The present volume offers a number of studies in which language is approached from quite diverse points of view. What is the common denominator of papers dealing with topics as diverse as the deliberate influence of human beings on language, socio- and psycholinguistic observations, the language of literature, theoretical grammar, computational linguistics, and terminology? The answer is brief: All these papers belong to the realm of interlinguistics.

What is interlinguistics, what are its aims and achievements? How is it connected with linguistics in general, what is its particular field of study and what is it good for? In this introductory article I try to address these questions. I take up in the following sections the definition of interlinguistics (section 1.), its object (2.), fields of ongoing research (3.), and the position of interlinguistics amongst the neighboring disciplines (4.). I finally also give some indications of further reading and specialized bibliographies and libraries (5.).

1. The scope of interlinguistics

There are several competing definitions of interlinguistics around, which, in my view, mainly differ in scope. As the term suggests, interlinguistics has something to do with interrelations and with languages. One possible criterion for distinguishing different scholars’ concepts of interlinguistics could be found in the nature of the interrelations taken to define this particular branch of science: some authors focus on the interrelations between language systems, whereas others emphasize the relations among the speakers of different languages and their ways of communicating across language barriers.
A discussion of various versions of a definition might seem too purely academic and not very interesting for a broader audience. This is only a superficial impression, however. Indeed the careful wordings scholars find to delimit "their" science tell us a lot about what research they are doing, what the goals and interests of their research are, and beyond that also how they see the role of their endeavor in a general context of science and of society.

Let us review the definitions of interlinguistics in a systematic way. These have four degrees of scope. I begin with the narrowest one.

The first definition is this: **Interlinguistics is the study of planned languages.**

In this definition, *planned language* is a term for what is also known as *international language, auxiliary language, artificial language, universal language, world language* or the like. What is meant are languages like Volapük, Esperanto, Occidental, Ido, Interlingua, and many, many others. There is a variety of terms to refer to these languages, of which *planned language* is at present the most widely used among the involved linguists. It was created in 1931 in the form of the German word *Plansprache* by Eugen Wüster, who in so doing managed to coin a term that spread still more widely than the one he attempted to translate: Jespersen's *constructed language* (Wüster 1931; Jespersen 1928b: 21; about the origin of the term: Wüster 1955/1976: 273). Detlev Blanke (in this volume, cf. 1985: 51ff.; 1987a,b), among others, has many arguments for the preference given to this term.

What is a planned language? I shall not review the terminological discussion here, but one question should be taken up here, since it leads to theoretical distinctions of more significance than just labeling. Wouldn't the term *artificial languages* indicate much more precisely the difference between the languages in question and all the other languages, such as Chinese, Hausa or German? Interlinguists often argue that the so-called "artificial" languages are not so artificial as is supposed by those who do not know them well. Indeed it is crudely misleading when ethnic languages are put in one group, and planned languages together with computer programming languages in another. Such misleading groupings are frequently found in writings from outside language science (e.g., Raphael 1976: 45, 178), but also linguists and even interlinguists do not always clearly distinguish languages from other sign systems (e.g., Achmanova 1966: 179;
Language is a system of signs for human communication, so that planned languages are languages and programming languages are not. Programming languages are at best highly restricted subsets of a language. The word language in programming language must be understood as a metaphorically used term, as indeed many terms of computer science are metaphors of linguistic ones.

This said, isn’t "artificial" still the most appropriate label for planned languages? Aren’t Esperanto and all those others human-made, whereas the "normal" languages have historically grown, are natural languages? Thus, isn’t artificial the most precise description? Such questions, often asked by both linguists and laymen, suggest that there is a sharp borderline between the two types of languages. The opposition artificial-natural seems obvious enough. But the more one examines this borderline, the vaguer it becomes. There are hundreds of projects with at least an outline of a planned language. Only a handful have come into communicative use. These "successful" projects all belong to the a-posteriori type (see Detlev Blanke in this volume), which means that they draw more or less heavily on the stock of language material found in ethnic languages. In these planned languages, there is thus a considerable fraction of historically grown, natural material. On the other hand, very many ethnic languages have not grown to their present form in an entirely natural way. Many of them have been subjected to deliberate language planning by literati, translators, missionaries or linguists. This applies in particular to the modern standard or normed languages, literary languages, written languages or whatever they are called. There are outstanding examples of language planning, such as New Norwegian, Bahasa Indonesia or Hebrew, revived and now spoken in Israel. There are many literary languages which cannot be identified with the language community of a single dialect, and sometimes not even with that of a single language. An example of the latter type is the Franco-Italian literary language of the 13th and 14th century, labeled Kunstsprache by Günter Holtus (1979: 37ff.). And also the standards of modern languages such as written German or English do not always reflect how people speak, but are to a certain extent artificial. In "natural" languages, it may be concluded, there is a good deal of artificiality.

Not only is there some naturalness in planned languages and some artificiality in ethnic languages, there are also all types of half-way products in between. There are projects of unified ethnic languages for regional or international use, such as pan-Slavic or pan-Germanic
languages (Detlev Blanke 1985: 153-154). There are various simplifications of existing languages for international use. A well-known example of these is Basic English by Charles Ogden (1930, and many other works) based on theoretical work on semantics (Ogden–Richards 1923). Its adepts propagated it not only as an international language, but also as a first step towards learning normal English. In this sense the project has much in common with modern attempts to define basic and essential vocabularies of languages taught in school and elsewhere. There are similar projects which draw on German, Nordic or Romance material, and various others (cf. Pei 1968: 113ff.). Even classical languages have been simplified, most frequently Latin. Latino sine flexione by Giuseppe Peano (1903; later called Interlingua, one of several projects with this name) was the most successful one, and there are also attempts to revive Latin more or less unchanged (Maadla 1984).

This discussion could be continued in much more detail. My point here is that there is no binary distinction of natural versus artificial languages, but rather a scale between the two poles "artificial" and "natural", or "consciously" and "unconsciously developed". Evgenij Bokarev investigated this question and speaks of degrees of artificiality in various languages, rather than of a distinction "artificial" versus "natural" (Isaev 1976: 9).

Planned languages are designed for international or interethnic communication. In this respect, interlinguistics is concerned with people of different native languages and with their ways of communicating across language boundaries. Interethnic communication has of course not been invented by the authors of planned languages, but takes place very frequently in ethnic languages. In such communication, the language spoken may either be the native language of one of the speakers or a third language. In the latter case, the means of communication is a language both speakers had to learn, thus a second language. It is a characteristic of planned languages, that they are always second languages, used virtually exclusively for interethnic communication. In an ethnic language, by contrast, interethnic communication is a side function. The prevalent function of an ethnic language is the intercourse within its language community. Is this "secondness" perhaps a distinguishing mark of planned languages? Is a planned language a language that is always a vehicular language, nobody’s native tongue?
This may be taken as the second definition: **Interlinguistics is the study of vehicular languages for interethnic communication.**

This second definition comprises more than planned languages. Another group of languages for interethnic communication which are not native languages is well-known: **pidgin languages.** The difference between pidgins and planned languages is quite well reflected in the latter term: Pidgins are interethnic languages that have come about **spontaneously** and in an unplanned way, whereas planned languages have an underlying **plan,** a language design, as the starting point of their development. (Since pidgins are interethnic, but not planned languages, I cannot agree with Alicja Sakaguchi, 1987b: 366, who lists the terms *interethnische Sprache* and *geplante Sprache* as synonyms.)

