

VĚRA BARANDOVSKÁ-FRANK

## Concept(s) of Interlinguistics

**Abstrakt (Pogląd(y) na interlingwistykę).** Interlingwistyka powstała jako nauka ustanawiająca standardy dla języków pomocniczych, ale w swojej stuletniej historii zaczęła być rozumiana coraz to szerzej, na ogół jako interdyscyplinarna gałąź nauki, obejmująca różne aspekty komunikacji, planowania i standaryzacji języka, wielojęzyczności, polityki językowej, tłumaczeń, socjolingwistyki, historii i literatury języków planowych itd. Ta rozszerzona koncepcja umożliwia różnym naukowcom, badaczom, stowarzyszeniom i organizacjom spojrzeć na interlingwistykę z wielu różnych punktów widzenia oraz pozwala na współpracę specjalistów z wielu spośród tych dziedzin. Z jednej strony widoczny jest brak jednolitego rozumienia zakresu tego pojęcia, czego można doświadczyć na przykład w Wikipediach. Z drugiej strony, szeroko definiowane rozumienie zarówno rozpościera przed interlingwistyką nowe horyzonty, jak i umożliwia zagłębienie się w poszczególnych aspektach. Dlatego przyszłość interlingwistyki może być pozytywnie postrzegana: nadal istnieje do odkrycia wiele interesujących terenów – czy to przez ponowną analizę dokumentów historycznych, czy też podążając za ostatnią falą konstruowania języków w Internecie i działaniami poliglotów, czy wreszcie obserwując narodziny nowych specjalizacji naukowych i podgałęzi jak interlingwistyka słowiańska.

**Abstract.** Interlinguistics was created in order to help establish standards for auxiliary languages. However, over the course of its hundred-year history it has come to be understood in ever broader ways, generally as an interdisciplinary branch of science including various aspects of communication, including language planning and standardization, multilingualism, language policy, translation, sociolinguistics as well as the history and literature of planned languages. This expanded concept makes it possible for different scholars, researchers, associations and organizations to treat interlinguistics from extremely diverse points of view and for specialists in different sub-fields to work together. On the one hand, there is a clear lack of agreement concerning the subject matter of interlinguistics as can be seen, for example, in Wikipedia entries. On the other hand a broad understanding opens up new horizons for interlinguistics and makes deeper specialization in individual areas possible. It is therefore possible to see the future of interlinguistics in a positive light: there are still many interesting fields to discover whether through a reanalysis of historical documents or following the latest wave in internet-supported language construction and the activity of polyglots or observing the birth of new scientific specializations and sub-branches such as Slavic interlinguistics.

## 1. Introduction

Interlinguistics was created as a science with the aim of standardizing interlanguages, but, over the course of one hundred years of history, it has expanded more and more in terms of its concept, methodology and goals. Nowadays, it is understood as an interdisciplinary branch of linguistics, which includes various aspects of communication, language standardization and language planning, multilingualism, language policy, translation, sociolinguistic problems, the history and literature of interlanguages (planned/auxiliary languages) and much more. Under these circumstances, we note a lack of a unified common conception and definition. In the present paper, the main concepts, as well as new trends, will be presented and discussed.

## 2. The beginning: Peano, Meysmans

The term “interlinguistics” itself originates in the expression *interlingua* (i.e. “interlanguage”) initially written with hyphen: inter-lingua, with the meaning of “international auxiliary language”. The Italian mathematician Giuseppe Peano used it for the first time the 27<sup>th</sup> of August 1903 in his article “De latino sine flexione”, dealing with the simplification of classical Latin for international use (Peano 1903). He created the term as a general expression for language constructs which aim to facilitate or make communication possible for people with mutually incomprehensible native languages. Peano was appointed director of “Academia pro Interlingua”, an international organization with more than 300 members from all over the world. One of them was the Belgian stenographer Jules Meysmans.

Meysmans published the article “A new science” (Meysmans 1911: Une science nouvelle) in his paper “Lingua internationale” in 1911, with a proposition to call “interlinguistics” a new science dealing with natural laws of formation of auxiliary languages. On the one hand, he says, the international auxiliary language is only a project and in this sense it is not yet an objectively observable phenomenon. On the other hand, there are many auxiliary languages formed in a natural way: essentially, users of non-standard dialects apply their common standardized ethnic language as an interlanguage. The tools for investigating and describing these common languages are already available, thus interlinguistics could adopt these well-known and reliable methods to explore interlanguages created in an analogical linguistic manner. In this way, interlinguistics could answer the currently discussed questions such as those concerning homogeneity or heterogeneity of the word stock, regularity or irregularity of the grammar, spontaneity or planning of language use, acceptability, authorship by a single person or a collective of authors. In summary, Meysmans believes that the same constructional principles and laws are valid for the standardization of ethnic languages and for the construction of auxiliary languages, which allows linguists to deal with the latter.

At the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Peano, Meysmans and the *Academia pro Interlingua* felt the necessity of exploring the long existing phenomenon, namely “artificial” languages, known under names such as “universal”, “philosophical”, “international” and “general”, which expressed the aim of their construction. By these means, language creation and language planning have been practiced since ancient times and flourished during the Renaissance, even though without explicit correlation to linguistics: they formed part of philosophical, philological, educational and similar activities. There was some kind of intensification of these activities particularly in the second half of 19<sup>th</sup> century, then Volapük (1879) and Esperanto (1887) began to be used in practice as international languages and aroused serious scientific interest.

