part of the presentation of research results. Therefore the present book inevitably contains considerably more figures than linguistic monographs usually do. The sources from which the images are taken are indicated in the table of figures (p. 343).

1.2. Notes on terminology and conventions

1.2.1. Basic concepts

In differentiating the systematic levels of writing we largely follow Coulmas (2003: 35–36) because he makes distinctions that are indispensable to this book. In particular, a **script** is defined as a set of graphic signs for writing languages. While it is true that "[s]ome scripts are thought by their speakers to be intrinsically related to their language" (Coulmas 2003: 35), they are fundamentally independent of languages. Examples like the Cyrillic, the Latin and the Arabic scripts demonstrate that any script can be applied to any number of languages. A **writing system** is "an implementation of one or more scripts to form a complete system for writing a particular language" (Lyons et al. 2001: s.v. *writing system*). For example, the application of the Cyrillic script to the Russian language yields the Russian writing system, and the application of the kanji, hiragana and katakana scripts to the Japanese language yields the Japanese writing system. This definition corresponds to the "secondary meaning" of *writing system* as given by Coulmas (2013: 17). His primary definition of *writing system*, according to which the term "refers to an abstract type of graphic system" is in this book referred to as *type of writing system* or *level of writing system*, since it is concerned with the linguistic level a writing system operates on: "word writing systems, syllabic writing systems, and phonetic writing systems" (ibid.). A writing system can be standardized by means of an **orthography**. It is especially important in the context of the present book that the orthography be distinguished as a separate level from the script (cf. Coulmas 2003: 35, 2013: 20). However, in our terminology the standardization of a writing system is part of the system as a whole (cf. Daniels & Bright 1996: xlv). For example, the Russian spelling reform of 1917, which abolished a few letters and changed the spellings of many words (e.g. ⟨совѣтъ (sovětъ")⟩ 'council' became ⟨совет (sovet)⟩), did not change the script, which continues to be the Cyrillic alphabet, but the new orthography is part of a new Russian writing system, which is distinguished from the old Russian writing system only by orthographic differences. Note that *orthography* in the sense of this book encompasses both explicit spelling norms (which are laid out in printed spelling rules and orthographic dictionaries) and implicit norms, which are propagated by emulation of model texts and which often license a considerably greater variation than explicit orthographies (cf. Sebba 2009: 43–44). This broad definition makes the term *orthography* applicable both to pre-modern societies and to informal in-group spellings of the digital age.

As scripts are of primary importance for this study, it is worthwhile to look more closely at which information is included in them. First of all, a script of course consists of a list of the shapes of its signs (e.g. {Aa Bb Cc Dd…}

for the Latin script, {Aa Бб Вв Гг…} for the Cyrillic script or {あ い う え…} for the hiragana script). The order of the signs does not seem to be an inherent part of the script (cf. the heterogeneous orders of the Cyrillic and Glagolitic letters in the alphabet tables collated by Kempgen (2015) or the different treatment of ⟨ä⟩ as a variant of ⟨a⟩ in German, as equivalent to ⟨ae⟩ in German phonebooks, as a separate letter between ⟨á⟩ and ⟨b⟩ in Slovak, and as a separate letter between ⟨å⟩ and ⟨ö⟩ at the end of the alphabet in Swedish). The list of signs can be expanded to adapt the script to a certain language (cf. French ⟨ç⟩, German ⟨ß⟩ or the thorn rune ⟨þ⟩ in Icelandic as letters of the Latin script, or the Latin letter ⟨j⟩, which has become a letter of the Cyrillic script as used for Serbian and Macedonian), and it can also be reduced (cf. the abolition of the Cyrillic letters ⟨ѣ⟩, ⟨і⟩, ⟨ѳ⟩ and ⟨ѵ⟩ in the Russian spelling reform of 1918).

In addition to this, a script contains information about the basic level of language to which its signs correspond: words, syllables or phonemes. If the signs essentially correspond to phonemes, we call the script (and the writing system) an **alphabet** (and its elements are called *letters*); a script on the basis of syllables is a **syllabary** (consisting of *syllabograms*); and word- or morpheme-writing is called **logographic**. We follow Coulmas' (2003) and Sebba's (2007: 168–171) terminology in calling writing systems like the Arabic or Hebrew one **consonantal alphabets** (called "abjads" by Daniels & Bright 1996: xxxix–xlv), and scripts like Nāgarī or Ethiopic are called **syllabic alphabets** (or *alpha-syllabaries*; Daniels & Bright call these "abugidas").[6]

Not being directly connected to any language, an abstract script of course cannot be equipped with grapheme-phoneme correspondences. For example, the sign ⟨u⟩ of the Latin script may correspond to [u] in the Italian writing system (*numero* 'number'), [y] or [ɥ] in the French one (*vue* 'view', *lui* 'him'), [ʉː] or [ɵ] in the Swedish one (*ful* 'ugly', *full* 'full') and [uː], [ʊ], [ʌ], [ə], [ɛ] or [ɪ] in the English one *(flu, pull, hut, circus, bury, busy)*, etc. How-

[6] Due to this information several scripts using the shapes of the Latin letters can be defined as separate scripts rather than variants of the Latin script. An example of this is the so-called 'Fraser alphabet'. It uses the uppercase letters of the Latin alphabet and rotated versions of them to write the phonemes of the Tibeto-Burman language Lisu. However, it differs from the Latin alphabet in not using lowercase letters, in using punctuation marks like ⟨.⟩, ⟨.,⟩ or ⟨;⟩ to indicate tone, in using ⟨=⟩ as 'full stop', in some extraordinary letter-sound correspondences (e.g. ⟨F⟩ for [ts], ⟨V⟩ for [h] or ⟨Λ⟩ for [ŋ]) and in the fact that all consonant letters include an inherent [a] like in syllabic alphabets. Primarily because of this latter feature the 'Fraser alphabet' is a distinct script, which is only externally based on the shapes of Latin letters (cf. Cheuk et al. 2008: 8–9 for a general argument and Everson n.d. for the independence of the Latin and Lisu typefaces). Similar examples are the Cherokee syllabary (with ⟨Ꭹ⟩ for [gi], ⟨Ꭺ⟩ for [go], ⟨Ꭻ⟩ for [gu], ⟨Ꭼ⟩ for [gə̄], etc.) and the Pollard script for Hmong, which is a full-fledged syllabic alphabet.

ever, when a script is adapted to a new language, the writing system thus created 'inherits' the grapheme-phoneme correspondences from some other language for which the script has already been used. (This is how Middle English came to spell [uː] as ⟨ou⟩ like in Anglo-Norman French.) These 'inherited' correspondences are not changed without reason,[7] but sound changes can of course lead to different phonetic values corresponding to the letters. (Thus, ⟨house⟩ is not pronounced ['huːs] any more but ['haʊs].)