Pidgins sometimes become native languages. This is an essential change in function, which is acknowledged by language science in the form of a different term: **creole languages.** What is so important about this change? The answer is found in that feature which is common to pidgins and planned languages: they are characterized by their function as a second language. A creole has lost this characteristic. It is a former pidgin in which the main communicative function has shifted from interethnic to intraethnic communication. What about creolization in planned languages? At least for Esperanto, there are indeed persons who speak it as their native language. But their number, possibly a few hundred, is small compared with the language community, and they have no special standardizing influence on the development of Esperanto. In addition Esperanto is, to the best of my knowledge, never the only native language. The language community as a whole is a pure second-language community. Esperanto, the planned language that has grown farthest into communicative use, is far from creolization.

The similarity between planned languages and pidgins was noticed by Dénes Szilágyi long before pidgins were an object of general attention among linguists. Interestingly enough, he uses this finding to illustrate the absence of a clear division between planned and ethnic languages: "Per conceptiones descriptivo, es difficile, si non impossibile, tale separatione, nam, per exemplo, Esperanto hodie non differ plus, in modo essentiale, de linguas nationale, sed certo non es tale; Lingua Franca, Pidgin English, Chinook, et similes, certo non es interlinguas, et tamen habe identico functione [...]" ('Such a distinction is difficult if not impossible by descriptive means, since Esperanto, for example, today no longer differs in any essential way from national languages, but certainly is not one; Lingua Franca, Pidgin English,
Chinook, and the like are certainly not planned languages, but they nevertheless have the same function"; Szilágyi 1931/1976: 165).

During creolization a language may function as a pidgin for some of its users and at the same time as a creole for others. This means that two persons with different native languages may communicate in a pidgin language they both have learned, while there are others for whom the language is native. Does the existence of others who use the same language in intraethnic communication have any effect on their communication? The answer depends highly on whether the two speakers, consciously or unconsciously, take the native speakers' usage as a norm and guideline for their own use. If not, they communicate in a normal pidgin setting. But if they are influenced by the native norm, their intercourse is closer to the use of an ethnic language, acquired by both partners. Again, there is a scale between two poles, rather than a clear distinction. This leads to the third definition of interlinguistics.

The third definition is still broader than the previous two ones: **Interlinguistics is the study of communication among speakers of different native languages, with special focus on the changes their languages undergo in such contacts.**

This definition comprises not only languages which exclusively function as second languages (pidgins and planned languages), but also ethnic languages used in interethnic communication. This includes ethnic languages, learned as a foreign language and used interethnically, but also native languages. A speaker's native language may change when he or she communicates across language borders frequently.

The third definition extends interlinguistics particularly to two fields of study which have drawn attention in linguistic scholarship during the last few decades: second-language acquisition and languages in contact.

Second-language acquisition theory has brought about a term which is so close to those of the science of planned languages that confusing misunderstandings are possible. This is the term *interlanguage* (cf. for instance Selinker 1969). It denotes the language system a learner adheres to when speaking or writing a foreign language. The term implies that the learner has not (yet) mastered the language in full concord with the norm established by the native speakers' usage. "Foreigner talk" is interlanguage.

In an insightful analysis Preben Bagger (1986: 16) shows what the difference is between an ethnic language and a planned language in
this respect: An ethnic language acquired as a second language virtually always remains a foreign language in the respect that the learner never becomes a member of the language community. Even if the learner attains a very high degree of perfection, his usage will not be taken as a contribution to the language's standard, but as a deviation, as an interlanguage. This is "die bleibende Fremdheit des Fremdsprachensprechers" (Ehlich 1986). In the acquisition of a planned language, however, the learner begins by speaking an interlanguage as well, but step by step he becomes a member of the language community, adding his mosaic pieces to the standard of the language.

Although this appears to suggest a sharp binary distinction between planned and ethnic languages, Bagger's lucid description actually confirms the absence of a clear borderline. Indeed languages can be said to have a threshold that, as it were, keeps a learner from becoming an equal of the native speakers, and again, different languages can be ranked on a scale as to the height of that threshold. A language never used for interethnic communication has the highest threshold, languages often used for this purpose have a lesser threshold, and languages exclusively in interethnic use have a low threshold. Planned languages are at the lower extreme of the scale, whereas minority languages whose members virtually all are bilingual and never communicate with the outside in their own language will form the high-threshold end. The threshold is lower in a community where there are many persons for whom the community language is foreign. Even within a single language there may be subcommunities with different thresholds. It is easier to become a member of the Indian-English community (which is to a large extent a second-language community) than of the English-speaking community in a small village in the British countryside.

This scale of thresholds is at the same time a scale of a language community's contacts to the outside. Here the study of language contacts has its main field of interest. Languages which are in long-standing contact with each other exercise a mutual (or monodirectional) influence. Loan words are only the tip of the iceberg – influences are possible on all levels of syntax and semantics down to word formation, morphology, phonology, and so on.

While those who apply the first definition of interlinguistics mean mainly the interrelations involving speakers from different language communities, those interested in language contacts deal mainly with
the interplay of language systems and may accordingly use the term in the sense of the third definition.

Language contacts and foreign-language teaching are not the only fields for which this definition holds. Also the use of ethnic languages in interethnic communication in general is dealt with by some under the heading of interlinguistics. Regional and international use of languages, colonialization, cultural domination, linguistic minorities, and many other topics belong to this realm.

From such a wide interpretation, it is a small step to the fourth and broadest definition: **Interlinguistics is contrastive linguistics.**

As opposed to the study of languages in contact, contrastive linguistics may compare any two (or more) languages, not only those that are geographically or otherwise related.

Having reached this remote point, let us return to the four definitions in reverse order, examining which ones are most widely spread and who adheres to which alternative.

The **fourth** definition is rare. I have an indication of very few instances in which the Russian word *interlingvističeskij* was used in the general sense of ‘between two [arbitrary] languages’ in studies of contrastive linguistics. As an example Duličenko (1982: 70) cites a comparison of German and Uzbek. Also Mario Wandruszka once defined interlinguistics as "alle kontrastive, konfrontative, differentielle Linguistik" (Wandruszka 1972: 19, quoted from Ölberg 1979: 243), but when he works out his idea in more detail he appears to adhere to the third type of definition (see below).

The **third** definition has found a larger audience in linguistic publications. Duličenko (1982: 69, cf. 1983) reports that in the sixties a number of studies were published in the Soviet Union, in which interlinguistics was taken to be the study of language contacts. This field has a certain tradition in the Soviet Union, especially under the heading of what in Russian is termed *obogaščenie* ‘enrichment’ or *vzaimoobogaščenie* ‘mutual enrichment’ and denotes the influences between the various languages of the country and its interethnic language, Russian. The authors cited by Duličenko (Žluktenko 1966; Jižákevyč 1969; Iljašenko 1970; also Rot 1971) seem to come from institutes engaged in these studies, in the Ukraine and Moldavia. I have no indication that they are aware of the use of the term in connection with planned languages.
Another adept of the third definition has been able to make his opinion more influential: Mario Wandruszka. Wandruszka is apparently unaware of the Soviet authors, but he explicitly refers to the well-established use of the term for the study of planned languages. But he nevertheless redefines it in his own way: "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 als Interlinguistik" (Wandruszka 1971: 10; note 2 on pp. 10f. refers to the term being used at the 6th International Congress of Linguists in Paris 1948 [cf. Martinet 1949; Lejeune (ed.) 1949: 409-416, 585-600], to Jespersen’s use and to [then] forthcoming publications edited by Haupenthal). Of all the fields Wandruszka’s vague definition comprises, the comparison of literary translations with each other and with the original has perhaps been most at the heart of his own work (e.g., Wandruszka 1969).