### 3. The first definition: Jespersen

Many new auxiliary language projects appeared as a reaction to Esperanto, some of them authored by scientists, among them the Danish phonetician Otto Jespersen. As if he were reacting to the proposition of Meysmans, he pleaded for interlinguistics to become an independent branch of linguistics in his article “A new science: Interlinguistics”:

“A new science is developing, Interlinguistics – that branch of the science of language which deals with the structure and basic ideas of all languages with the view to the establishing of a norm for interlanguages, i.e. auxiliary languages destined for oral and written use between people who cannot make themselves understood by means of their mother tongues. Interlinguists contend, and to my mind, rightly, that there is here a field that can be treated according to scientific methods and which is of the utmost importance to civilized mankind to see thus treated in order to obtain a satisfactory solution to a really harassing problem” (Jespersen 1930/31: 57).

This article, emphasizing the necessity of a new science, was written as a reaction to the IALA conference in Geneva in 1930. The IALA, i.e. International Auxiliary Language Association, founded in 1924 in New York, invited illustrious professors of linguistics and philology along with authors of the most successful auxiliary languages, to discuss, appraise, and select the most suitable of them. There were many important common points found, but none of the presented candidates (Esperanto, Ido, Nov-Esperanto, Latino sine flexione, Occidental, Novial) seemed to be acceptable in their entirety. The declaration of the conference expressed the necessity of collaboration between mainstream linguists and interlinguists in order to create an optimal auxiliary language. Jespersen finished the quoted article with the words:

“The advent of a simple and adequate International Auxiliary Language will prove a boon to philologists, philosophers, medical men, scientists, technicians, politicians, merchants, tourists – in short, to everybody whose horizon is not limited to his native country” (Jespersen 1930/31: 67).

The very first sentence of the article is usually quoted as the first definition of interlinguistics: the science exploring interlanguages (plural) or auxiliary languages (plural), but Jespersen himself admitted that only one ideal/optimal auxiliary language was being searched for at the time. Once all the presented candidates had been explored and compared, a single system joining the advantages of all of them proved to be impossible.

Twenty years later, the Dutch philologist Willem A. Manders (Manders 1950) declared in his book “*Interlingvistiko kaj esperantologio*” that the description of the aims and methods of interlinguistics, as defined by Jespersen, were apt and striking, nevertheless the satisfactory solution did not yet exist. He voiced his skepticism towards a possible elaboration of a project satisfying all social and ethnic groups, and moreover towards the will of all the people to accept it. He also mentioned the importance of non-linguistic factors in the acceptance of an auxiliary language.

#### 4. Interdisciplinarity: Szilágyi

Another member of the *Academia pro Interlingua*, Hungarian historian Dénes Szilágyi, pleaded for a larger concept of this discipline, introducing the field of historical and comparative studies of interlanguages as a part of general interlinguistics. This would make it possible to arouse the attention of those linguists who consider the very idea of an international auxiliary language to be utopian, he thought. Szilágyi founded the “*Officium Interlinguisticum Budapestiense*” in 1928 by coordinating a terminological commission of seven eminent authorities: Giuseppe Peano, Otto Jespersen, Walter Borgius, Ernst Drezen, Edward P. Foster, Giacomo Meazzini, and Edgar de Wahl. In 1931, he published the results of their work under the title “*Versus Interlinguistica*” consisting of two parts. The first, “*Principles of general interlinguistics*” deals with 23 principles, such as naturalness (e.g. pidgins) and artificiality, linguistic creativity, philosophical approaches, social components etc. The second part is an outline of terminological vocabulary “*Schedio encyclopaedico*” with 69 articles about phenomena such as apriority and aposteriority, autonomy, induction and deduction, internationalism, rationality, naturalism, neolatinism etc., concerning mostly the construction of auxiliary languages and interlanguages.

According to Szilágyi, interlinguistics in its essence is a system of theories and technical remedies for the production of interlanguages, but there is a difference between normative and general interlinguistics. The product of normative interlinguistics, if standardized or constructed, has to be explored in terms of its capability of acquiring social acceptance, its accordance with general evolutionary tendencies, correspondence to the historical period concerned as well as the need for it. The most important of Szilágyi’s observations is the need for interdisciplinarity (he calls it “*limitrophy*”). As human intercommunication is dependent upon various, not only linguistic factors, interlinguistics

cannot exist without collaboration with other scientific disciplines, above all sociology and psychology. There are many other characteristics to be respected, related to common practice, experience and customs, politics, economy, religion, even pathology, which could be important for the selection, acceptance, and use of interlanguages.

Another significant point of “Versus Interlinguistica” is the question of terminology. Szilágyi was the first to observe, that a new science needs a clear and unified terminology to avoid misunderstanding or parallel elaboration of the same phenomenon under a different name. His “Schedio encyclopaedico” was elaborated empirically, with the help of actually used and collected material, in consultation with seven specialists. It is very deplorable, that such a basic postulate has been ignored until the present day: as a matter of fact, terminological chaos prevails both in the construction and in description of interlanguages. For example, “Aga magéra difúra” (Albani-Buonarroti 1994), which is the largest encyclopedia of invented languages before the Internet-era, has only nine terms identical with that of Szilágyi (*academia extralinguistica*, *artificial lingua*, *auxiliary lingua*, *grammatica rationale/universale*, *interlingua*, *interlinguistica*, *naturalismo interlinguistico*, *pasigraphia*, *philosophica lingua*). The terminology of the 21<sup>st</sup> century (see Rogers 2011) is even more confusing.