1.2.2. Script variants

Within a script, several graphical variants can be distinguished. For example, within the Latin alphabet the difference between the letterforms ⟨𝔄𝔟𝔠𝔡𝔢⟩ and the letterforms ⟨Abcde⟩ is in some respect considered sociolinguistically meaningful (but the letterforms ⟨𝖠𝖻𝖼𝖽𝖾⟩ are mainly perceived as a stylistic alternative to ⟨Abcde⟩). Consequently, these script variants ("Schriftvarianten", Glück 1994: 751) form a hierarchy of variants and subvariants. Their classification is subject to major controversy (Spitzmüller 2013a). A workable hierarchy of printed fonts was proposed by Willberg (2008), who distinguishes *type genres (Schriftgattungen*, also called *type forms)* such as blackletter and roman from *type styles (Schriftstile)* (or *metafamilies (Schriftsippen)*, as Spitzmüller 2013b calls them) such as Humanist, Modern Serif or Sans Serif (within the roman genre), *type families* (*Schriftfamilien*) such as Bembo or Garamond (within the Humanist style) and *type shapes* (*Schriftschnitte*) such as Garamond Medium or Garamond Bold (within the Garamond family).[8] A classification for handwriting would have individual hands instead of type shapes at the bottom of the hierarchy.

[7] However, there have been cases of "[a]ssigning unprecedented values to Roman letters not otherwise required" (Baker 1997: 103): Baker mentions ⟨c⟩ for the dental click [ǀ], ⟨x⟩ for the lateral click [ǁ] and ⟨q⟩ for the retroflex palatal click [ǃ] in the Xhosa and Zulu orthographies as well as ⟨g⟩ for [ŋ], ⟨q⟩ for [ŋg] and ⟨c⟩ for [θ] in the Fijian orthography (ibid.). Another example is the Pinyin transcription of Chinese, which uses ⟨q⟩ for [tɕʰ] and ⟨x⟩ for [ɕ]. (In the Wade-Giles system, these phonemes are spelled ⟨ch'⟩ and ⟨hs⟩, respectively.) However, all these cases are clearly marked as deliberate deviations from the 'default' correspondences with the conscious aim of reducing the amount of diacritics, digraphs or special letters needed for writing a certain language by using letters whose usual values do not correspond to any existing phoneme of that language.

[8] Note that the common font classifications usually consider italics to be shapes within a type family including the roman shapes as main variants (e.g. Garamond Regular, **Garamond Semibold** and *Garamond Italic* as shapes of the Garamond family or **Bodoni Regular**, **Bodoni Semibold** and ***Bodoni Italic*** as shapes of the Bodoni family). This is due to purely functional criteria. If the classification were based on graphic similarity consistently, all the italic fonts would have to be classified as a separate type genre *italics*.

For the purpose of this book, however, it is more important to determine the structure of script variants by the graphematic and sociolinguistic functions they fulfil. For example, the type shape *italics* can have a graphematic function within roman type:

> "I'm a poor man, your Majesty," he began.
> "You're a *very* poor *speaker*," said the King. (Carroll [1865] 1995: 79, ch. 11)

This is meant to be pronounced with contrastive stress and to be understood with an accentuation of a different part of its meaning in comparison to ⟨You're a very poor speaker⟩. The same function is fulfilled by increased letter-spacing in blackletter (⟨**Dou're a very poor ſpeaker**⟩) and by underlining in handwriting (⟨*You're a very poor speaker*⟩). However, the same effect could be obtained using the type styles Fraktur and Schwabacher in 16th/17th-century German (⟨Du biſt ein **ſehr** armſeliger **Redner**⟩, Carroll 1869: 159) or using the type genres blackletter and roman in 17th/18th-century Polish (⟨**Jeś nedzny** *mówca,* **wiemy o tem**⟩ or ⟨**Jeś nedzny** MÓWCA, **wiemy o tem**⟩, Carroll 1927: 141). Therefore within this book we will usually abstract from the typographic differences and call all these differences script variants.

Marti (2008a: 6–8) uses the term *warianta pisma* 'script variant' in exactly this sense, e.g. for blackletter and roman type,[9] but then makes the following remark:

> W Serbiskej jo Vuk Stefanović Karadžić na zachopjeńku 19. stoleśa wutworił wosebnu (pod)wariantu ciwilne kyrilice, kenž jo se wuznamjeniła pśez radnu licbu nowych pismikow (⟨ђ ј љ њ ћ џ⟩) a pśez wužywanje striktnje monografiskego pisanja […] a kenž jo w 20. stoleśu była podłožk za makedońsku kyrilicu. (ibid. 7)
>
> In Serbia at the beginning of the 19th century Vuk Stefanović Karadžić created a separate (sub)variant of the Cyrillic civil script, which was characterized by several new letters (⟨ђ ј љ њ ћ џ⟩) and by the use of a strictly monographic spelling […] and which in the 20th century was the basis for the Macedonian Cyrillic alphabet.

While the difference between the 'civil script' and the Old Cyrillic variant is a matter of letterforms (similar to the one between blackletter and roman), the 'Serbian variant' is characterized by the use of certain graphemes and orthographic principles. Therefore it is actually opposed to the 'Russian variant' of Cyrillic. In order to distinguish the script variants of the type of blackletter

[9] In Marti (2005: 231–232) a different terminology is used, with *vidy pis'ma* 'types of writing' for scripts and *šryfty* 'scripts, typefaces' for glyphic variants. The "linguistic (national, regional) […] and sometimes also chronological *variants of a script*" ("моўныя (нацыянальныя, рэгіянальныя) *разнавіднасці пісьма* […], а часам і храналагічныя") basically correspond to orthographies in our sense.

and roman from those of the type of the 'Russian' and 'Serbian' alphabet, we will refer to the former as **glyphic**[10] **variants**.

1.2.3. Names for writing

Some scripts that are used for several languages are sometimes referred to by an intermediary's name. For example, the Cyrillic script is often called *Russian alphabet*, reflecting the fact that many peoples of the former Soviet Union and Mongolia write their languages in a special variant of the Cyrillic script that is based on Russian orthography (e.g. in several non-Slavic languages the specifically Russian letter ⟨э⟩ is used for [ɛ] because the historically more obvious choice ⟨е⟩ represents [jɛ] or [ʲɛ] in Russian). A similar role was played by Persian in the spread of the Arabic script, which is therefore often called *Perso-Arabic* when used with letters like ⟨پ⟩ [p], ⟨گ⟩ [g] or ⟨چ⟩ [t͡ʃ] for common sounds that do not occur in the Arabic language. However, while such differentiations tell us something about historical relations between language communities, systematically it makes more sense to use the same name for all implementations of a script, which makes it clearer that e.g. Bulgarian and Mongolian use the same *Cyrillic* alphabet.

Unfortunately, there is a lot of confusion about the names of several glyphic script variants. In this book, however, the type ⟨𝔄𝔟𝔠𝔡𝔢⟩ is called *blackletter*, covering the whole group of 'broken' typefaces in the sense of "an all-encompassing term used to describe the writing of the Middle Ages in which the darkness of the letters overpowers the whiteness of the page" (Bain & Shaw 1999: 4). The name *Gothic*, which is frequently used in the sense of 'blackletter', ought to be restricted to the script of the Goths, which can be found e.g. in Ulfilas' Bible translation (⟨𐌰𐌱𐌲𐌳𐌴⟩), and is only used in this sense here. (Alternatively, it might also be used for that type of blackletter that was actually invented during the Gothic period: ⟨𝕬𝖇𝖈𝖉𝖊⟩; but *Textura* is a more precise term for this. Even more confusing is the American use of the word *Gothic* for sans-serif typefaces like ⟨Abcde⟩.) The type ⟨Abcde⟩ is called *roman*. To avoid confusion, the Latin alphabet is therefore exclusively called *Latin* in this book, never *Roman alphabet*. For the early periods up to the 17th century, the term *blackletter* encompasses both the printed and the handwritten glyphic variant, since the former basically imitated the latter.