I am not aware of any scholar suggesting the second definition of interlinguistics. That is, I know no explicit definition of this type. But there are reasons to believe that quite a few implicitly apply a definition like this. One of these reasons is the interest of some interlinguists for pidgins and creoles. The series Interlinguistica Tartuensis, for instance, published by the University of Tartu (Estonia, Soviet Union) and edited by Aleksandr Duličenko in collaboration with an editorial board of linguists from various Soviet institutes, already in its first volume (Duličenko [ed.] 1982) contains, among papers on planned languages, also a study of a creole (Nurmekund 1982). In addition, a number of authors point out the similarities between pidgins and planned languages without calling the study of these common features interlinguistics. Szilágyi (1931/1976, quoted above) mentions their function as vehicular languages. Charles Hockett (1958: 422ff.) puts it the other way round, saying that neither pidgins nor planned languages normally are native languages, and he draws an interesting parallel between the creolization of a pidgin and Esperanto becoming used as a native language by children of mixed couples. De Groot (1962: 25) reports similar observations.

Various other researchers seem to be guided by a similar reasoning. Claus Jürgen Hutterer (1975: 413-419) subsumes pidgins, creoles, and planned languages under the common heading of Mischsprachen. The editors of the forthcoming Lexikon der romanistischen Linguistik place
a contribution on Romance-based planned languages (Schmidt-Radefeldt forthc.) in a volume on pidgins, creoles, and other contact languages (Holtus–Metzeltin–Schmitt [eds.] forthc.). The editors have not only chosen this place for the paper because it had to be inserted somewhere, but they obviously wish to emphasize a strong connection between planned languages such as Esperanto, Occidental, etc., on the one hand and literary languages with a high degree of artificiality such as medieval Franco-Italian on the other, uniting the relevant contributions by a common section title "Plan- und Kunstsprachen auf romanischer Basis I-IV" (Schmidt-Radefeldt forthc.; Mölk forthc.; Tavani forthc.; Holtus forthc.). I understand from personal communications from Schmidt-Radefeldt and Holtus that they label Esperanto, etc., Plansprachen, and Franco-Italian and the like Kunstsprachen. But in French and Italian the publisher’s folder from which I quote translates Plan- und Kunstsprachen as Langues artificielles, Lingue artificiali without distinction. That scholars from outside the interlinguistics circles see artificiality in language in this way, may be taken as a support for the idea of a scale, rather than a sharp borderline, between artificiality and naturalness.

The first definition, finally, is the one most widely acknowledged and applied among the scholars involved. Definitions of this type are implicitly used by a considerable number of authors. Among those who are explicit about their definition is first of all Otto Jespersen, although the term was invented not by him, but by Jules Meysmans (1911-12/1976). Jespersen had earlier been a member of the committee of the Délégation pour l’adoption d’une langue auxiliaire internationale. This society never succeeded in opting for one of the existing language projects, nor did they combine their expertise to design a new and better one. But individual scholars involved wrote their own language projects. Among them are Louis Couturat and Louis de Beaufront who under the name of the Délégation in 1907 launched a project to reform Esperanto, which became a planned language of its own, Ido (cf., e.g., Beaufront 1925; Detlev Blanke 1985: 185ff. gives details about the intricate question of who is really the author of Ido). Giuseppe Peano published Latino sine flexione (Peano 1903), and Jespersen (1928a) Novial. According to Jespersen (1930-31/1976: 148), interlinguistics should study existing languages "with a view to the establishing of a norm for interlanguages", i.e., planned languages.
Hermann Öberg (1954/1976: 243) defines interlinguistics in a broad sense as a field comprising all means of interethnic communication (so that it looks like a type-two definition), but immediately narrows his definition by saying that interlinguistics proper is concerned with planned languages. Other works often proceed similarly. Humphrey Tonkin and Detlev Blanke give a definition approximately like Öberg’s. They acknowledge — which Öberg in 1954 of course could not do — the existence of Wandruszka’s opinion, but emphasize that planned languages are the central field of study in interlinguistics (Tonkin 1977: 8; Detlev Blanke 1977a,b, 1985: 293, and in this volume). Sergej Kuznecov puts a strong accent on planned languages as well, but extends his definition also to multilingualism and so-called internationalisms (Kuznecov 1982a: 18, 1982b: 5, 1987: 7ff.). Internationalisms are a phenomenon which was paid much attention to by the International Auxiliary Language Association (IALA), established in 1924 (Gode et al. 1951: ix). Other authors just state that interlinguistics deals with planned languages (e.g., Tauli 1968: 28, 167; Dubois et al. 1973: 265).

What do all these definitions reflect about the authors’ intentions? It is instructive to hear what scholars write about the purport of interlinguistic studies.

Meysmans (1911-12/1976), the inventor of the term *interlinguistique*, calls for a science to investigate interethnic use of ethnic languages in order to design a planned language for world-wide use, and Jespersen’s intentions aim in a similar direction (cf. also Jespersen 1913). In this way, many authors even today describe interlinguistics as an active science. According to them, interlinguistics should resolve the world language problem by means of a planned language. Szilágyi (1931/1976: 179) defines a historical and comparative *interlinguistica generale* and in addition an *interlinguistica normativo* about theories and techniques for producing planned languages. Manders (1950: 3-4) says, "La interlingvistiko estas tiu branĉo, kiu celas trovi la plej kontentigan solvon de la planlingva problemo" (‘Interlinguistics is the branch that aims at finding the most satisfactory solution of the problem of a planned language’). In Wüster’s definition (1955/1976: 272) interlinguistics is part of what he calls *gestaltende Sprachwissenschaft*. Although Wüster probably had essentially terminological standardization in mind (see Wera Blanke, in this volume), Valter Tauli (1968: 27, 167) does not depart too far from Wüster when he claims interlinguistics as a subbranch of his own field
of interest, language planning. The journal Language Problems and Language Planning, previously called La Monda Lingvo-Problemo, was established to focus on the entire range of issues in language politics and language planning. Its policy has recently become more open towards interlinguistics. This witnesses the insight that planned languages through their movements are inseparably involved in the struggle for linguistic equality and thereby in language politics, and also that the active approach to language that brings about planned languages at the same time establishes a very tight link to language planning in ethnic languages. The connection between planned languages and language planning is also emphasized by those authors who place interlinguistics in the framework of applied linguistics (Back 1970; Ölberg 1979: 243; Szerdahelyi 1979a: 72, 1979b: 10-11; Sakaguchi 1985: 48; Lewandowski 1979: 295; for a critical viewpoint, see Kuznecov, in this volume) and it is often recognized in passing by language planning researchers (e.g., Alisjahbana 1974: 414). Still more explicit than such remarks is the decision of István Fodor and Claude Hagège to include into their three-volume anthology on language reform István Szerdahelyi’s contribution on Esperanto (Szerdahelyi 1984) amongst a series of articles on ethnic languages (in one of which Tauli, 1984, deals with Estonian).

Other authors more specifically point out what the solution in their view is. Artur Bormann (e.g., 1959-60/1976: 294) always speaks about die internationale Sprache (n.b. the use of the definite article), and Reinhard Haupenthal (1976: 4) quite correctly notes that Bormann means Esperanto. Many others concentrate on Esperanto in a similar way (Szerdahelyi 1965/1976; Haupenthal 1971: 50).

2. The object of interlinguistics

Having stated that interlinguistics according to the by far most widely accepted definition is concerned with planned languages, I now take up in brief what kind of research interlinguists currently are engaged in.