## 5. Language comparison: Wandruszka

As mentioned, the IALA conference in 1930 elaborated a comparative analysis of the interlanguages presented, which enriched interlinguistics with elements of comparative linguistics. Many specialists (Edward Sapir, Maurice Swadesh, William Edward Collinson and others) participated in the activities of IALA the period 1930-1940 in comparing European ethnic languages with the aim of elaborating a common prototype. The amount of international root words was seen as a basic constructional material for an auxiliary language of a European type. Such a language appeared under the name “Interlingua” (corresponding to the term used by Peano) in 1951. At times, interlinguistics has been understood as referring explicitly only to this interlanguage.

Nevertheless, such a name for the science makes at least two interpretations possible: firstly, interlinguistics as a science about “interlinguas”, which is the original and most limited concept, and secondly, interlinguistics as activity exploring the relations “interlinguas”, that means between languages. The second concept corresponds to language comparison, which is, as IALA maintained, one of implicit parts of interlinguistics, but we must not limit the whole content only to comparison.

In this context, the approach of the Austrian linguist Mario Wandruszka in “Interlinguistik. Umrisse einer neuen Sprachwissenschaft” (Wandruszka 1971) has to be seen as an isolated and misleading case, as he understands interlinguistics as only comparative/contrastive linguistics:

“Linguistik der Mehrsprachigkeit, der Sprachmischungen und Mischsprachen, der Übersetzung und des Übersetzungsvergleichs, des Gesprächs zwischen den Sprachen in uns, die neue vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft, die noch ihren Namen sucht, das alles kann man zusammenfassen in Interlinguistik.” (The linguistics of multilingualism, language mixtures and mixed languages, translation and translation comparison, the dialogue between the languages within us, the new comparative linguistics is still searching for their name, all this can be summarized in interlinguistics. Wandruszka1971: 10).

The explicitly limited concept of Wandruszka, which takes into consideration only one part of interlinguistic activities, no longer corresponds to the current understanding of the complete discipline, but it regrettably appears in some recent Internet resources.

## 6. Language planning: Wüster, Tauli

In the opinion of the Austrian terminologist Eugen Wüster, interlinguistics should not only describe, but also prescribe, i.e. consciously influence language evolution. This is apparently already the case of standardizing ethnic languages by means of fixed grammar and vocabulary. To this end, Wüster introduced a new term “Plansprache” (planned language) in 1931 (Wüster 1970), because he did not find a more adequate translation of the expression “constructed language” used by Jespersen in his book about “Novial” (New International Auxiliary Language), 1928. The German translation “konstruierte Sprache” is very unusual, as well as the translation of “interlingua” by a neologism “Zwischensprache”. Wüster considered that creative linguistics could be called “Sprachplanung” (language planning) and the consciously created, thus planned, interlanguage would be hence “Plansprache”. This term is very frequently used in German literature and adopted by Esperanto as “planlingvo” (There was a special journal “Planlingvistiko” in the 1980’s).

The Estonian linguist Walter Tauli presented a broader definition of language planning: “*Language planning is the methodical activity of regulating and improving existing languages or creating new common regional, national or international languages*” (Tauli 1968:7).

This concept is very often quoted and considered of basic importance because it implicates both ethnic languages and planned languages. In his “Introduction to the theory of language planning”, a new definition of interlinguistics appears accordingly:

“Interlinguistics can be defined as the science of international language (IL) planning, or more precisely, the branch of theory of language planning which investigates the principles, methods and tactics of IL planning. By IL is meant a universal language to be used as a means of communication by individuals belonging to different language communities” (Tauli 1968:41).

It is obvious, Tauli says, that current international communication by means of many official national languages is not an ideal solution to the problem, it would be better to learn some neutral common second language. Esperanto, Ido, Occidental and Interlingua are specifically mentioned, but not considered fully acceptable, as they are depending on European language models. Tauli emphasizes that an international planned language must be created by a competent team of linguists (as Interlingua actually was) and he recommends using English in the meantime. Principally, Tauli opened the door of language planning to planned languages; nevertheless, the concept of language planning is nowadays much more often used in connection with status planning of ethnic languages, in fact it is equal to language policy.

## 7. Broader concepts: Bormann, Kuznetsov, Szerdahelyi, Blanke

The main tasks of interlinguistics until the second half of the 20th century were concentrated around the construction, analysis, comparison and selection of planned languages. Especially, the activities of IALA attracted the attention of linguists and other scientists throughout the world, but this attention gradually diminished after the publication of Interlingua and the liquidation of the IALA in 1952. Interlingua, though praised as “the” auxiliary language constructed by specialists, couldn’t prove itself as the ideal solution to the problem of intercommunication. Interlinguists were in doubt: shall we still look for an ideal planned language? Shall we improve the existing ones or elaborate one (or several of them) more? Shall we deal with ethnic languages? Is more interest in generalities needed or, on the contrary, concentration on Interlingua or Esperanto alone?