[10] This term makes use of the Ancient Greek verb γλύφειν, which was a synonym to γράφειν in its original meaning 'to carve'. However, in contrast to γράφειν, γλύφειν never acquired the metaphorical meaning 'to write', which makes it suitable for terms focussing on the outward appearance of what is 'carved'. In this sense, *glyph* is a term used in modern typography for the concrete image that a font provides for a given abstract code position. (A glyph roughly corresponds to a *sort* in old letterpress printing; in grapheme terms a glyph is an *allograph*.)

From the 18th century on the handwritten forms of blackletter that were developed in Germany started to differ significantly from their printed counterparts (cf. G. Newton 2003: 185–186). These are then called *German cursive*. In Russian publications, the expressions *kirillica* 'Cyrillic script' and *kirillovskaja pečat'* 'Cyrillic print' are often used in opposition to *graždanskij šrift* 'civil type' and *graždanskaja pečat'* 'civil print' (i.e. for the letterforms ⟨ѧввгдє⟩ instead of ⟨Абвгде⟩), so that they have to be translated as *Old Cyrillic* to avoid confusion.

Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian and Montenegrin are here considered to be national varieties of a single Serbo-Croatian language (for details and reasons for this point of view see Bunčić 2008, or, from slightly different perspectives, e.g. Gröschel 2009 or Kordić 2009). Note that the glottonym *Serbo-Croatian* is used in full acknowledgement of and respect towards the individual nations and their linguistic characteristics, based on modern sociolinguistic arguments and not in false sympathy for Socialist Yugoslavia.

1.2.4. Representation

Angle brackets ⟨ ⟩ are used consistently to refer to linguistic material in its written form (whether graphemic or at the level of allographs). The material in the brackets can also be a transliteration. Where both the original form and a transcription are given, the transcription is included in parentheses ( ). Where Chinese terms are given in both traditional and simplified characters, they are always given in this order (e.g. *Hànzì* 漢字/汉字). Phonological material is usually enclosed in brackets [ ] rather than slashes / / because this is often more appropriate in contrastive studies and because the discussion of this material is not preceded by a thorough phonemic analysis.

Wherever non-Latin scripts have to be represented with Latin letters (to integrate them into the running text or in bibliographical references), we use those transliteration (or transcription) systems that are most common in the linguistic literature. For example, the Slavic languages written in Cyrillic are transliterated according to the scientific transliteration, Japanese is transcribed with the Revised Hepburn System, and Chinese is transcribed using the Pinyin system. Greek is usually left in the Greek alphabet (except for proper names, which are transliterated according to ISO 843). For Rusyn, which does not have any widely accepted transliteration system, the Ukrainian transliteration is used, adding ⟨ŷ⟩ for ⟨ы⟩. This includes ⟨y⟩ for ⟨и⟩, ⟨h⟩ for ⟨г⟩ and ⟨ji⟩ for ⟨ї⟩, which in some other systems are transliterated as ⟨i⟩, ⟨g⟩ and ⟨ï⟩, respectively. In old Serbo-Croatian texts, Cyrillic ⟨щ⟩ and Glagolitic ⟨ⱎ⟩ are transliterated as ⟨ĉ⟩, and Cyrillic ⟨ѣ⟩ and Glagolitic ⟨ⰹ⟩ as ⟨ĵ⟩, ⟨ć⟩, ⟨đ⟩ or ⟨ǧ⟩ (depending on context). For Russian in pre-1918 orthography, the 'hard sign' ⟨ъ⟩ is usually omitted at the end of words but in some contexts it is exceptionally represented as ⟨”⟩. Words in common use in the

(linguistic) literature are employed in their widely accepted forms, e.g. *Moscow* rather than *Moskva* or *Hindi* rather than *Hiṃdī*.

2. History of theoretical research on biscriptality (D. Bunčić)

The following is not intended to be an exhaustive history of ideas on the parallel use of two writing systems within one speech community for its own sake. The sole aim of this part is to make clear in what way the concepts presented in part 3 relate to previous research. Moreover, research on this subject itself is not very old – the earliest tentative sociolinguistic conceptualization is from 1971 – and the scholars who have tried to define the concept theoretically, abstracting from the situation in an individual language, can almost be counted on the fingers of one hand. A concise overview of the history of the concept of *digraphia* is provided by Grivelet (2001: 1–6). Nonetheless, apart from adding some references[11], we would like to start a bit earlier, because long before this sociolinguistic concept was developed, adjectives like *di-* or *bigraphic* had been used to describe manuscripts, coins, inscriptions, etc. written in two scripts but in the same language, and this usage had consequences for the later development of sociolinguistic concepts. However, it has to be stressed that especially in this context the following overview concentrates on 'western' (or maybe rather 'northern') descriptions of biscriptal documents. We are aware that similar traditions are likely to exist in India, the Arabic world, East Asia, etc., but we are unable to take these into account here.

First of all let us look at the wider context: the development of a sociolinguistics of writing.

2.1. The context: Sociolinguistics of writing

As already mentioned, Saussure (1916: introduction, ch. VI, § 1) had classified writing as "foreign to the internal system" of language ("étrangère au système interne"), and Bloomfield ([1933] 1984: 21, ch. 2.1) stated that "writing is not language, but merely a way of recording language by means of visible marks" (cf. Coulmas 2013: 2–8). Accordingly, apart from a few exceptions like Gelb ([1952] ²1963), Diringer (1962) or Vachek (1973) and apart from fields of "applied linguistics" like spelling reform, lexicography or language education, most

[11] In finding these additional references, large archives of digitized texts with full-text search have proved very helpful (cf. Bunčić 2012b: 398–401).

linguists in the 20th century did not consider writing to be a legitimate object of their studies – until the 1980s, when medial differences between oral and written communication and the linguistic consequences of literacy came into the focus of Florian Coulmas (1981), Peter Koch & Wulf Oesterreicher (1985), Utz Maas (1985), Geoffrey Sampson (1985), Peter Eisenberg (1988), Hartmut Günther (1988), Wolfgang Raible (1988), Peter T. Daniels (1990), Harald Haarmann (1990) and other – primarily German – linguists. Consequently, when sociolinguistics was established as a subdiscipline of linguistics by Basil Bernstein, William Labov, Joshua Fishman and others in the 1960s, it was exclusively concerned with spoken language.

One of the first attempts to integrate linguistic knowledge about how writing works into sociolinguistics is from Stubbs (1980), whose monograph bears the programmatic subtitle "sociolinguistics of reading and writing". Very much in the tradition of Bernstein, Stubbs' (1980: 161) aim is an "explanation of reading failure" in the schools. However, he clearly sees that sociolinguistics will not be able to provide this explanation without exploring the intricacies of reading and writing:

> I have argued that much work in the past has been rather narrow, tending to concentrate in particular on reading as a psychological process, but often ignoring the linguistic organization both of written language and also of writing systems, and ignoring also the social purposes of written language and literacy. (Stubbs 1980: 162)

His study thus provides interesting insights such as this:

> Many of these administrative and intellectual functions which written language serves are very far beyond the needs or experience of young children; writing has no social use for many children […]. (Stubbs 1980: 161)

Coming from the other direction, palaeography, towards (historical) sociolinguistics, Casamassima (1988) describes some aspects of his monograph on the cursive script in Northern Italy from the 10th to the 13th centuries (based on a corpus of texts mainly from Florence) as follows:

> Nel presente contributo troveranno conferma, di scorcio e da un punto di vista paleografico, ossia grafico immanente e storico, anche tali generiche asserzioni di *sociologia dello scrivere*. (Casamassima 1988: 13; emphasis added)

> In the present contribution such generic statements of the *sociology of writing* will, in short and from a palaeographic, i.e. immanently graphic and historical, point of view, find confirmation as well.