First of all, what are planned languages? I have used a large part of section 1. on motivating that there is no sharp borderline between planned and ethnic languages. Rather, all human languages together can be imagined on a scale between naturalness and artificiality. But although there may be doubts about one or the other language as to its status as either an ethnic or a planned language, there are of course
names of languages which are without hesitation associated with the realm of Planned Languages. How many are there? I do not know the answer, and if I did, it would be incorrect by the time the book is printed. There are hundreds of projects, maybe a thousand, most of them published since the middle of the 19th century (see Duličenko's statistics, in this volume). I am not aware of any exhaustive list, but there are quite sizeable overviews, provided among others by Louis Couturat and Léopold Leau (1903/1907a), Monnerot-Dumaine (1960: 163ff.), Detlev Blanke (1985: 99ff.; cf. in this volume), and Evgenij Bokarev (1987). The most complete record is probably Duličenko's 916-entry list (Duličenko 1988). The number of projects is ultimately also a matter of definition. How complete must the language design and the dictionary be to qualify as a project rather than a sketch? How much must it differ from existing projects to count as a reform project rather than a modification proposal?

The second question, which is often asked (and unfortunately often answered without a thorough knowledge of the facts), is whether Planned Languages really are languages. And consequently, whether they are worth linguists' attention. I shall not summarize the discussions devoted to this question in the pages of linguistic books and journals during the last hundred years. I only give an answer, which I cannot prove in this paper, but which the reader will find substantiated throughout this book.

The question is this: Can something as artificial as a Planned Language be a full-fledged human language? A language – to take an abstract, but uncontroversial starting point for the argument – is a system of signs for human communication, whose meaning is fixed and maintained by convention in a language community. Is it possible to replace this process of conventional definition by artificial language design? Most linguists deny this, and I think they are right. Indeed, a Planned Language is not a "real" language in the moment when its grammar is published in a brochure. Many Planned Languages have never gone further than this. Sometimes a project was published, but only a handful of people started using it, and often not even this many. All these projects are not languages. In a few cases, however, a proposed Planned Language was more widely accepted and learned by many people with different native languages – an essential feature. Slowly the language acquired a language community (more precisely: a second-language community), in which, finally, after decades of development, the linguistic signs indeed were fixed and maintained by convention.
When reading or quoting linguists’ discussions of planned languages from several decades ago, one should be aware of this development in some of the projects, above all in Esperanto. The Esperanto which Karl Brugmann, August Leskien, Hugo Schuchardt, Jan Baudouin de Courtenay, and their contemporaries were discussing at the beginning of this century was still in many features a project, while we today can observe a language. Their arguments may not pertain to today’s object of interlinguistics. Our evidence differs from theirs (Schuchardt 1904/1976; Brugmann–Leskien 1907; Baudouin de Courtenay 1907/1976; cf. Achmanova–Bokarev 1956; Grigor’ev 1960; Szerdahelyi 1976: 4ff.; Detlev Blanke 1985: 74ff.).

Detlev Blanke (1985: 105ff. and Tabelle 2; also in this volume) has investigated planned languages from this point of view and arranged them on a scale of progression on their way towards the real-language status. Blanke divides his scale into three major groups and says that the overwhelming majority of planned languages have remained projects, some have become semi-languages and, for the time being, only a single one can be considered to be a full language: Esperanto. It is merely for the ease of the reader when the authors of this volume mostly speak of planned languages, not distinguishing between a language, a semi-language, or a project. And of course Blanke’s classification is not a law which all other interlinguists would agree with (for criticism cf. Sakaguchi 1987a: 188). But whatever one feels about Blanke’s account, I think it is uncontroversial to say that a language project is not a language from the very beginning, but can only become a language through a relatively slow and unconscious development. I have elsewhere described this view in more detail, especially with artificial symbol systems in mind that are not and cannot become languages, such as programming languages, predicate-logical notations etc. (Schubert 1988b). My paper on word grammar (Schubert, in this volume) is also concerned with the development of a project towards a real language.

These differences in development also explain why in most of the contributions to this book Esperanto plays a role, although other planned languages are dealt with as well: Esperanto is the most developed one of all the planned languages, it has the largest language community, the largest literature, and so on. As early as 1947, Henry Jacob, a prominent adept of Ido, one of Esperanto’s competitors, frankly admits that "Esperanto is today the only artificial language which has been able to form and to maintain a mass movement" (Jacob 1947: 39). This implies that of all planned languages, Esperanto
is the one in which research best can be based on observation of actual phenomena, rather than on speculation about eventual possibilities. Antoine Meillet's famous remark "Toute discussion théorique est vaine: l’espéranto a fonctionné" (Meillet 1928: 278) is a paraphrase of this fact. André Martinet (in this volume) cites a similar opinion.

One of the most exciting objects of interlinguistics, which characterizes the whole discipline and distinguishes it from neighboring fields, is the development of a language project towards a full human language. In step with this development of the object of study, also interlinguistics itself has grown and changed. Many interlinguists define their science as an applied, active effort of design (see 1.). This is the more understandable, if one considers the roots of interlinguistics. It derives from attempts to obtain recognition from the side of the "official" language science for the language projects launched during the last decades of the 19th century. In the beginning, these activities where mainly propaganda for certain projects, Volapük, Esperanto, Ido, etc. Without this sort of propaganda, no language communities would ever have been gathered for the projects. But while some of the projects, most obviously Esperanto, quietly changed into languages, the academic interest in them changed into a science. Those studying planned languages did no longer do so only in order to defend them, nor only to improve or redesign them or to prescribe a certain usage, but they learned to observe, to study and to describe. One of the first to apprehend this scientific attitude towards planned languages was probably René de Saussure (cf. Schubert, in this volume).

It would require more detailed investigation into the history of interlinguistics to account for the degree and the kind of "official" recognition interlinguistics found in various periods. I shall not list the famous names linked to interlinguistics, but it may be mentioned that two of the International Congresses of Linguists dedicated discussions to planned languages: the second one in Geneva in 1931 and the sixth one in Paris in 1948 (Actes 1933: 72-108; Martinet 1949; Lejeune [ed.] 1949: 409-416, 585-600). After a long period of silence, recently the 14th International Congress of Linguists in Berlin in 1987 took up interlinguistics in two sessions of a Round Table (lead by Detlev Blanke, Ronald Lötzsch, and Sergej Kuznecov). It may be taken as an indication for the increased strength of the science, that outside these interlinguistic sessions planned languages played a role also in a series
of papers in quite different sections of the Congress (Bahner–Schildt–Viehweger [eds.] forthc.). Another such indication is the interlinguistics committee which at the time of writing is being founded within the Association Internationale de Linguistique Appliquée (AILA).

3. Fields of current research

The Congresses of Linguists of course by no means give a complete overview of the ongoing interlinguistic research in the world. In my view, some of the fields currently most focussed on may be summarized under these four headings:

- Deliberate influence on language.
- The communicative function of a planned language.
- Internality and its reflexes in language structure.
- Practical applications of planned languages.

Of course these labelings comprise a good deal of subjective interpretation. In somewhat more detail, I consider the four fields to contain each a stream of interrelated research, carried out at different places and with different emphases.

