

Klaus Schubert (red.) (2001): *Planned Languages: From Concept to Reality*. Brussel:Hogeschool voor Wetenschap en Kunst, p. 121-177. Paralele en: *Interface. Journal of Applied Linguistics / Tijdschrift voor Toegepaste Linguïstiek* 15 [2] (2001). p.121-177.

Creoles, Pidgins, and Planned Languages

Language Evolution under Special Conditions

Liu Haitao

ABSTRACT

Creole and pidgin languages are often considered simplified languages unconsciously born from a practical situation of interlinguistic communication. To facilitate interlanguage communication, some people have consciously created planned languages, which are also structurally simpler than normal human languages. A common property of pidgins/creoles and planned languages is that they are languages brought into being for special purposes and languages coming into existence and further evolving under special conditions. In this article the author compares similarities and differences between planned languages and contact languages from social and linguistic points of view. The paper focuses mainly on studying and comparing pidgins, creoles, and planned languages for their special traits from the viewpoint of language development. The study begins from their birth and follows the development of these languages until they reach their life environment. The study also observes them from the point of view of linguistics, because in essence they are languages, focusing the discussion on word order and lexicon. Since the aim is to find the common foundation of two areas, the paper also explores the developing track of one term from its birthplace in a planned language to its home in creolistics. The relationship between interlinguistics and creolistics is also discussed.

- 1 What Are Planned Languages and Creole Languages?
- 2 Sociolinguistic Aspects
- 3 Linguistic Aspects
- 4 Relationships between the Study of Planned Languages and Creolistics
- 5 Conclusion

In the scientific debate about planned languages, there is often a discussion about whether, after being created, they evolve according to the same laws as ethnic languages and whether they in

the course of such an evolution conserve or lose some or all of the special features which distinguish them from languages which have evolved historically.* In his famous work on linguistics, Ferdinand de Saussure discusses language evolution and continues:

Cette évolution est fatale; il n'y a pas d'exemple d'une langue qui y résiste. Au bout d'un certain temps on peut toujours constater des déplacements sensibles. Cela est si vrai que ce principe doit se vérifier même à propos des *langues artificielles*. Celui qui en crée une la tient en main tant qu'elle n'est pas en circulation; mais dès l'instant qu'elle remplit sa mission et devient la chose de tout le monde, le contrôle échappe. *L'espéranto* est un essai de ce genre; s'il réussit, échappera-t-il à la loi fatale? Passé le premier moment, la langue entrera très probablement dans sa vie sémiologique; elle se transmettra par des lois qui n'ont rien de commun avec celles de la création réfléchie, et l'on ne pourra plus revenir en arrière. L'homme qui prétendrait composer une langue immuable, que la postérité devrait accepter telle quelle, ressemblerait à la poule qui a couvé un œuf de canard: la langue créée par lui serait emportée bon gré mal gré par le courant qui entraîne toutes les langues.

(Saussure 1916/1969: 111, my emphasis)

Creoles and pidgins are languages which evolve naturally under special conditions. Accordingly, I would like to study the question of whether Esperanto is a creole language or a pidgin, as some say (Fromkin/Rodman 1988: 288; Dasgupta 1997: 152; Gledhill 2000: 41; Nuessel 2000: 25). In this article I intend to compare similarities and differences between planned languages and creole languages from the social and linguistic points of view.¹ We will focus mainly on studying and comparing pidgins, creoles, and planned languages for their special traits from the viewpoint of language evolution. Why do we do this comparative study? Because we can often read various statements about planned languages and creole languages, we have reason to ask ourselves: Does the similarity to some extent described by interlinguists really exist, and if yes, why do creolists not admit this? We will begin with the way they are born and go through the developmental road of these languages until they reach their life

* *Acknowledgements*: If it weren't for the help of the following colleagues who sent me the related materials, I wouldn't have been able to complete the work. I hereby extend my thanks to them: Jacques Arends, Philip Baker, Peter Bakker, Věra Barandovská-Frank, Detlev Blanke, Tazio Carlevaro, Robert Chaudenson, Renato Corsetti, Julia Falk, Alwin Fill, Christopher Gledhill, Anett Heil, Richard Hudson, Claire Lefebvre, Dan Maxwell, Peter Mühlhäusler, Benoît Philippe, Claude Piron, Marc van Oostendorp, Alicja Sakaguchi, Klaus Schubert, Mark Sebba, Wilhelm Trampe, Usui Hiroyuki, Wacha Balázs. – Detlev Blanke, Mark Fettes, Wouter Kusters, Dan Maxwell, and Klaus Schubert read through the manuscript and provided many good comments, which have improved the article a great deal. Their friendly assistance is greatly appreciated. – I'd also like to thank Dan Maxwell, who translated this article from Esperanto into English. Without his work, the readers could not read the study in fluent English.