In particular, he shows that the cursive script of the 10th to 12th centuries was based on the scriptorial tradition of the medieval *curiales* and *notarii*,

whereas in the 13th century the relationship between the cursive and the book script was redefined by a newly established class of notaries in the modern sense (Casamassima 1988: 14, 165 f.).

No doubt there have been more such individual attempts to use sociolinguistic concepts for the study of writing. However, the first more general effort was made in the encyclopedic *The world's writing systems*. Of its 966 pages, 22 (2.3%) are dedicated to "Sociolinguistics and scripts" (Daniels & Bright 1996: 763–784). They contain a short introduction by one of the editors (Bright 1996) and "some case studies dealing specifically with sociolinguistic choices among competing scripts" (ibid. 764). In particular, the short sections deal with blackletter and roman type in Germany (Augst 1996), the "biscriptal" language Serbo-Croatian (Feldman & Barac-Cikoja 1996), South Asia (Masica 1996), missionary alphabets (Gleason 1996) and Soviet and post-Soviet script reforms (Comrie 1996). In his introduction, Bright (1996: 764) enumerates a wide range of topics connected to writing that sociolinguists have increasingly become aware of and the discussion of which "could fill another book at least as large as the present one".

In the same year, Smith & Schmidt (1996) published a paper dealing with the use of non-normative *kana* in five modern Japanese literary genres (mystery novels, comics, business novels, science fiction and romance novels). Although this was not a general or theoretic topic, the methodology applied was truly sociolinguistic, and the subtitle "Towards a sociolinguistics of script choice" clearly leads the way. In their conclusion Smith & Schmidt (1996: 68) even propose the adjective "socioliterate" for matters pertaining to the sociolinguistics of writing.[12]

While Daniels & Bright (1996: 763) still juxtaposed "sociolinguistics *and* scripts" like two separate objects remaining foreign to each other, Coulmas (2003: 223–241) more bravely writes of the "sociolinguistics *of* writing". He dedicates 19 of his 290 pages (6.6%) to this subject and treats problems of literacy, the role of writing in language standardization and in diglossia, writing reform, and – of primary importance to our present study – he has a separate chapter on "Digraphia" (almost 3 pages, Coulmas 2003: 231–234). The expression "sociolinguistics of writing" is also taken over by Rogers (2005: 7) as a chapter heading; however, he gives only a short summary of half a page (0.1% of his 338 pages).

Unseth (2005) has written a very influential paper whose title already says everything: "Sociolinguistic parallels between choosing scripts and languages". This is a resolute argument for the adaptation of the sociolinguistic instru-

[12] As a matter of fact, this term was already used earlier by Bazerman (1994: 36) in a narrower sense, designating an approach within writing instruction that focuses on different audiences, text functions and discourse conventions. In this sense it has gained currency within the pedagogical literature (cf. Hedgcock 2009).

ments developed in such areas as language planning, language contact, bilingualism, etc. to the study of writing. (Needless to say, it also includes a short treatment of "Digraphia: The use of more than one script", Unseth 2005: 36–37.) The questions that have to be asked in this context are outlined by Pasch (2008: 99):

> Fishman's (1965) fundamental sociolinguistic questions concerning oral communication, "Who *speaks* what language to whom and when?," require an extension: "Who *writes* what content in which language in what script, on what medium and when?"

The first truly sociolinguistic monographs on writing (as envisaged by Bright 1996: 764) were written only recently: Sebba's (2007) *Spelling and society* and Coulmas' (2013) *Writing and society*. Both describe the social impact of writing very precisely, presenting a host of useful insights. However, both books are largely concerned with the consequences of *one* writing system for a speech community. The present monograph aims to fill the gap by discussing the implications of the use of two (or more) writing systems by the same speech community.

2.2. Concepts of biscriptality before the advent of sociolinguistics

2.2.1. Biscriptal documents

The fact that some historical monuments contain two scripts has long been noticed by scholars, and scientific terms for this phenomenon have been coined since the 19th century. In the following, we have attempted a hypothetical classification of the various inventions. On the basis of those uses of adjectives for biscriptal documents that we have been able to find, it seems that there are three independent traditions: one using *digraphic*, which originated in Greek philology; one using *zweischriftig* and its English translation *biscriptu(r)al*, which originated in numismatics; and one using *bigraphic*, which originated in Ancient American and Asian studies.

2.2.1.1. Greek philology: digraphic

Documents including the same text in two scripts, which are so important for the decipherment of unknown writing systems, were traditionally called *bilingual* (or *trilingual*, e.g. for the famous Rosetta Stone, which shows the same text in an artificial, archaizing Egyptian with hieroglyphs, in contemporary (Demotic) Egyptian in the demotic script and in Greek with Greek letters). This practice persists even to this day (cf. the cross-reference from

zweischriftig 'biscriptal' to *Bilingue* in Glück ²2000: s.v.). However, Demetrios Pierides (1875: 38) proposed the more exact term *digraphic* for such texts:

> In the summer of 1873 I became possessed of an inscription in Greek and Cypriote, then discovered in Larnaca, the ancient Citium. […] As the language is the same in both parts, and only the writing differs, I prefer calling this inscription *digraphic*, instead of *bilingual*, until a better definition is proposed. (original emphasis)

Just like many other makeshift solutions, this proposal proved to be rather persistent, for in the following years it was repeatedly quoted approvingly, especially within the discipline of Greek philology:

> Diese […] inschriften […], welche gemeingriechische und epichorische schriftzeichen nebeneinander aufweisen, würde ich lieber nicht bilingue, sondern nach P i e r i d e s ' vorschlag digraphisch nennen. (Voigt 1885: 165; original emphasis)

> Following P i e r i d e s ' proposal, I would prefer to call these […] inscriptions […], which include Common Greek and epichoric characters next to each other, digraphic rather than bilingual.

From Greek philology, which at that time was still a basic discipline for any student of languages, it was taken over into other philologies. For example, the orientalist Joseph Halévy had since about 1873 maintained the thesis that those cuneiform inscriptions thought by his fellow orientalists (and by everybody today) to be written in an isolated language called Sumerian were in fact just another way of writing the Semitic language Assyrian (Akkadian): "une hiérographie artificielle, une espèce particulière d'idéographisme, inventée par les Assyriens eux-mêmes à côté de leur système vulgaire" ("an artificial hierography, a particular kind of ideographism invented by the Assyrians themselves alongside their vulgar system", Halévy 1883: 241). In this context he repeatedly uses the term *digraphic* for actually bilingual (Sumerian-Akkadian) texts:

> Les textes réputés bilingues de l'antique Babylonie, quel que soit leur caractère, ne peuvent donc être que des rédactions digraphiques exprimant une langue unique, l'assyrien. (ibid. 255)

> The texts of ancient Babylonia regarded as bilingual, whatever their nature, can therefore only be digraphic recensions conveying a single language, Assyrian.