**Deliberate influence** on language comprises both planned languages and language planning. There is a continuum of decreasing artificiality in the following types of languages (for the terms see Detlev Blanke, in this volume):

- an a-priori planned language (e.g., Leibniz’s language of 1666; cf. Detlev Blanke 1985: 129),
- an autonomous a-posteriori language (Esperanto),
- a naturalistic a-posteriori language (Occidental),
- a compromise language for a certain family of ethnic languages (pan-Slavic),
- a modified or simplified ethnic language (Latino sine flexione),
- a simplified ethnic language for the purpose of introducing learners to the unmodified language (Basic English),
- a more or less consciously developed literary language between several language communities (medieval Franco-Italian),

- a highly planned ethnic language (Estonian),

- a super-regional standard form of an ethnic language (High German),

- an ethnic language "restored" by purists (Icelandic),

- an "untouched" ethnic language (Frisian).

This list can be seen as an enlarged close-up of the three middle items on Umberto Eco's scale of (linguistic and extralinguistic) communication systems between the poles "natural, spontaneous" and "cultural" (Eco 1968/1972: 20-26; cf. also Sakaguchi 1983b: 276; see Dulicenko, in this volume, on the opposition natura – cultura).

Research into the relationships between planned languages and language planning is carried out among others by Valter Tauli (1968; on Tauli cf. Verloren van Themaat 1985: 21, 1987: 696). The standpoint of the language designer is focussed on by Dan Maxwell, François Lo Jacomo, and Rüdiger Eichholz (all in this volume). Also Aleksandr Dulicenko (in this volume) takes up the similarities of humans' deliberate influence on both planned and ethnic languages. Language planning presupposes an active attitude towards language development. That such an attitude quite naturally includes both ethnic and planned languages is a fact that is sometimes alluded to by the term language engineering (cf. for instance, Alisjahbana 1974: 391, 414; Guzmán de Rojas 1985). Henry Jacob (1948: 1) even sees a direct link to unplanned language development, when he writes: "In fact, I believe that language-making is not an activity moving in a vacuum but merely the anticipation of linguistic development of our ethnic language on a new level, and I therefore propose to call it interlinguistics, that is, the study of international language."

The communicative function of a planned language has at least two main aspects, an individual and a collective one, and is studied by psycholinguists and by sociolinguists, respectively. It is obvious that these research directions are mainly concerned with Esperanto, since Esperanto and its language community can most easily be studied with the methods and instruments familiar from ethnic languages.

The psycholinguistic approach addresses among others the questions how Esperanto interacts with the speaker's native language, which communicative competence speakers acquire, and what their
attitude is towards the planned language. Does cognitive language acquisition distinguish Esperanto speakers from the speakers of other second languages such as pidgins?

Psycholinguistic research on planned languages is reported by Carlevaro (in this volume), by Pool and Grofman (in this volume) and by Kornilov (1984).

The sociolinguistic approach to the communicative function of planned languages deals with Esperanto’s language community (and, as far as they exist or have existed, those of other planned languages). Interesting questions are how a second-language community functions, how a common standard is established and maintained, how ethnic influences are dealt with, how cross-cultural communication develops and on whose terms, which social groups need international communication, which ones use a planned language for the purpose and whether this shows in the language system... The problem of a standard in pronunciation, syntax, semantics, vocabulary, text structuring, style, and so on has interesting intersections with the first group of questions about deliberate influence: What is the role and effect of reform projects, or of academies and language committees? Do textbook authors and lexicographers describe or prescribe? Can the author of a project steer its development? Do dialects emerge?


**Internationality** and its reflexes in language structure is a heading I use for investigations into seemingly quite diverse objects. At an abstract enough level, the question is whether the special function of a planned language as a cognitively acquired second language and a means of interethnic communication presupposes special features in the grammar or the vocabulary of the language, or whether it brings about such reflexes. At a more concrete level, this question is the subject of rather different branches, such as syntax, semantics, word formation,
lexicology and, in particular, terminology, and of the study of literary language.

In the more grammatical of these fields, syntax, semantics, and word formation, the need of internationality is catered to by project authors at first hand in a superficial manner: They choose the elements of their languages in such a way that they seem familiar to the members of their target group. This aim is pursued with at least two competing and mutually exclusive methods, the naturalistic and the autonomous language design (cf. Detlev Blanke, in this volume). The naturalistic approach relies on the immediate intelligibility of words, whereas the autonomous approach gives preference to reliable, unrestrictedly productive rules. In the autonomous languages (Esperanto, Ido ...) the rule-governed structure comes down to a high degree of decomposability or, seen from the generative point of view, highly productive combinatorial rules. Concretely speaking, this means phonemic pronunciation rather than etymological spelling, complex multi-morpheme words rather than many unanalyzable roots, word-by-word translatable expressions rather than idioms, explicit syntactic markers rather than "invisible" word order rules and many other features.

This field comprises most of the grammatical work done in interlinguistics and is too sizeable to be accounted for with a few references. This volume contains relevant contributions by Dasgupta, Sadler, and Schubert. For more literature I refer to the standard works and bibliographies listed in section 5. (cf. also Jacob 1947: Part I; Janton 1973; Isaev 1981). Claude Piron's paper on the evolution of Esperanto (in this volume) approaches internationality from a more sociolinguistic angle.

Lexicology and terminology have to do with the communicative function of the language (and, incidentally, with deliberate influence), because planned languages – the less wide-spread they are, the more so – in the beginning of their development have to rely heavily on active word and term makers. Words do certainly arise and spread through unreflected use as well, but language planning within a planned language is without doubt inevitable, at least in the beginning.

Interlinguistics has here a close link to the language planning activities needed in ethnic languages when technical and scientific writing, language for special purposes, and similar sublanguages are at issue. Such links were created largely by Eugen Wüster who initiated much of today's effort at standardization in terminology and other
areas of ethnic languages by drawing substantially on the insights he had obtained in interlinguistics.

Relevant research is accounted for among others by Dietze (1983), Sadler (1987), Eichholz (1988), Wera Blanke (1988), and by Eichholz, Sadler, and Wera Blanke (all in this volume).

While terminology is concerned with making a language, planned or ethnic, suitable for technology and science, the language of literature covers a different, not less essential part of language. Critics often suggest that a language like Esperanto might perhaps be useful for technical writing, but will never attain the subtle depth and the expressiveness of profound emotion and human sentiment which is characteristic for the languages of Puškin, Goethe, Shakespeare ...

But again, study comes closer to the truth than prejudice (cf. Ölberg 1954/1976: 245). Therefore, research on the language of literature belongs to interlinguistics, although the literary qualities of works of literature in planned languages are beyond the scope of (inter)linguistics.

Two contributions to this book tackle the Esperanto of literature. Pierre Janton (in this volume) compares Shakespeare in English and Esperanto, and Manuel Halvelik (in this volume) accounts for his methods of creating dialect, slang, and archaic language in Esperanto for literary translations. The latter effort may at first sight convince the reader finally and irreversibly that all this Esperanto stuff is nothing but a senseless pastime for eccentric hobbyists. Yet again, one should not judge, but study. In a recent report, Aira Buffa (1987) tells us about exactly the problems Halvelik tries to resolve. But Buffa did not encounter the need to create archaic language in Esperanto or Occidental, but in a perfectly "real" and "natural" language: Finnish. Buffa’s problem was translating the archaic Italian in Umberto Eco’s novel *Il nome della rosa* into Finnish. If this is such a problem in Finnish, which has had a writing tradition since the 16th century, how much more must Buffa’s and Halvelik’s creative approach be applicable to translation into the recently alphabetized languages of Africa, Asia, and America?

Research into the language of Esperanto literature is reported about by Margaret Hagler (1971), Kopylenko (1983), Claude Piron (1987).