In this situation, an interdisciplinarity and more detailed partition of interlinguistic fields of activity were required. The German economist Artur Bormann, founder of “Interlingvistika informa servo” emphasized again the current need of a common inter-language, the role of which could be played both by an ethnic language and planned one (Bormann 1959/60). Bormann presented various aspects of linguistic, organizational, and political problems, in solving of which interlinguistics could be engaged. To this aim, a new definition was needed:

“Der Zweig der Wissenschaft, der die allgemein-politischen, kulturellen, soziologischen und linguistischen Fragen einer von allen Menschen in den internationalen Beziehungen gleichermaßen zu gebrauchenden gemeinsamen Sprache, der internationalen Sprache, erforscht.” (The branch of science that explores the general political, cultural, sociological, and linguistic issues of a common language, the international language, to be used equally by all people in international relations. Bormann 1959/60:14)

The span of interlinguistics, according to this definition, includes fields of general policy, culture, sociology, and linguistics. Moreover, Bormann proposed a division of interlinguistics into three main parts:

- 1) general interlinguistics explores the basic relations between language, the individual and society, in order to deduce principles of selection of interlanguage; then its political, cultural, social and economic effects are observable;
- 2) special interlinguistics investigates relations between national and international languages and their mutual influence;
- 3) practical interlinguistics is occupied with the international language: its grammar, vocabulary, stylistics, construction and evolution.

In the 1970's, there were so many different approaches to the concept of interlinguistics, that there was talk of schools. The German translator Reinhard Haupenthal translated into German and published about twenty important contributions concerning the essence of interlinguistics as a scientific discipline in 1976 (Haupenthal 1976). In his preface, he says that the most applicable assertion about interlinguistics is that "this science has yet to find the way to itself", because its aims had not been defined with sufficiently exact awareness. In general, the content of interlinguistics is becoming more and more complex.

A special position in interlinguistic activities belonged to the Soviet school, since the Soviet Union was a multinational and multilingual country. Language policy, sociolinguistics, cases of bilingualism and multilingualism, as well as the standardization of ethnic languages and their writing systems were the most common topics. But also the evolution of modern technology received much attention, so that terms as language construction and language engineering were used. For example, Pjotr Nikitich Denisov considered constructive linguistics as pre-cybernetic modeling, Olga Sergeevna Achmanova added automatic interlanguages (this refers to codes for communication between humans and machines) to fields of interlinguistic interest. A detailed bibliography of the Soviet school was elaborated by Alexander Dmitrevich Dulichenko in 1983 (Dulichenko 1983). Dulichenko himself has been respected as a founder of Slavic interlinguistics.

The Muscovite Sergej Nikolayevich Kuznetsov (Kuznetsov 1982,1987) concentrated on the concept of interlinguistics in human communicative contacts and their means. So in addition to interlanguages, especially multilingualism (its origin, evolution and perspectives), mutual language influence, the establishment of common expressions / internationalisms (in vocabulary or grammar), planning of national languages, and inter-ethnic languages should belong to the topics of interlinguistics. On the other hand, programming languages and machine codes clearly should not be part of it. Kuznetsov, too, proposes general and special subdivisions of the discipline: the world language situation and problems of intercommunication along with its solution by dint of both natural and planned languages are the content of general interlinguistics. The special one is then the linguistics of individual planned languages, among them esperantology in particular.

István Szerdahelyi, founder of the department of Esperantology at Eötvös Loránd University in Budapest, sees interlinguistics as a part of applied linguistics. He begins the classification of applied linguistics with three sub-branches: sociolinguistics (including language policy), psycholinguistics, and language modeling (including language planning). All of them have then an immediate relation with interlinguistics, which can be further divided in general and special, as Kuznetsov had (see Szerdahelyi 1979).

Modern concepts of interlinguistics continually broaden its content. The most suitable of current definition seems to be that of the German linguist and esperantologist Detlev Blanke:

“Die Interlinguistik ist eine interdisziplinäre sprachwissenschaftliche Disziplin, welche die internationale sprachliche Kommunikation mit allen ihren politischen, ökonomischen, linguistischen, informationstheoretischen und anderen Aspekten erforscht.” (Interlinguistics is an interdisciplinary linguistic discipline that investigates international linguistic communication along with all its political, economic, linguistic, information theory and other aspects. Blanke 1985:293)

This definition, thanks to its breadth, opens great possibilities for theoretical work, research, experiments, and cooperation with other sciences. One of the important merits of Blanke was the founding of the “Gesellschaft für Interlinguistik” (GIL) in Berlin in 1991. This society (about 70 members, predominantly linguists) is acting in accord with the concept of Blanke:

“Gegenstand der Interlinguistik ist die internationale sprachliche Kommunikation. Die Gesellschaft für Interlinguistik e.V. (GIL) untersucht diese unter politischen, linguistischen, ökonomischen, kulturellen u.a. Aspekten. Schwerpunkt ihrer Arbeit sind dabei die Struktur und Funktion von Plansprachen (wie z.B. Esperanto).” (The subject of interlinguistics is international linguistic communication. The Society for Interlinguistics (GIL) examines its political, linguistic, economic, cultural and other aspects. Its work focuses on the structure and function of planned languages (such as Esperanto) (<http://www.interlinguistik-gil.de/wb/pages/startseite.php>).

As we can see, the focus of the interlinguistic activities of GIL is on planned languages, their structure and function. As the most important condition of functioning of an interlanguage is its social acceptance and realization, Blanke elaborated a scale of about twenty points reaching from outline to full realization. Although Esperanto is fully realized and thus the most significant of planned languages, it is not the only topic of interest and work of the mentioned society.

In 2006 (Blanke 2006), Blanke characterized four main streams of contemporary interlinguistics, which involve the exploration of:

- 1) international auxiliary languages (ethnic languages that function as lingua francas as well as planned languages)
- 2) international communication in general
- 3) multilingualism and contrastive linguistics
- 4) the planned languages Interlingua and Interlingue.