Within Greek philology again, Koehler (1885) used *bialphabetic* (or rather, a German suffixless adjective *bialphabet*: "bialphabete Inschrift") for an inscription in Athens, which contains the same short text in both the older Attic and the younger Ionic variant of the Greek alphabet. As philologists usually call these script variants *alphabets*, the term *bialphabetic* might have

seemed more appropriate to Koehler than *digraphic* (if he knew that term at all), since both parts of the inscription use the same Greek script. Note that in contrast to most other 'bilingual' or 'digraphic' documents, this inscription was not originally intended to contain two versions:

Fig. 1: Coin of Evagoras (ca. 400 BCE)

> Die Entstehung der doppelten Fassung wird man sich nicht anders denken können als so, dass die erste Zeile später, nachdem die attische Schrift ausser Uebung gekommen war, um der Deutlichkeit Willen auf dem Stein hinzugefügt worden ist. (Koehler 1885: 282)
>
> The emergence of the double version can hardly be imagined in any other way than that the first line was added to the stone later, after the Attic script had fallen out of practice, for the sake of clarity.

By the turn of the century Greek philologists seem to have become used to the notion, so that Kluge (1897: 67) in his amateurish attempt to decipher the "Mycenean script" (he seems to have failed to differentiate between Linear A and Linear B; cf. Jensen ^{3}1969: 121) already seems to take the German term *zweischriftig* for granted: "Fernere Beweise könnten nur durch zweisprachige oder zweischriftige Inschriften gegeben werden" ("Further evidence could only be obtained from bilingual or biscriptal inscriptions").

2.2.1.2. Numismatics: biscriptu(r)al

In the same year that the philologist Demetrios Pierides introduces the term *digraphic*, the numismatist Alfred von Sallet describes Cypriot coins minted by Evagoras I, king of Salamis (ca. 411–374/373 BCE; cf. fig. 1), using the German word *zweischriftig* probably for the first time:

> […] einige dieser Münzen, welche als zweischriftig – sit venia verbo – besonders interessant sind, geben neben der cyprischen auch die griechische Legende:
>
> *Hf.* Bärtiger Heracleskopf; cyprisch *Euagora*.
>
> *Rf.* Liegender Bock EY; cyprisch *basileos*. (Sallet 1875: 132)
>
> […] some of these coins, which are especially interesting as they are *zweischriftig* – if you pardon the expression –, also give the Greek legend next to the Cypriot:
>
> *Obv.* Bearded head of Heracles; Cypriot *Euagora*.
>
> *Rev.* Lying ram EY; Cypriot *basileos*.

In the following years, the noun *Zweischriftigkeit* also becomes a common name for the German situation with blackletter and roman type. The most prominent use of this word is in the title of a pamphlet arguing for the

Fig. 2: Indo-Greek coin of Philoxenos (ca. 100 BCE)

abolition of blackletter, "Aufruf an das deutsche Volk zur Aufhebung der unnützen Zweischriftigkeit: Eine dringende Forderung der Stunde" ("Appeal to the German people to abolish the useless biscriptality: An urgent demand of the day", Soennecken 1917).

Within numismatics, Sallet's term seems to have been translated into English as *biscriptual* or *biscriptural* (although the word-formation of the latter adjective seems to imply rather the existence of two scriptures than two scripts). Banerjea (1940: 128, 1941: 133) describes ancient Indian coins, among them "a round copper seal discovered at Sirkap in the year 1914–15" as "biscriptual, bearing the legend '*Śivarakṣitasa*' in Brāhmī and Kharoṣṭhī characters of the early first century A.D." (cf. fig. 3 in Banerjea 1941: pl. VIII). Mahajan (^{2}1962: 325, ^{5}1970: 367) uses "biscriptural" for Indian coins from the mid-second century BCE to the first century CE with Greek inscriptions in the Greek alphabet on the obverse and Pali inscriptions in the Kharoṣṭhī script on the reverse (fig. 2).

2.2.1.3. Ancient American and Asian studies: bigraphic

As many as thirty-five years before Pierides' and Sallet's inventions, *bigraphic* had been used in the same sense by Claude-Charles Pierquin de Gembloux, a notorious writer on dozens of scientific subjects. In a rather disputable book about the Central French province of Berry, meant as a preliminary study for a history of France before the Roman conquest ("Histoire de la Patrie avant la conquête romaine", Pierquin de Gembloux 1840: X) he writes about alleged migrations of the Gauls almost all over the world, including the Americas. In this context he mentions a big rock on the Mississippi river with "a bigraphic, i.e. half hieroglyphic and half alphabetic, Celtic inscription" ("une inscription celtique bigraphique, c'est-à-dire moitié hiéroglyphique, moitié alphabétique", Pierquin de Gembloux 1840: 248). This is the earliest attestation of *bigraphic* (or *digraphic* or any other such term) that we have been able to find. However, it is hard to believe that it should have been Pierquin who coined the term and influenced later writers. Either it had been used even earlier, or he coined it as a nonce word, while the real terminological history of *bigraphic* was initiated later.

The same term was once more proposed – obviously independently of both Pierides and Pierquin – by Siméon (1889: IX) for Nahuatl pictographic manuscripts with Nahuatl glosses in the Latin alphabet. In his introduction to Chimalpahin's *Annales* he writes:

> Les documents […] renferment pour la plupart des annotations en mexicain et en espagnol, qui les ont fait indistinctement considérer comme des manuscrits

> bilingues. Cependent ceux d'entre eux dont les gloses sont en *nahuatl* pourraient être plus exactement appelés *bigraphiques*, ces gloses n'étant, à proprement parler, que la reproduction phonétique, avec nos caractères, des termes figuratifs. Ainsi, pour ne citer qu'un exemple, les Mexicains, voulant désigner la première année de leur cycle, dessinaient l'image du lapin, qu'ils accompagnaient d'un point. L'annotateur, en mettant à côté de ces figures les mots mexicains *ce tochtli*, « un lapin », n'a fait que répéter dans une autre écriture les mêmes expressions. Le mot *bigraphique* serait donc bien appliqué à ce genre de manuscrits et permettrait d'établir une distinction fort utile pour l'histoire de l'écriture.
>
> Most of the documents […] contain annotations in Mexican and in Spanish, which made them be indiscriminately considered bilingual manuscripts. However, those among them whose glosses are in Nahuatl might more exactly be called *bigraphic*, their glosses being, strictly speaking, just a phonetic reproduction of the figurative elements with our characters. Thus, to quote just one example, in order to refer to the first year of their cycle, the Mexicans drew the picture of a rabbit and added a dot. By putting the Mexican words *ce tochtli* 'a rabbit' next to these drawings, the annotator only repeated the same expressions in a different script. The word *bigraphic* may therefore well be applied to this kind of manuscripts and would allow establishing a disctinction that would be very useful for the history of writing.