There are many practical applications of planned languages, especially of Esperanto. A special type of application which recently has been gaining ground is the use of Esperanto in computational
linguistics. (I am not aware of any other planned languages used in computer applications.)

Three stages may be distinguished in this development. Firstly, when in the forties and fifties of this century machine translation among ethnic languages turned out to be much more difficult than had been supposed, Esperanto, Interlingua, and other projects were mentioned every now and then as suitable and possibly useful instruments for natural-language processing by scholars who, however, did not themselves have the required interlinguistic expertise to realize their idea (Hutchins 1986: 34). Still before computers really existed, Petr Smirnov-Trojanskij in the 1930's devised a method of automatic translation based on an allegedly cross-linguistic "logical syntax" which he expressed by means of Esperanto function morphemes. His proposals were studied three decades later in the Soviet machine translation groups (Denisov 1965: 80ff.). At approximately the same time, Lucien Tesnière (1959/1982: 64) developed his dependency syntax in which Esperanto word class identifiers function as universally valid labels. My contribution to this book may suggest why Esperanto has these "universal" features.

Secondly, interlinguistic and computational skills met, and Esperanto was used in a number of implementations. In the second phase, Esperanto was mainly treated as any other (ethnic) language, but with some special comfort for the computational linguist, since it happened to be a good deal more regular and processable than other languages. Some of the available publications seem to be mere paper studies (Sjögren 1970; Kelly 1978; Dietze 1986), others comprise smaller programs (Ben-Avi 1977) and in a few cases implementations of a larger scale could be realized, for example in machine translation (Maas 1982, 1985, 1987: 240; Katumori–Hukuda 1984; Makino–HIRATA–Katumori 1986; Kat 1985; Mohai 1986; Li 1986), in speech recognition and synthesis (Sherwood 1978, 1982, 1985) and even in efforts to combine both fields (Sato–Kasuya 1987).

The third stage begins with the DLT machine translation project. Distributed Language Translation is the name of a long-term research and development project carried out by the BSO software house in Utrecht with funding from the Netherlands Ministry of Economic Affairs. For the present seven-year period (1985-1991) it has a budget of 17 million guilders (for details about DLT cf. Witkam 1983; Papegaaij 1986; Schubert 1986, 1987, forthc. b; Papegaaij–Schubert 1988; Hutchins forthc.). Although much larger in size than earlier attempts, DLT started off as just another project of the second stage,
using Esperanto as its intermediate language. Esperanto had been judged suitable for this purpose because of its highly regular syntax and morphology and because its agglutinative nature promised an especially efficient possibility of morpheme-based coding of messages for network transmission. During the course of the first years of large-scale practical development, however, the role of Esperanto in the DLT system increased substantially. The intermediate language took over more and more processes originally designed to be carried out either in the source or in the target languages of the multilingual system. When I consider the DLT system to be one step more highly developed than the earlier implementations involving Esperanto, it is because the increase in the role of Esperanto was due to intrinsic qualities of Esperanto as a planned language. In other words, Esperanto is in DLT no longer treated as any other language (which incidentally has a somewhat more computer-friendly grammar than other languages), but it is now used in DLT for a large part of the overall translation process because of its special features as a planned language. Some facets of this complex application are discussed by Sadler (in this volume).

The functions fulfilled in DLT by means of Esperanto are numerous. Generally speaking one can say that since the insight about the usefulness of a planned language’s particular features for natural-language processing, the whole DLT system design has tended to move into the Esperanto part of the system all functions that are not specific for particular source or target languages. These are all semantic and pragmatic processes of meaning disambiguation, word choice, detection of semantic deixis and reference relations, etc. So-called knowledge of the world has been stored in a lexical knowledge bank and is consulted by a word expert system. All these applications of Artificial Intelligence are in DLT carried out entirely in Esperanto. Let it be said explicitly: Esperanto does not serve as a programming language (DLT is implemented in Prolog and C), but as a human language which renders the full content of the source text being translated with all its nuances, disambiguates it and conveys it to the second translation step to a target language.

In this function as an intermediate language in machine translation Esperanto in principle competes with three other types of sign systems. The interlinguistic experience in DLT suggests that Esperanto outdoes them all (Schubert 1988a: 205; for an alternative approach, see Boitet forthc.). For this particular function Esperanto is better suited than
- **ethnic languages**, since the intermediate language should be substantially clearer than source and target languages, allowing for **fully** automatic translation from it, which is impossible from ethnic languages (Hutchins 1986: 154).

- **artificial symbol systems** such as predicate-logical notations, number codes, programming languages, etc., since their expressiveness is inherently insufficient for the comprehensive rendering of the content of texts written in human languages (Hjelmslev 1963: 101; Schubert 1988b).

- **other projects of planned languages**, since these have not proceeded so far as Esperanto in the unreflected development in a sizeable multi-cultural language community, a prerequisite for the emergence of a semantic system which is **autonomous**, i.e., not bound to any reference language(s).

These four fields of current interest comprise quite a lot of different approaches to the phenomenon of planned languages within the general field of human language. In addition, much work is done in the area of descriptive grammar of planned languages. Interestingly enough, the study of structurally clearly designed language systems in many cases reveals a good deal of pertinent evidence for the way human language functions quite generally. Probal Dasgupta’s chapter of Universal Grammar (in this volume) and also my own contribution (Schubert, in this volume) proceed in this way from a descriptive treatise of Esperanto to more general conclusions. My analysis is built on the idea of a planned language as a model and laboratory tool for general language studies, much in the way Otto Back (1979: 270) suggests.

### 4. Intersections with related fields

Interlinguistics is in many respects an interdisciplinary effort. It has connections to many branches of linguistics and of neighboring sciences.

When interlinguistics describes planned languages, it has much in common with the study of ethnic languages. Esperantology, a subbranch of interlinguistics, describes Esperanto in a way similar to the description of English or Japanese in other disciplines. In studying a certain group of the languages of the world, interlinguistics
contributes to grammar, phonology, and other "traditional" branches of language science.

When interlinguistics investigates the development of planned languages, it intersects with the study of language planning, but also with the theory of (unplanned) language change.

When interlinguistics explores an individual’s acquisition of, and competence in, a planned language, it overlaps with psycholinguistics and with the science of second-language acquisition and foreign-language teaching.

When interlinguistics studies the functioning of a planned language in its language community and in the native communities of its speakers, the emergence and maintenance of a standard or questions of cross-cultural communication, it cooperates with sociolinguistics, with the linguistics of pidgins and creoles, and with the study of ethnic languages used for an international audience.

When interlinguistics contributes to speech recognition and synthesis, in machine translation and other fields of natural-language processing, it competes with other branches of applied and computational linguistics at the frontline of ongoing research in language technology.

Kuznecov’s (1987: 14) clearcut sketch of the position of interlinguistics amongst its neighbor sciences is to the point: "Takim obrazom, možno skazat’, čto interlingvistika sibližaetsja po raznym napravlenijam s temi jazykovedč eskimi disciplinami, kotorye imejut prjamoe ili kosvennoe otnošenie k 1) meždunarodnym jazykam i meždunarodnomu v jazyke ili 2) iskusstvennym jazykam i iskusstvennomu v jazyke" (‘thus one can say that interlinguistics from different directions approaches those disciplines of linguistics that have a direct or indirect relation to 1) international languages and internationality in language or 2) artificial languages and artificiality in language’).

5. Further reading

The present volume can but introduce the reader to some subfields of a complex science. Readers interested in a more profound study of interlinguistics may approach the field from many directions. As for the possibility of finding the desired information straightforwardly, two
sources of information can be recommended: standard works and bibliographies.