Moreover, the science of planned languages (“Planlinguistik”) can have two basic approaches: constructive and descriptive.

## 8. Philology: Sakaguchi

Research of planned languages has been mostly limited to pure linguistic occurrences, unlike studies of ethnic languages, which implicate studies of language along with literature (e.g. the German word “Romanistik” refers to studies of Romance languages and literatures or Romance Philology). Astonishingly, the literature component has been completely neglected until recently. The only plea for inclusion of literature to interlinguistic research comes from Alicja Sakaguchi. In her theoretical work (Sakaguchi 1998) she reduces interlinguistics to its essential part, the linguistics of planned languages (*Plansprachenkunde*), which is not only language science but also the science of literature dealing with planned languages and their literature. In her opinion, the methods of linguistic research, together with related theories, hypotheses, terminology and procedures are without a doubt applicable in interlinguistics. This means that the main character of interlinguistics has to remain linguistically oriented, while disciplines such as sociology, philosophy, politics etc. play only a secondary role. Special interlinguistics, i.e. the branch dealing with individual interlanguages, includes their literature. Three new terms appear in Sakaguchi’s work:

- 1) pure interlinguistics requires recognition of data, relationships and processes
- 2) applied interlinguistics uses the results of pure linguistics to solve the tasks of international communication
- 3) scientific interlinguistics is needed to find a perfect model of a planned language

## 9. Current conceptual problems

As mentioned, various scientific fields lay claim to collaboration with interlinguistics: didactics, pedagogy, sociology, philosophy, information science, semiotics, terminology, communication, informatics, logic, cybernetics, artificial intelligence, culture, religion, policy ... They are also non-linguistic factors, which tend to be overlooked: behind the most successful international languages (English, German, Russian, Arabic ...) are countries with political, economic and even military power. This means that planned languages, if seen as the main research field of interlinguistics, hardly have any chance of being used to a greater extent.

One of the most striking contemporary problems is the presentation of interlinguistics in general. The relevant literature is mostly not immediately available, so

that the normal first source of information is Wikipedia. By 2018-03-01, Wikipedia existed in 295 languages, 19 of them (6%) contain an article about Interlinguistics, which they are defining in some way. (The language versions are: Belarusian, Catalan, Czech, German, English, Esperanto, French, Gaelic, Hindi, Ido, Interlingua, Italian, Hungarian, Dutch, Polish, Portuguese, Russian, Swedish, Ukrainian.) Even if they are automatically adapted to each other and compared with the English version (ordinarily by robots), none of them is practically identical with any other (the only exception is the Belarusian one, because it is closely translated from Russian). In spite of many similarities, they all differ in details concerning the detailed concept and content of the discipline. Most of the definitions agree, that interlinguistics is a part of linguistics and that various aspects of communication belong to its field of interest. But, e.g., only one of them (Catalan) mentions interdisciplinarity, three of them mention language policy (Czech, Esperanto, Swedish), one history of planned languages (Hungarian) etc. The most important notions of the supposed content of interlinguistics are:

<b>Important notions regarding content</b>	<b>Sum of Wikipedias</b>
Part of linguistics	10
Part of comparative linguistics	1
Interdisciplinarity	1
Various aspects of communication	13
Auxiliary languages, e.g. Esperanto	15
Ethnic languages, lingua franca	5
Pidgins and creoles	4
Translation, codes, technology	6
Optimization of communication	6
Language policy	3
Multilingualism	1
History of planned languages	1
Literature in planned languages	1

English Wikipedia (<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Interlinguistics>) presents a similar definition:

“Interlinguistics is the study of various aspects of linguistic communication. It is concerned with investigating how ethnic and auxiliary languages (lingua franca) work in such situations and with the possibilities of optimizing interlinguistic communication, for instance by use of international auxiliary languages, such as Esperanto or Interlingua. These are languages that are created by an intentional intellectual effort, usually with the aim of facilitating interlinguistic communication, but there are also interlanguages that have arisen spontaneously. These are called pidgin languages.”

The authors of Wikipedia-articles are not necessarily specialists in interlinguistics, but more likely to be experienced programmers and computer experts. Moreover, lan-

guage creation has become an intellectual hobby, it is thus rather difficult to attract the attention of serious linguists, as Jespersen or IALA were. Interlinguists are becoming overwhelmed with many new approaches and themes such as the standardization of national languages, the evolution of pidgins and creoles, automatic translation codes and pivot languages, new languages of fictional communities ... The elaboration of a valid and acceptable concept depends also on the professional background of the individual persons exploring and teaching interlinguistics: some of them are linguists or philologists, others are information scientists or media scholars. Therefore, international collaboration, the exchange of experiences and the elaboration of new ways of dealing with present intercommunication problems are topics of the highest priority.

## 10. New tendencies

### 10.1. Conlanging

The most recent history of language planning is connected with the invention and progress of the Internet. The first electronic “Constructed Language Mailing List” started in 1990 for those who owned a computer and had knowledge of the English language. The communication became faster with the introduction of www. and the possibility of creating individual websites. Since Americans had the most opportunities for Internet use, the English abbreviation “conlang” (CONstructed LANGuage) quickly spread online and replaced terms such as “interlingua” or “international language”. Among the pioneering websites was Projecto Auxiligua (1996-2004) by Javier Bowks de la Rosa. He registered about 650 “helping projects”: classics such as Solresol, Basic English and Esperanto but also newer ones, with links to authors’ websites. An additional list of “Members of Auxiliary Language Community” reached the number of 1120 people. Some materials are still to be found in the archive (<https://web.archive.org/web/20010222081443/http://adam.cheshire.net:80/~jjbowks/auxiling.html>).