Ten years later, the noun *bigraphism*, denoting the phenomenon that a single text contains two scripts, is used in its Russian form *bigrafizm* by Ol'denburg (1899: 208) referring to an Ancient Indian manuscript:

> [Ч]резвычайно любопытную особенность этого отрывка составляетъ то, что въ немъ мы имѣемъ образчикъ *биграфизма*, а именно на листѣ 27b. мы встрѣчаемъ *одновременно* и письмо характера *индійскаго* gupta и *кашгарскаго*; внѣшній видъ рукописи не оставляетъ, какъ намъ кажется, сомнѣнья въ томъ, что текстъ кашгарскими письменами написанъ одновременно съ текстомъ письменами индійскаго gupta, точно также какъ правописаніе и содержаніе текстовъ нисколько не противорѣчатъ одновременности. Это явленіе биграфизма намъ извѣстно въ индійскихъ надписяхъ еще со временъ Ашоки, а примѣромъ сохраненія разныхъ шрифтовъ въ томъ же памятникѣ можетъ служитъ [sic] двойная нумерація непальскихъ и старыхъ джайнскихъ рукописей. (original emphasis)
>
> It is an extremely interesting feature of this fragment that it is an instance of *bigraphism*; specifically, on folio 27b we *simultaneously* find both writing in the *Indian* gupta and in *Kashgarian*. The outer appearance of the manuscript does not, in our opinion, leave any doubt that the text in Kashgarian letters was written at the same time as the text in the letters of the Indian gupta, just as orthography and contents of the texts are not in the least inconsistent with simultaneity. This phenomenon of bigraphism is known to us from Indian inscriptions from the time of Ashoka. An example of the preservation of different scripts within the same monument is the double numeration of Nepalese and ancient Jain manuscripts.

This information was reported to the Central European scientific community in German by Barthold (1899: 140), using the German form *Bigraphismus*.

However, for more than a century terms like *bigraphic* have nonetheless remained unknown to the bulk of linguists. Consequently, as recently as in 1995, Robert J. Blake, when describing a 13th-century scribe who used both Latin and Spanish orthography within the same manuscript, could use the adjective *bigraphic* in inverted commas[13] next to *bilingual* and claim to "invent" the former as a new term:

> Al cotejar este documento pretendo abrir de nuevo el debatido tema de la diglosia medieval en la España cristiana: o sea, ¿era este escriba un hablante bilingüe tanto del latín como del romance, o más bien un escriba "bígrafo" (para inventar un término adecuado) que se sentía obligado por las convenciones de su época a emplear una ortografía tradicional y latinizante para tramitar asuntos oficiales al lado de sus experimentos con la escritura romanceada? (Blake 1995: 463)

> By instancing this document, I would like to reopen the vexed issue of medieval diglossia in Christian Spain: namely, was this scribe a bilingual speaker of both Latin and Romance or rather a 'bigraphic' scribe (to invent an appropriate term) who felt obliged by the conventions of his time to employ a traditional and Latinizing orthography for transmitting official matters alongside his experiments with Romancized writing?

2.2.2. Biscriptal languages

In all the instances mentioned above the adjectives were used to describe individual texts. However, as early as 1877, Jules Oppert even applied them to whole languages being written in two scripts, thus using them in quite the modern sense (albeit only as an adjective):

> Man kennt allerdings auch Sprachen, die sich mit zwei verschiedenen Alphabeten schreiben, wie das Türkische, das man mit arabischen und mit armenischen Buchstaben ausdrückt; und die Juden schreiben bekanntlich alle neuern Sprachen mit hebräischen Schriften. Das Cyprische, einst auch von Halevy nicht richtig aufgefaßt, ist digraphisch. Oder verwandte Sprachen, wie das altägyptische und das demotische, werden jede in ihrer Schriftart wiedergegeben. (Oppert 1877: 1420)

> Indeed we also know languages which are written with two different alphabets, like Turkish, which is expressed with Arabic and with Armenian letters; and the Jews, as is well-known, write all modern languages with Hebrew scripts. Cypriot, which previously

[13] Corvest (1996: 73) uses inverted commas as well, which, however, might be due to the unusual way the word is used there: "The institute for the blind in Bogota, Colombia publishes a collection of literary books with 'bigraphic' illustrations, i.e. in relief and color."

> Halevy did not understand properly either, is digraphic. Or related languages, like Old Egyptian and Demotic, are each rendered in their own type of script.

A few years later, Indologist Auguste Barth (in Bergaigne 1893: 348, 349) assigns the term *digraphisme* to twelve identical stelae from Cambodia described by Bergaigne. These stelae were erected by Yasovarman I in 889 CE and all contain the same Sanskrit text in two scripts. Obviously Barth (or Aymonier 1904: 482, who uses the word in the same sense) did not think in sociolinguistic terms yet, but even if we understand *digraphism* as 'the habit of writing the same inscriptions in two scripts' this seems to be the first time that a single noun was used to more or less describe the subject of this study.

Apart from terminological considerations, cases of languages using more than one script have of course sometimes been mentioned when the respective language is discussed. Gelb (^{2}1963: 227) even gives a very short general overview after the following telling introduction:

> Normally a language uses only one writing at a time. […] Cases in which one language is expressed at the same time in different writings are few and unimpressive.

His only explicit examples are Aramaic written in Aramaic and cuneiform, and Hurrian in both Babylonian cuneiform and "a unique form of cuneiform writing" (ibid.), although on the same page in a different context he also mentions Aljamiado literature, i.e. Spanish, Polish and Belarusian texts in the Arabic script. Hegyi (1979: 268, n. 17), after looking at the problem a bit more closely, suspects that biscriptality might be "more widespread than commonly assumed" (cf. p. 39), and Glück (1994: 753) even comes to the following conclusion:

> Die Beispiele für mehrfach verschriftete moderne Sprachen und damit monolinguale Zweischriftigkeit ihrer Sprecher bzw. Schreiber sind Legion.
>
> The examples of modern languages with multiple writing systems and therefore monolingual biscriptality of their speakers and writers are legion.

2.3. Sociolinguistic concepts of biscriptality

2.3.1. Concepts modelled on diglossia

Real sociolinguistic concepts could of course not be worked out before the emergence of sociolinguistics. Above all it seems to have been Charles Ferguson's (1959) concept of diglossia that proved especially fruitful for the discussion of biscriptal language situations. In his conception, there is a functional distribution between two varieties of the same language, H and L

('high' and 'low' variety[14]), both of which can be written (although the H is connected to the literary heritage, whereas L is more commonly spoken). After Ferguson's famous article it took twelve years, but then two authors applied his concept to writing systems in the same year. One of them was Paul Wexler (1971: 340), who briefly writes about *orthographic diglossia* as a special case of diglossia: "Different scripts may be used by a single ethnic group for different purposes (e.g., secular versus religious literature) […]". Unfortunately he does not give any examples, so we do not know if he was only thinking of languages with diglossia, which happen to use different scripts for their H and L variety, or if he also considered 'purely orthographic' cases: In such cases there would be no major linguistic differences in the language used in secular and religious literature, so that it would not be justified to talk of different *varieties* (though of course religious literature will be written in a different *register* than secular literature) and thus there would not be diglossia in the traditional sense, but the use of different scripts for different purposes would qualify as "orthographic diglossia".

While Wexler uses only this combined term, *orthographic diglossia* (in which *orthographic* does not seem very exact, since what is meant is not orthographies but scripts), the first to use the word *digraphia* was the Occitan linguist and writer Robèrt Lafont. In an article about Occitan, which is in a state of diglossia, with Standard French as H and Occitan as L, he also writes about its two orthographies. Occitan nowadays has two orthographic norms: one of them, called "classical" , is a relatively new standard that has revived sound-letter correspondences of the classical period of Occitan literature; the other orthography, "Mistralian", mostly uses Standard French letter-sound correspondences (cf. section 4.9.1, p. 308). For this situation, Lafont (1971: 95) introduces the term *digraphie*:

> La situation de diglossie occitane n'est donc pas semblable absolument à celles qu'on peut trouver en d'autres lieux de contacts linguistiques : elle se complète par une situation de digraphie.
>
> Therefore the Occitan situation of diglossia does not resemble those which one can find in other places of language contacts at all: it is completed by a situation of digraphia.