Overview works on planned languages and on interlinguistics have been written every now and then during the last hundred years. One of the earliest is Louis Couturat and Léopold Leau’s *Histoire de la langue universelle* (1903/1907a). Annotated reviews of greater or smaller numbers of language projects were published by both interlinguists and outside observers (e.g., Manders 1947; Monnerot-Dumaine 1960; Pei 1968; Bausani 1970; Large 1985). But the standard work, outstanding in scope, comprehensiveness, and bibliographical accuracy, is at present Detlev Blanke’s *Internationale Plansprachen* (1985). Similarly comprehensive works, that draw in part on different sources than Blanke, are Sergej Kuznecov’s books (1982b, 1987).

According to an estimation by Detlev Blanke (1985: 294, 1987: 89), 60% of the interlinguistic literature is written in planned languages, of which 95% in Esperanto. Although many of these publications contain valuable scientific findings, they are often published in very low quantities by internationally unexperienced publishers and are circulated outside the "official" channels like book stores and catalogues, university and public libraries, etc. In this situation, reliable bibliographies are an indispensable instrument for interlinguistic investigations. A classical bibliography is provided by Stojan (1929/1973). Annotated introductory bibliographies come from Haupenthal (1968, especially the interlinguistics chapter) and Tonkin (1977). A good selective bibliography which covers the whole century of interlinguistic endeavor is found in Haupenthal’s collection of translated articles *Plansprachen* (Haupenthal 1976b). The probably most complete (although of course not exhaustive) bibliography is contained in Detlev Blanke’s standard work (1985: 296-381). An interesting source is Duličenko’s (1983) account of Soviet interlinguistics, which contains short abstracts of many publications hardly accessible outside the Soviet Union. Finally, also Wood’s (1982) description of the state of the art at the time of publication gives useful bibliographical hints. The most important source of up-to-date bibliographic information is Tonkin’s interlinguistics chapter in the *MLA International Bibliography of Books and Articles on the Modern Languages and Literatures* (e.g., 1986 *MLA international bibliography* 1987: nos. 12,651-12,880) which for a couple of years has been a well-informed and reliable working tool. Other international
linguistic bibliographies of the same scope, such as the otherwise rather complete *Bibliographie linguistique* (e.g., 1987), often include only incidental references in the realm of interlinguistics. A still more up-to-date source of information than the one in the annual MLA bibliography is provided by *Informilo por interlingvistoj*, an interlinguistics newsletter in Esperanto, published by the Center for Research and Documentation on World Language Problems in Rotterdam and New York and edited by Ryszard Rokicki (Warsaw).

Discovering a bibliography entry is no guarantee for finding the publication itself. What is not obtained through university libraries and international library exchange may be found in specialized libraries maintained by the Esperanto movement and other organizations. Valuable collections are kept at the Universal Esperanto Association’s head office in Rotterdam, at the British Esperanto Association in London, in the municipal library of La Chaux-de-Fonds in Switzerland, and in the International Esperanto Museum, a branch of the Austrian National Library in Vienna. To the best of my knowledge, only the latter one is connected to international library exchange services. Besides these, collections of various size are found at many places all over the world. Some of these collections are accounted for in specialized catalogues, e.g., Vienna (Steiner 1969; Hube–März 1975), Lublin (Wojtakowski 1979), Saarbrücken (Haupenthal 1977), and Oslo (Høeg 1973). For a partial survey of collections, see McKown (1981).

Finally, interlinguistics publications are for sale. But again, it is often difficult to get hold of the works through normal book stores. This especially pertains to works written in planned languages which are aimed at those languages’ worldwide scattered language communities. The Esperanto movement has formed a well-functioning network of mail order book stores, the most important one of which is maintained by the Universal Esperanto Association in Rotterdam. It issues a 400-page catalogue from time to time (Moleono [ed.] 1988) with continuous updates in the Association’s monthly journal *Esperanto*. The catalogue and the update column *Laste aperis* ‘recently published’ contain interlinguistics materials on Esperanto and other planned languages together with Esperanto literary works, scientific publications and all kinds of materials in and about Esperanto. The Interlingua book service in Beekbergen, The Netherlands, publishes an annual catalogue, whose latest issue contains 16 pages (Bibliographia
The Ido movement in Cardiff, Great Britain, sends an eight-page catalogue on request (*Katalogo* s.a.).

It is my hope that this volume *Interlinguistics – aspects of the science of planned languages* will contribute to the establishment of closer and more fruitful links between interlinguistics and language science in general, to the advantage of both sides.

References

Achmanova, Ol’ga Sergeevna
1966 *Slovar’ lingvističeskich terminov* [Lexicon of linguistic terms] (Moskva: Sovetskaja ençiklopedia).

Achmanova, Ol’ga Sergeevna – Evgenij Alekseevič Bokarev
1956 "Meždunarodnyj vspomogatel’nyj jazyk kak lingvističeskaja problema [The international auxiliary language as a problem of linguistics]", *Voprosy jazykoznanija* [6]: 65-78.

*Actes du deuxième congrès*

Albault, André

Alisjahbana, S. Takdir

Back, Otto
1970 "Was bedeutet und was bezeichnet der Ausdruck ‘angewandte Sprachwissenschaft’?", *Die Sprache* 16: 21-53.

Bagger, Preben
1986 *Sprog og sprog imellem* [Between the languages] (Skelby: Kommunikation og Kultur).

Baudouin de Courtenay, Jan

Bausani, Alessandro
1970 Geheim- und Universalsprachen (Stuttgart etc.: Kohlhammer).

Beaufort, Louis de
1925 Kompleta gramatiko detaloza di la linguo internaciona Ido [Complete comprehensive grammar of the international language Ido] (Esch-Alzette: Meier-Heucke).

Ben-Avi, Stephen
1977 An investigation into the use of Esperanto as an intermediate language in a machine translation project (Manchester: doct. diss.).

Bibliographia de Interlingua
1988 Bibliographia de Interlingua (Beekbergen: Servicio de libros UMI), vol. 15.

Bibliographie linguistique

Biedulski, Czeslaw (ed.)

Blanke, Detlev
1985 Internationale Plansprachen (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag).
1987b "The term 'planned language'”, Language Problems and Language Planning 11: 335-349.

Blanke, Wera

Boitet, Christian

Bokarev, Evgenij Alekseevič

Bormann, Artur

Brugmann, Karl – August Leskien
1907 Zur Kritik der künstlichen Weltsprachen (Straßburg: Trübner).
Buffa, Aira
1987 "Da 'Il nome della rosa' a 'Ruusun nimi', un salto linguistico in un tempo quasi astorico [From 'Il nome della rosa' to 'Ruusun nimi', a linguistic jump into a quasi-ahistoric time]'", *Parallèles* [8]: 50-52.

Couturat, Louis – Léopold Leau

Dasgupta, Probaj

Denisov, Petr Nikitič
1965 *Principy modelirovanija jazyka (na materiale vspomogatel'ných jazykov dlja avtomatičeskogo poiska i perevoda)* [Principles of language modelling (on auxiliary languages for automatic retrieval and translation)] (Moskva: Moskovskij universitet).

Dietze, Joachim

Dubois, Jean et al.

Duc Goninaz, Michel

Duc Goninaz, Michel (ed.)

Duličenko, Aleksandr Dmitrievič
1988 "Proekty vseobščykh i meždunarodnyh jazykov (Chronologičeskij indeks so II po XX vv.) [Projects of universal and international languages (Chronological index from the 2nd to the 20th century)]". Duličenko (ed.) 1988: 126-162.