1 We have already had a few studies from creolists on the topic (Versteegh 1984, 1993; Mühlhäusler 1992) and interlinguists (Dasgupta 1997; Corsetti 1999). In some basic works and monographs on planned languages, the phenomenon of pidgin and creole languages, or their relationship with planned languages is also mentioned, for example, Szilágyi (1931/1976), Szerdahelyi (1977), Schubert (1989), Drezén (1991), Albani/Buonarotti (1994), etc. Unfortunately, these studies often focus on only certain sides of the topic. Szerdahelyi also touches the topic many times in other sources; nevertheless these are probably somewhat superficial. Philippe (1991a), in my opinion, is a somewhat detailed comparison of the topic. In the framework of his Esperanto grammar, Gledhill (2000) also deals with the topic, in a brief but useful way. The doctoral dissertation of Heil (1999) is the most complete study of the topic. I review her interesting book elsewhere (Liu, to appear). As the title of the book indicates, the main topic of her study emphasizes only the grammatical reduction of planned languages and French-based creole languages. For this reason, we can not use this work further in this study.

environment. We will also observe them from the linguistic viewpoint, because in essence they are languages, focusing the discussion on word order and lexicon. Since we are aiming to find the common foundation of two areas, we also explore the developing track of one term from its birthplace in a planned language to its creole home. Without doubt, the questions are complex; we are not able to complete all tasks in this brief study. We only hope that through this study we can acquire a somewhat deeper and more comprehensive understanding of the subject.

In section 1, a few definitions of terms to be used are discussed. Section 2 analyzes the question mainly from sociolinguistic viewpoints. Section 3 is dedicated to a linguistic aspect of the topic; we approach the questions through phonetics, lexicon, and syntax. The scientific disciplines of creolistics and interlinguistics, as well as their relationship, are the main topic of section 4. In conclusion, I summarize the similarities and differences between contact and planned languages by means of a comparative table.

1 What Are Planned Languages and Creole Languages?

We have to consider several linguistic phenomena which are not very well known in linguistic circles. For this reason, it is perhaps necessary to first of all define the basic notions which will be used in this article.

What is a *planned language*? A planned language is “eine von einzelnen Personen oder Personengruppen nach bestimmten Kriterien bewußt geschaffene Sprache zum Zwecke der Erleichterung der internationalen sprachlichen Kommunikation” (Blanke 1985: 53).² Another version is “ein System, das zur *Optimierung internationaler Kommunikation* mit unterschiedlichen Zweckstellungen *bewußt* vom Menschen *geschaffen* worden ist” (Sakaguchi 1998: 58-59). In the two definitions the authors emphasize that a planned language is *consciously* created by people with the purpose of (Blanke:) *facilitating* or (Sakaguchi:) *optimizing* (international) language communication. From the two similar definitions, we can conclude that a planned language is intended for situations of international communication in which an efficient common language is lacking to the ones communicating. Until now, perhaps about 1,000 planned language projects have been created (Duličenko 1990). Nevertheless, if we follow the criteria and definitions just mentioned, the number becomes much smaller. If we consider their use from the viewpoint of sociolinguistics, only a few remain. Blanke classes the systems as projects immediately after their creation and distinguishes a group of evolutionary stages, concluding that a handful of languages passed these evolutionary stages to some extent and only one, Esperanto, passed them completely, or in the best way. So, whether we want to or not, we will have to use the data from Esperanto a lot in the following discussions, especially when we touch the problem from the viewpoint of sociolinguistics. Perhaps, the title should more precisely be “Does Esperanto evolve just like creoles and pidgins” or “Is Esperanto an artificial creole?”

2 Here Blanke refers to a definition of Wüster (1931).

Although in the title we only use the words “creole” and “pidgin”, nevertheless we in fact want to indicate by means of this term one category of human languages “contact languages”, in which creolists customarily include three kinds of languages: pidgins, creoles, and mixed languages. More precisely, our study will be concerned with planned languages (Esperanto) on the one hand and these three types of languages on the other hand. It is worth noting that, although interlinguists already have a single notion of what a planned language is, creolists do not yet agree or have precise definitions of what a pidgin or creole language is. Some even deny the existence of mixed languages as independent language phenomena. Before discussing further, I give provisional but perhaps suitable definitions of these three language types.

Concerning *pidgin languages*, it is “generally agreed that in essence these represent speech-forms which do not have native speakers, and are therefore primarily used as means of communication among peoples who do not share a common language” (Muysken/Smith 1995: 3). In the same place we read the definition of *creole languages*: “one vital difference from pidgins is that pidgins do not have native speakers, while creoles do” (Muysken/Smith 1995: 3). As our discussion develops, we will see that pidgins and creole languages are not defined so simply; also the difference between them is not so straightforward. A *mixed language* is “a language which shows positive genetic similarities, in significant numbers, with two different languages” (Bakker 1997).