However, Lafont unfortunately does not dwell on this for long, so although his coinage is obviously modelled on *diglossia*, it does not become clear if he considers the relationship between the two Occitan orthographies to be a diglossic one, with one of them being the H and the other the L orthography,

[14] In using *H* and *L* as linguistic terms, we follow Ferguson (1959: 327), who gives the long forms only in parantheses and inverted commas: "For convenience of reference the superposed variety in diglossia will be called the H ('high') variety or simply H, and the regional dialects will be called L ('low') varieties or, collectively, simply L."

or if he employs the term in a more general sense of two orthographies being used for the same language.

Only three years later, the term *digraphia* was used again, this time by Petr Zima (1974), who is credited by Grivelet (2001: 1) with having coined the term. He is mainly interested in Hausa, which is written in both the Latin and the Arabic script, and considers the phenomenon here to be an almost unique case, since in Europe and "most classical language communities existing under the intensive impact of modern communication media" the use of two scripts for the same language is mainly the "dynamic, transitional, and unstable" outcome of script changes and reforms (Zima 1974: 59). However, he is "fully aware that other African language communities can also provide rich material" and mentions Swahili as a case in point (ibid. 60). Just like Wexler and Lafont, Zima explicitly refers to Ferguson's concept of diglossia (ibid. 58), but he also elaborately describes the partially functional distribution of the scripts in Hausa, although he does not say which of the scripts corresponds to the H and which to the L variety (after all, Arabic is used for "Islamic religious literature", but Latin for "modern administrative literature", ibid. 67). Apart from this, he makes an important graphematic distinction between *digraphia*, where a language community uses "two distinct graphical systems (scripts)", and *diorthographia*, where it uses "two distinct orthographies" (ibid. 58).

Another two years later, James R. Jaquith (1976) writes an article about deviating spellings in advertisements, e.g. ⟨kleen⟩ instead of ⟨clean⟩ in ⟨Kleenex⟩, ⟨kist⟩ for ⟨kissed⟩ in ⟨Sunkist⟩ or ⟨Olde Thyme Shoppe⟩ instead of ⟨Old Time Shop⟩, and draws an analogy to diglossia:

> There appears to exist a more or less exact analogy between diglossia in Ferguson's sense and the relationships between DF [Dictionary Forms] and AF [Advertising Forms]. That is, there are many circumstances in which DF is considered the only acceptable spelling of a word. […] Nonetheless, there exists one arena in which orthographic conventions (spelling rules) are different. […] Thus, advertising spelling constitutes the graphic analog of diglossia. I suggest that "digraphia"[15] would appropriately specify situations in which different versions of a written language exist simultaneously and in complementary distribution in a speech community. (Jaquith 1976: 303)

[15] In the title of Jaquith's paper, *digraphia* is misspelled as "diagraphia", so that the article is sometimes cited with the wrong title "Diagraphia in advertising". However, throughout the text and even in the repetition of the title in the running foot, *digraphia* is spelled correctly. Interestingly enough, the same misspelling is also found in Dale (1980: 5; see fn. 17 on p. 40 below) and Collin (2005: 10). Especially the last instance, which is found within a quotation whose original correctly has "digraphia", shows that these are nothing but spelling mistakes, rather than the outcome of "some variation about the actual term in the early days of its usage", as Berlanda (2006: 11, fn. 1) suspects.

Note that the formulation "the graphic analog of diglossia" should not be taken to imply that diglossia in Ferguson's sense only concerns the spoken language. Of course it concerns the language as a whole, including its written form. What is different in Jaquith's *digraphia* is that the difference concerns *only* the written form, while the pronunciation of ⟨clean⟩ and ⟨kleen⟩ is exactly the same.

It is obvious that in Jaquith's case the two types of spelling can easily be characterized as H and L in Ferguson's sense, since the dictionary forms are in most cases "considered the only acceptable spelling", thus giving them the status of H, whereas the advertising forms are restricted to the context of advertisements, where these deliberate deviations from the norm are used as eye-catchers and to create a familiar atmosphere. Unfortunately Jaquith does not mention any other "situations in which different versions of a written language exist simultaneously" than advertising.

Another three years later, Ottmar Hegyi (1979: 265) describes the situation of Muslim Gujarati speakers, who use different scripts for different purposes, as "alphabetical diglossia":

> […] the Arabic alphabet is thus reserved for texts representing the specific Islamic spirituality of the community, with a concomitant familiar and intimate connotation; the Devanāgarī is relegated to the exigencies of secular life, imposed by the practical and daily necessity of communicating with individuals outside the religious group. (Hegyi 1979: 265)

However, the technical term he uses for this situation is not *digraphia* but *bigraphism*. In a note he gives more information and a definition:

> The use of two or more different writing systems for the same language by the same individual would merit closer attention. While the topic of bilingualism and multilingualism has received abundant attention, the phenomenon of "bigraphism" or "multigraphism," i.e., the use of two or more alphabets by the same individual, applied sometimes to the same language, but with different functional purposes, has rarely been touched. We feel, however, that such cases have been more widespread than commonly assumed. (Hegyi 1979: 268, n. 17)

Apart from Muslim Arabic texts like the Gujarati ones mentioned above, he instances Jewish religious texts in several languages (Spanish, Greek, Karaim, etc.) written in the Hebrew script where once again the same Jews who write these texts use a different script if they want to be understood by Gentile speakers of the respective language.

By requiring that the "alphabets" (*scripts* would be a more general term) be used "by the same individual" he excludes cases like Hindi-Urdu, and by insisting on "different functional purposes" a case like Serbian is excluded, too. Therefore Hegyi's notion is clearly 'diglossic', even though the term he uses is modelled on *bilingualism* rather than *diglossia*.

In the next year, the term *digraphia* was used again, without any reference to Lafont, Zima or Jaquith and obviously without any knowledge of them, by Ian R. H. Dale (1980). Dale was credited by Britto (1986: 309) with having "introduced" the term, together with John DeFrancis (1984), "[w]riting independently four years later". Indeed the idea of taking Ferguson's concept over to the description of writing systems seems to have been in the air in the 1970s and 1980s – so much so that the term *digraphia* was 'invented' as often as six times independently (by Lafont, Zima, Jaquith, Dale, DeFrancis and Consani).[16]

Although Dale is, as we have seen, only the fourth to have 'coined' the term *digraphia*, he has to be credited as the first to write about the phenomenon as a whole. While Lafont, Zima and Jaquith use the word *digraphia* merely to describe a specific situation (Occitan, Hausa and advertising spellings, respectively), his paper is "the first general discussion of a phenomenon which may be termed *d[i]graphia*[17] – the use of two (or more) writing systems for representing a single language (or varieties thereof)" (Dale 1980: 5; original italics, underscore added). Dale mentions a wide range of examples, among them many ancient languages – e.g. Egyptian, Meroitic, Hittite, Etruscan, Latin, Faliscan or Oscan –, several South Asian languages – e.g. Hindustani, Punjabi, Sindhi, Kashmiri, Malayalam, Tamil –, Serbo-Croatian, Hausa, Swahili, Malay and many others.