Similar pages by various authors were partially identical with Projecto Auxiligua, but over time they have been receiving more and more information on the latest inventions. There are always some new helping projects invented, but many new conlangs have been serving for artistic, experimental, fantastic, and similar purposes. At the end of the last century, the conlang websites of Don Blaheta, of Chris Bogart, of Don Harlow, of Bruce Gilson, of Richard Kennaway, of Thomas Leigh, of Rick Morneau, of Morten Svendsen, Yahoo, Model Languages Website appeared, later also the “Artificial Language Lab”, “Scattered Tongues Site” and others. Bogart, for example, included in his collection categories such as “Artistic Conlangs”, “Experimental Conlangs”, “Logical Conlangs”, “Conlangs in Actual Use”, “Conlangs for International Communication”, “Fiction”, “Latin Reform” and “Conlang Resources”. In connection with conlang collectors and authors have appeared ideas and advice for language planning,

such as Paul Bartlett's "Thoughts on IAL Success" or Richard K. Harrison's "Proposed Guidelines for the Design of an Optimal International Auxiliary Language".

The most impressive and comprehensive website was Langmaker (1997-2008) by Jeffrey Henning ([www.langmaker.com](http://www.langmaker.com) no longer exists, little information can be found in the Wikipedia: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Langmaker>). The "Model Languages" magazine, in 1995, advanced it: its first number contained the often quoted introduction, which justifies and defends the creating of languages. Henning clearly recognized the new trend, contacted many authors, gathered, commented on and discussed all the conlangs sent and cataloged them in a database together with a short description and a link to this website. There were alphabetical lists of conlangs and authors, files for word creation, writing systems, neologisms, literature and other material for language planning, especially the updated "Index of Resources" with links to dozens of related languages and websites. At the beginning of this millennium, Langmaker became so popular that it employed a dozen of expert assistants and began to offer professional services for language creation. In 2007, Langmaker, who registered more than 2000 conlangs by that time, was changed into a wiki format, which enabled interested parties to directly contribute to the site. Then the situation obviously has become confusing, so the page was blocked one year later.

After Langmaker's disappearance, orientation in the world of conlangs has been very difficult. The search machines offer thousands of websites; to the old "trademarks" such as Audience, Conlang IRC, Conlangage, EngCore, Artlangers Community, Livejournal Conlangs Community, Neographies Discussion Group, Zompist Bulletin, Elfling, Geofiction Club, Germaniconlang, Ideolengua, Romance Conlang List, Slaviconlangs, Ancient Scripts, Uglossia, Yahoo Groups for Conlangs and Conlanger B-Board have been added new wikis such as Frath Wiki, Conlang Free City, Conlang Wikia and Knee Quickie; hundreds of personal pages of individual authors cannot even be tracked. The crude division of conlangs in ten categories does not help anymore, new conlang features are characterized by arbitrary and incompatible terminology – and there is obviously no coordinated authority.

Some help is provided by the Language Creation Society (LCS – <http://conlang.org/>), founded in 2007 in the USA, originally by students and professors at the University of California in Berkeley. Some of them already had experiences with previous projects, e.g. the author of languages or the "Game of thrones" TV series David J. Peterson ([https://Wikipedia/wiki/David\\_J.\\_Peterson](https://Wikipedia/wiki/David_J._Peterson)) had worked as a scout for Langmaker and led an experiment to build a pidgin Wasabi. Already in 1996, Mark Rosenfelder has offered his help page for linguistic engineering "The Language Costruction Kit" (<http://www.zompist.com/kit.html>), which is available from 2010 as well as a book. It provides methodological help for language construction: the user decides which type of language they want to have, and in that way one can create sounds, vocabulary, grammar, alphabet including a script, and create a translation of a selected text. The procedure is shown with the example of conlang Kebreni. Another book called "The Planet Construction Kit" helps to create new worlds and planets (conworlds). In 2012, the second volume for advanced language developers "Advanced Construction Kit"

was added, in 2015 “China Construction Kit” and “The Conlanger’s Lexipedia”, specialized in the creation of vocabulary.

These practical tools have become widely popular and have made conlanging a socially fully acceptable intellectual occupation. Linguists, sociologists, psychologists etc. were still skeptical some 20 years ago, when conlanging was considered, on the one hand, as a children’s game, on the other hand a manifestation of abnormal psychology, or a purely artistic creation outside the interest of the field of interlinguistics. Nowadays, the activity of the LCS led by professional linguists and computer programming specialists strengthened the position of conlangs. The Internet has spread in particular the LARP (Live action role-playing games) which is often connected with the learning of conlangs.

LCS helps adepts of conlanging not only through specialized services (including pedagogical and linguistic material) and forums (about 1500 persons are registered on their Facebook page alone), but also by organizing live Language Creation Conferences (LCC). Three of them took place in the USA and two in Europe. They are all described on the LCS website and the materials are freely available. LCS is a useful informational and educational institution for conlangers – and also for interlinguists who are losing themselves in the growing jungle of websites (Barandovská-Frank 2017).