Duličenko, Aleksandr Dmitrievič (ed.)
Duličenko, Aleksandr Dmitrievič (ed.) [continued]


Eco, Umberto

1968  *La struttura assente* [The absent structure] (Milano: Bompiani).


Ehlich, Konrad


Eichholz, Rüdiger


Felber, Helmut – Friedrich Lang – Gernot Wersig (eds.)

1979  *Terminologie als angewandte Sprachwissenschaft* (München etc.: Saur).

Fodor, István – Claude Hagège (eds.)


Forster, Peter G.


Gode, Alexander et al.


Grigor'ev, Viktor P.

1960  "I. A. Boduën de Kurtené i interlingvistika [I. A. Baudouin de Courtenay and interlinguistics]". *I. A. Boduën de Kurtené (k 30-letiju so dnja smerti)* (Moskva: AN SSSR), 53-66.

Groot, A. W. de

1962  *Inleiding tot de algemene taalwetenschap* [Introduction to general linguistics] (Groningen: Wolters).

Guzmán de Rojas, Iván

1985  "Hacfa una ingenierfa del lenguaje [On language engineering]", *Boletín de informática (RCII)* 3 [1]: 1-10; 3 [2]: 18-25.

Hagler, Margaret G.

1971  *The Esperanto language as a literary medium* (Bloomington: Indiana University, doct. diss.).
Haupenthal, Reinhard
1968 *Enkonduko en la librosciencen de Esperanto* [Introduction to Esperanto philology] (Nürnberg: Pickel).
1971 "Was ist und zu welchem Zweck betreibt man Interlinguistik?", *Linguistische Berichte* 15: 48-52.

Haupenthal, Reinhard (ed.)

Hjelmslev, Louis
1963 *Sproget* [Language] (København: Berlingske forlag), 2nd ed.

Hockett, Charles

Høeg, Tom Arbo
1973 *Katalog over interlingvistisk litteratur i Universitetsbiblioteket i Oslo* [Catalogue of interlinguistic literature in the University Library in Oslo] (Oslo: Studentenes Esperanto-Forening).

Holtus, Günter


Holtus, Günter – Michael Metzeltin – Christian Schmitt (eds.)

Hube, W. – H. März

Hutchins, William John


Hutterer, Claus Jürgen

Il'jašenko, T. P.

Isaev, M. I.
1976 "E. A. Bokarev i interlingvistikà [E. A. Bokarev and interlinguistics]". Isaev et al. (ed.), *Problemy interlingvistikà* [Problems of interlinguistics] (Moskva: Nauka), 5-11.


Jacob, Henry
Jacob, Henry [continued]

Janton, Pierre

Jespersen, Otto
1928a  *Et verdenssprog* [A world language] (København: Gyldendal).

Jižakevyč, H. P.
1969  *Ukrajins’ko-rozijs’ki movni zv’jazky radjans’koho času* [Ukrainian-Russian language contacts in the Soviet period] (Kyjiv: Naukova dumka).

Jordan, David K.

Kat, J. O. de
1985  "Traduko el la internacia lingvo al naciaj [Translation from the international into national languages]". Koutny (ed.) 1985: 259-266.

Katalogo

Katunori Hirosi – Hukuda M.
1984  "Esuperanto o tyūkai-gengo to suru kikai-hon’yaku no kokoromi [Summary: An attempt of constructing a machine translation system by the use of Esperanto]", *WGNL kaigi* 1984- 7-26.

Kelly, Ian D. K.

Kopylenko, M. M.

Kornilov, V. A.

Koutny, Ilona (ed.)
1985  *Perkompuitila tekstoprilaboro* [Natural-language processing] (Budapest: Scienca Eldona Centro).

Kuznecov, Sergej Nikolaevič
Kuznecov, Sergej Nikolaevič [continued]
1987 Teoretičeskie osnovy interlingvistiki [The theoretical foundations of interlinguistics] (Moskva: Universitet družby narodov).

Large, Andrew

Lejeune, Michel (ed.)

Lewandowski, Theodor

Li Wei
1986 "Aŭtomata tradukado el la internacia en la činan kaj anglan lingo (Esperanta-angla/čina mašintraduka sistemo) [Automatic translation from the International Language into Chinese and English (an Esperanto-English/Chinese machine translation system)]", Grundlagenstudien aus Kybernetik und Geisteswissenschaft / Humankybernetik 27: 147-152.

Lo Jacomo, François

Maadla, Jüri [J.]

Maas, Heinz Dieter

Makino Satoru – Hirata Mituru – Katumori Hiroshi
1986 "Esperanto to tyūkai-gengo to suru kikai hon'yaku [Summary: A machine translation system by the use of Esperanto as a bridge language]", WGNL kaigi 1986-3-28.

Manders, Wilhelmus Johannes Arnoldus
1947 Vijf kunsttalen [Five artificial languages] (Purmerend: Muusses / Utrecht: doct. diss.).
Martinet, André

Matulina-Jerak, Željka
1987 Grundlagen der germanistischen Linguistik (Zagreb: Školska knjiga).

Maxwell, Dan


McKown, Cornelius J.

Meillet, Antoine

Melena Jiménez, José-Luis et al. (eds.)

Meysmans, Jules
1911-12 "Une science nouvelle", Lingua Internationale 1 [8]: 14-16.

Mohai, Lajos

Moleono, Francisco Ksavero (ed.)

Mölk, Ulrich

Monnerot-Dumaine, M.

1986 MLA international bibliography


Nurmekund, Pent P.

Ogden, Charles Kay
1930 The Basic vocabulary: a statistical analysis (London).
Ogden, Charles Kay – Ivor A. Richards  

Ölberg, Hermann M.  

Papegaaij, B. C.  

Papegaaij, Bart – Klaus Schubert  
1988 *Text coherence in translation* (Dordrecht/Providence: Foris).

Peano, Giuseppe  

Pei, Mario  
1968 *One language for the world* (New York: Biblio and Tannen).

Piron, Claude  

Raphael, Bertram  
1976 *The thinking computer* (San Francisco: Freeman).

Rokicki, Ryszard (ed.)  

Rot, D. M.  

Sadler, Victor  

Sakaguchi, Alicja  
Sato, Shigeru – Hideki Kasuya


Schmidt-Radefeldt, Jürgen


Schubert, Klaus


Schuchardt, Hugo


Selinker, Larry


Sherwood, Bruce Arne


Sjögren, Siv


Steiner, H.

Stojan, Petr Evstaf'evič
1929  *Bibliografio de internacia lingvo* [Bibliography of the international language]. (Genève).

Szerdahelyi, István

Szilágyi, Dénes
1931  "Versus interlinguistica [Towards interlinguistics]", *Schola et Vita* 6: 97-120.

Tauli, Valter

Tavani, Giuseppe

Tesnière, Lucien

Tonkin, Humphrey

Venture, Alec

Verloren van Themaat, Willem Anthony

Wandruszka, Mario
Wandruszka, Mario [continued]

Wells, John Christopher

Witkam, A. P. M.

Wojtakowski, Edward T.
1979 Decimala katalogo de la planlingva literaturo ĉe Universitata Biblioteko de la Katolika Universitato en Lublino [Decimal catalogue of the literature in and on planned languages in the University Library of the Catholic University in Lublin] (Romo/Lublino: IKUE).

Wood, Richard E.

Wüster, Eugen

Žluktenko, Ju. O.