In contrast to his three predecessors, Dale does not mention Ferguson's concept of diglossia explicitly (though he does cite later papers by Ferguson, Fishman and other sociolinguists in a different context (Dale 1980: 5–6) and was certainly aware of it). His very broad definition of *digraphia* as "the use of two (or more) writing systems to represent varieties of a single language" (ibid. 6) seems to imply that in contrast to Lafont, Zima and Jaquith he really did not intend any similarity between diglossia and digraphia.

Dale (1980: 5) broadens the area of application of the term *digraphia* even more by including changes of writing systems into it, distinguishing between "synchronic digraphia (more than one writing system used contemporaneously for the same language) and diachronic digraphia (more than one writing system

[16] Of the six people who independently 'invented' the term *digraphia*, Britto (1986: 309) mentions Dale (1980) and DeFrancis (1984). Grivelet (2001) adds Zima (1974), and Unseth (2008: 3, n. 1) adds Jaquith (1976). Lafont (1971), to our knowledge the very first to have used the term, and Consani (1988, 1989, 1990) do not seem to have been noticed so far, maybe because they did not write in English (and Lafont, in contrast to all the other five, did not have the term *digraphia* in the title of his paper).
An interesting parallel is that the term *diglossia* is usually falsely accredited to Charles Ferguson (1959). In fact it had already been used for both the Greek and the Arabic situation by various scholars since 1885, first of all by Emmanuel Roidis and Jean Psichari (Ioannis Psicharis; cf. Fernández 1995).

[17] Here the word *digraphia* is misspelled "*diagraphia*"; cf. fn. 15 on p. 38.

used for a given language in successive periods of time)". This idea was later taken over by Grivelet (2001: 5–6) and Berlanda (2006), though Grivelet (2001: 6) criticizes Dale for including "cases of the creation of new writing systems for previously unwritten languages". Indeed in a case like the invention of the Armenian alphabet (Dale 1980: 11) there is no second script motivating the expression *digraphia*.

John DeFrancis (1984: 66) mentions in a note that he had been informed before the actual publication of his article "Digraphia" about Dale's publication with the same title four years before. He makes contradictory statements about how this happened. According to the mentioned note of 1984, Joshua Fishman informed him after he submitted the article to *Word*, the journal that eventually printed it. However, twenty-two years later DeFrancis (2006: 22) reports that he had originally planned to publish his article in the *International Journal of the Sociology of Language (IJSL)*, the same journal that had previously printed Dale's article. After being informed about this, DeFrancis chose to publish his article in *Word* (rather than to revise it to make it compatible with Dale's theoretical framework). He legitimated this procedure by his "unique focus on the phenomenon in East Asia" (DeFrancis 1984: 66). This latter version seems more probable, considering that Joshua Fishman was (and remained until his death last year) the general editor of the *IJSL*.[18]

DeFrancis (1984: 59) explicitly states that "[t]his term is intended to parallel in writing the well-known concept of 'diglossia' in speech" (although it has to be stressed once more that Ferguson's diglossia does not apply to speech only). He also gives a short introduction to this concept (ibid.), but his definition of *digraphia* has nothing to do with functional distribution: "Digraphia is the use of two or more different systems of writing the same language" (ibid.) – almost the same as in Dale (1980: 6). The reason for this contradiction seems to be that unlike Dale but like Lafont, Zima and Jaquith, he is interested in a single example of digraphia, in his case that of Chinese (cf. DeFrancis 1984: 62). His objective is to convince people of the advantages of using the Latin alphabet (the Pinyin transcription) for Chinese while at the same time retaining the Chinese script. In this context he needs Ferguson's concept to describe the subordinate status of Pinyin and to stress at the same time the potentially stable nature of situations like these. The other examples of a duality of scripts that he discusses – mainly Serbo-Croatian and Hindi-Urdu – are provided in order to show that such a duality would not be unique. For this argument it seems to be irrelevant that, as Coulmas (1996: 743–744) and Grivelet (2001: 4) correctly observe, neither in the Hindi-Urdu nor in the Serbo-Croatian case it is possible to talk of H and L varieties.

[18] Both in 1984 and in 2006 DeFrancis consistently misspells Dale's name as "Dole". Despite writing about Chinese digraphia throughout his life, DeFrancis seems never to have dealt with Dale's article thoroughly.

Like Dale (1980), DeFrancis (1984: 60) includes, albeit as "marginal cases", changes of writing systems into *digraphia*, distinguishing such "sequential digraphia" from "concurrent digraphia". He mentions the Latinization of Turkish and the Soviet script reforms and refers to Gelb (^{2}1963: 227–28) for "a few cases in early times" (e.g. Persian being written, in the course of 25 centuries, in cuneiform, Pahlavi, Avestan and Arabic), but his main objective remains "concurrent" digraphia as in Chinese.

Britto (1986: 309–310) has an entry "Digraphia" in his "annotated glossary of diglossic terms" (ibid. 295–333). In this entry he gives a very short overview of Wexler (1971: 340), Dale (1980) and DeFrancis (1984), which unfortunately remains undetermined as to whether digraphia in his sense requires a functional distribution. However, "'[d]igraphia' is not significant in Tamil Nadu" (Britto 1986: 310), which is the interest of his book.

Starting four years after DeFrancis' article, Carlo Consani (1988, 1989, 1990) published a trilogy of papers with the title "Bilinguismo, diglossia e digrafia nella Grecia antica" ("Bilingualism, diglossia and digraphia in Ancient Greece"). As he does not mention any of the five preceding 'inventors' of the term *digraphia*, it has to be assumed that his use of it was independent of them, too. Indeed this seems quite plausible: He is interested in documents from Cyprus from the sixth to the end of the third century BCE (Consani 1990: 64) containing text in the Greek alphabet and the Cypriot syllabary. In calling these documents *digraphic* (Ital. adj. *digraf(ic)o*, or, as a noun, *digrafa*), he draws on a long tradition, which was established in Greek philology by Pierides (1875: 38; see subsection 2.2.1.1 above). Furthermore, he does not attempt to give a sociolinguistic definition of digraphia. Rather, he calls all the digraphic documents "cases of digraphia" ("casi di digrafia", 1988: 37, 1990: 67 *passim*), and digraphia in his sense can even be *used* ("[…]l'uso della digrafia nelle monete di Stasioicos di Marion", i.e. "the use of digraphia in the coins of Stasioikos of Marion", 1990: 67), so what he means by this seems to be rather a phenomenon for the researcher than a linguistic situation.

Nonetheless, Consani's term *digrafia* is properly chosen to reflect the role of the two scripts used in Cyprus within Greek diglossia, because "throughout the Archaic and Classical Period the syllabary is the script tied to the dialect" ("per tutto il periodo arcaico e classico il sillabario è la scrittura legata al dialetto", Consani 1988: 37), and the latter is part of a "diffuse diglossia dialect/koiné" ("diffusa diglossia dialetto/κοινή", Consani 1990: 79). At the end of his investigations he concludes:

> Tutti questi elementi mostrano a quali drastiche restrizioni, ai diversi livelli diatopico, diastratico e diafasico-situazionale, risponda l'uso del dialetto e della scrittura sillabica. (Consani 1990: 77)
>
> All these elements show to what drastic restrictions, on various diatopic, diastratic and diaphasic-situational levels, the use of the dialect and of the syllabic script are subject.