## 10.2. Polyglotism

In addition to conlanging, English speakers have (re)discovered another hobby: polyglotism. Since English is now functioning as an international language, polyglots learn other foreign languages, as many as possible, just for fun. Polyglotism has been redefined to this purpose: a polyglot is no more a person working actively with many languages in thier personal or professional life, but chiefly “someone who deliberately, but for no apparent reason, learns multiple languages”(see Charters 2015: 270).

New language sites and social media brought about the formation of an online polyglot community. In 2007, the first YouTube videos from polyglots began appearing online. Dozens of portals for language learning can be found online, such as Learnlangs, Italki, Duolingo, Babbel, Actualfluency, Mango, Omniglot, Rosetta stone, Memrise, Speaking fluently – to mention only the most popular. A number of clever individuals have discovered a marketing gap and promptly created a job of “language learning coach” and gained enormous popularity on Facebook and elsewhere. A mother who sells her daughter on YouTube, on TV and at various events has become a sensation with 250 000 clicks. The six-year-old girl has been recorded speaking and reading eight languages. By and by, the time has become ready for organizing live meetings. The first of them took place at the Polyglot Conference in 2013 in Budapest and it was an immediate hit – <http://polyglotconference.com/about/our-history:>

“Meeting offline opened up the language-learning community to a new, wider audience for the first time. From that first event, the language-learning community of

YouTubers, bloggers, teachers, translators, interpreters, writers and entrepreneurs has continued to grow and flourish. Each year more people who love language come together at our international events to raise the quality of their learning experience and – by extension – the profile of polyglottery worldwide.”

Subsequent conferences were held in Novi Sad (2014), New York (2015), Thessaloniki (2016), Reykjavik (2017) and Ljubljana (2018), with a constantly growing number of participants, who are brought together to “focus on language in a way that most of us are unable to do in our daily lives”, as the website puts it. Other similar events, such as the “Polyglot Gathering” (since 2014, in 2018 the event held in Bratislava had 540 participants) or “Linguafest” (Bratislava 2018, with workshops in twenty languages, visited by many school classes, accompanied by language games, multilingual concerts and cultural program) are the continuation of the idea.

It is still controversial whether this new phenomenon belongs to the sphere of interlinguistics. Nevertheless, the main topic of polyglot meetings is acquisition of languages and many polyglots are also speakers of conlangs. In any case, this new trend attracts the attention of interlinguists.

## 11. Challenges for interlinguistics

Interlinguists should not ignore the blooming activity of polyglots and especially of conlangers. Although it can be terminologically equal: constructed languages (conlangs) = artificial languages = planned languages, (see <https://www.quora.com/Whats-the-difference-between-a-planned-a-constructed-and-an-artificial-language>), the term “conlang” has become popular and generally accepted because it is used in English-language websites. Therefore, interlinguistics is now confronted with two current problem areas: linguistic and technical-professional.

As for language, it will be necessary to recognize the dominant role of the English language, due to the leading political, economic and military position of the USA. In addition, the USA is the world-wide power in computer technologies, so the language of the Internet has been American English from the very beginning. Due to these sober facts, no science can more progress without knowledge of English – this also applies to interlinguistics. Even if new websites in ethnic languages arose (e.g. Polskie forum językotwórców), international communication without knowledge of English will be really difficult, although the non-native speaker, especially those who cannot achieve a high language level, are discriminated against. (This can be shown on the present example: the author of this paper has been asked to write in English, not in her mother tongue, nor in any of the other languages in which she publishes.)

As English is already fulfilling the role of the international language, further proposals of languages for international communication are less important. Therefore, artconlangs, not created for human understanding, but for fictional communities, are the most flourishing branch of conlangs. The second largest group contains conlangs

for literature, film and experimentation. The entertainment industry has already taken advantage of this, while interlinguistics still hesitates (however, some specialized books on artificial languages have appeared at the Lincom Europa publishing house).

In addition, language learning for pleasure, for experimental, psychological, didactic, research and similar goals becomes very popular. New options for interlinguistics are being offered here: it would be interesting not only to explore different theories, for example, of language universalities, from the point of view of cognitive linguistics; it would be possible to explore conlanging as a historical and social-linguistic phenomenon, to observe new methods of language acquisition, etc., benefiting from the interdisciplinarity of interlinguistics (Barandovská-Frank 2018).

In order to avoid the confused terminology, expressions as “conlang”, “conlanger”, “conlanging” should be taken in consideration. The finest classification of conlangs is still an ongoing chapter (see, for example, Szilva 2015).

Interest in creating new auxiliary languages has not yet declined: we can even clearly pursue four main trends:

- (1) reforms of English (e.g. Rootian English, Transitional English, Esata, English, Englisic, Engalis Anu, 26th Century American, Globish);
- (2) reforms of Esperanto and new projects inspired by it (such as Universe, Unilang, Mondlango, Arlipo, Eurolengo, Poliespo);
- (3) Romance conlangs (e.g. Romanova, Romance, Románico, Brandonian, Lingua Franca Nova, Nove Latinus, Romanido, Faulona, Simplengua);
- (4) Interslavic projects and sites for slaviconlangs (e.g. Slaveni, Slavisk, Panslava, Slovio, Proslava, Slovianski, Novoslovienskij, Medžuslovjanski). Lately, this group is attracting the attention of several interlinguists. The doctoral thesis of Anna-Maria Meyer (Meyer, 2014) was dedicated to the comparison of slaviconlangs. A germ of fruitful collaboration between interlinguists and conlangers was shown e.g. by the presentation of Slavic interlinguistics (created and propagated as a subspecies of interlinguistics by the slavacist Alexander Dulichenko during the last years) at the 101<sup>st</sup> congress of Esperanto in Nitra, Slovakia, in 2016 (see Košecký 2016).

Interlinguistic Studies at Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań are therefore a very important place to practice, learn, discuss, and research in the field of interlinguistics, a still young and developing science.

## Bibliography

- Albani, Paulo & Berlinghiero Buonarroti 1994<sup>1</sup>: *Aga Magéra Difúra. Dizionario delle lingue immaginarie*. Bologna: Zanichelli 478 p.
- Barandovská-Frank, Věra 2017: *Interlingvistiko. Enkonduko en la sciencon pri planlingvoj*. Provel-dono. Poznań: Interlingvistikaj Studoj UAM. 209 p.
- Bibliography of Planned Languages excluding Esperanto*: <http://www.lingviko.net/biblio.html>, copyright 1992–1995 by Richard K. Harrison

- Barandovská-Frank, Věra 2018: Conlangs: Ĉu studobjekto de interlingvistiko? In: Gotoo Hitosi & Vergara, José Antonio & Kimura Goro Christoph (red.): *En la mondo venis nova lingvo. Festlibro por la 75-jariĝo de Ulrich Lins*. Novjorko: Mondial. 617–632.
- Blanke, Detlev 1985: *Internationale Plansprachen*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag. 408 p.
- Blanke, Detlev 2006: *Interlinguistische Beiträge. Zum Wesen und zur Funktion internationaler Plansprachen*. Sabine Fiedler (ed.). Frankfurt a. M.: Peter Lang 405 p.
- Bormann, Artur 1959/60: Grundzüge der Interlinguistik. In: *Sprachforum* 1959-60/3: 14–25.
- Charters, Duncan 2015: Polyglot Conferences and Gatherings: observing a new phenomenon. In: *Język Komunikacja Informacja* 10: 264–276.
- Dulichenko, Aleksandr D. 1983: *Sovetskaja interlingvistika*. Tartu: Tartuskij gosudarstvennyj universitet. 87 p.
- Haugen, Einar 1959: Planning for a standard language in Norway. In: *Anthropological Linguistics*, 1959 1/3: 8–21.
- Hauptenthal, Irmi & Reinhard 2013: *Auswahlbibliographie zur Interlinguistik und Esperantologie. Selektita bibliografio pri interlingvistiko kaj esperantologio*. Bad Bellingen: Iltis. 60 p.
- Hauptenthal, Reinhard (ed.) 1976: *Plansprachen. Beiträge zur Interlinguistik*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Interlinguistics*: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Interlinguistics>
- Jespersen, Otto 1931: A new science: Interlinguistics. In: *Psyche*. London. 1930–31/3: 57–67 (<http://interlanguages.net/IL.html>)
- Koščeký, Stanislav (eld.) 2016: *Prilingve en Nitro. Politike, historie, teorie, instrue. Fakaj prelegoj prezentitaj kadre de la 101-a Universala Kongreso de Esperanto*. UEA, Rotterdam. 73–140.
- Kuznetsov, Sergej Nikolajevič 1982: *Osnovy interlingvistiki*. Moskva: Universitet družby narodov. 106 p.
- Kuznetsov, Sergej Nikolajevič 1987: *Teoreticheskie osnovy interlingvistiki*. Moskva: Izdatelstvo universiteta družby narodov. 207 p.
- Manders, Wilhelmus 1950: *Interlingvistiko kaj esperantologio*. Purmerend: Muusses. 76 p.
- Meyer, Anna-Maria 2014: Wiederbelebung einer Utopie. Probleme und Perspektiven slavischer Plansprachen im Zeitalter des Internets. Bamberg (Bamberger Beiträge zur Linguistik 6).
- Meysmans, Jules 1911: Une science nouvelle. In: *Lingua Internationale*. Bruxelles. 1911/12/8: 14–163.
- Peano, Giuseppe 1903: De latino sine flexione. In: *Rivista di matematica*, Torino, VIII: 74–83.
- Rogers, Stephen D. 2011: *A Dictionary of Made-up Languages*. Avon, Massachusetts: Adamsmedia. 294 p.
- Sakaguchi, Alicja 1998: *Interlinguistik. Gegenstand, Ziele, Aufgaben, Methoden*. Frankfurt am Main etc.: Peter Lang. 492 p.
- Szerdahelyi, István 1979: Enkonduko en la Interlingvistikon. In: Carlevaro, Tazio & Günter Lobin (eld.): *Einführung in die Interlinguistik*. Alsbach: Leuchtturm. 9–85.
- Szilágyi, Dénes 1931: Versus Interlinguistica. In: *Schola et Vita*, supplement 15.3.1931. Milano. 24 p.
- Szilva, Szabolcs 2015: Diversaj aliroj al klasifikado de planlingvoj. In: *grkg/Humankybernetik* 2015 (56)/1: 21–40.
- Tauli, Valter 1968: *Introduction to a Theory of Language Planning*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells. 227 p.
- Wandruszka, Mario 1971: *Interlinguistik. Umriss einer neuen Sprachwissenschaft*. München: Piper. 141 p.
- Wüster, Eugen 1970<sup>3</sup>: *Internationale Sprachnormung in der Technik. Besonders in der Elektrotechnik. (Die nationale Sprachnormung und ihre Verallgemeinerung)*. Bonn: H. Bouvier u. Co. Verlag. 277–433. (first edition 1931)