As an interlinguistic term, pidgin or creole languages are *compromise* languages. As Blanke says: “Kompromißsprachen nennt man plansprachliche Systeme, die aus der Kombination von zwei oder mehr Ethnosprachen hervorgegangen sind. ... Auch Pidgin-Sprachen werden gelegentlich als Kompromißsprachen bezeichnet” (Blanke 1985: 155).

2 Sociolinguistic Aspects

In this section, we will sketch and discuss the social status, manner of birth, stability and evolution, speakers, and creolization of contact languages and planned languages. When considering the specific facts of creoles and planned languages in a social environment, we will have to discuss the topic in more detail.

2.1 Social Status of Contact and Planned Languages

Creolist Lefebvre summarizes two main traits of pidgins and creoles from the sociolinguistic point of view:

First these languages are only developed in *multilingual* communities. Second, communities where pidgin and creole languages emerge generally involve several substrate languages spoken by the majority of the population and a superstrate language spoken by a relatively small but economically powerful social group. Crucially, the substrate community does not have one *common language*. This situation creates the need for a *lingua franca*.

(Lefebvre 1998: 1, my emphasis)

In other words, pidgin and creole languages, as well as planned languages, can only be born in multilingual circumstances, where there is a need to communicate but no common language. It is often useful to note that there is precisely *one* superstrate language, which often is a source language for creole or pidgin languages, and becomes at least the provider of a creole lexicon. The creole source language cannot be selected freely. It depends intimately on the situation of society and economy at the time when the pidgin language is born.

Concerning the birth and status of pidgin/creole languages and planned languages, sociolinguist Hudson says:

There is yet another way, apart from code-switching and borrowing, in which varieties may get mixed up with each other, namely by the process of creating a new variety out of two (or more) existing ones. This process of “variety-synthesis” may take a number of different forms, including for instance the creation of artificial auxiliary languages like Esperanto and Basic English. However, by far the most important manifestation is the process of pidginisation, whereby PIDGIN LANGUAGES, or PIDGINS, are created. These are varieties created for the very practical and immediate purposes of communication between peoples who otherwise would have no common language whatsoever, and learned by one person from another within the communities concerned as the accepted way of communicating with members of the other community. (Hudson 1996: 59-60)

His words and sociolinguistic viewpoint are useful to the following understanding and comparison.³ According to the definition, a planned language is created consciously, with the goal of crosslinguistic communication. It is likewise created due to the lack of a common language or to improve the quality of communication.

Unlike with a creole language, the creator of a planned language has the right to select source languages for his project. He also can construct some new elements which do not exist in any ethnic languages. Hockett observes this at an early stage in his book about modern linguistics. “In origin, to be sure, an artificial language is seemingly different from a pidgin: a pidgin arises under the pressure of practical circumstances in a bilingual situation, while an artificial language is invented by a scholar sitting quietly in his study” (Hockett 1958: 422). Interlinguist Schubert provides further details: “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” (Schubert 1989: 11). Creolist Sebba also expresses a similar opinion: “It is very clear that no one in a language

3 Concerning this, Wouter Kusters rightly comments, “This makes me wonder whether perhaps the difference between planned languages and contact languages is of a continuous instead of of a discrete nature. I mean, they are both reactions on a situation of communication problems. While one extreme is improvisation, and non-directed change (pidgin and its subsequent creole), the other extreme is planning and guided change (cf. the debates on the evolution of Esperanto in the first half of the 20th century, when e.g., Ido, split off.). It seems me to be continuous, however, since also in spontaneous solutions, that is, in creole languages, there is an element of planning, especially when an orthography and other centralizing powers exert their influence. On the other hand, in Esperanto, of course, there are spontaneous evolutions, as Oostendorp recently described with respect to abbreviated forms which are governed by natural phonological laws and not by idiosyncratic planned decisions”(Kusters 2 May 2000, email). The following discussions will show to us intimate relationship between the two areas.

contact situation sets out consciously to ‘invent’ a maximally simple language... Pidginization is not the result of conscious strategies but of unconscious process” (Sebba 1997). For this reason, one can see that *spontaneity* and *plannedness* are significant distinguishing features between creoles and planned languages. The comparison between both types of languages is important for a more fundamental understanding of language development and genesis according to two tendencies. As for their social status, both creoles and planned languages have a low status in the eyes of linguists. According to the definition in Chambers Twentieth Century Dictionary (Macdonald 1979), a pidgin language is “any combination and distortion of two languages as a means of communication”. Together with the name of pidgin/creole languages, we often can see negative epithets such as “corrupt”, “misformed”, “jargon”, “incapable”. Nevertheless, a planned language like Esperanto has a still more miserable lot. In reference to such a case, we not only come across terms like “thought up”, “artificial”; it is also called “a fantasy”, “rigid”, “without a people”, “unsuccessful”, etc. Piron (1988) gives detailed explanations and responds positively to the various attacks against Esperanto. These attacks and the response apply to planned languages, but perhaps also to creoles and pidgins.⁴

It is important to recognize that both kinds of language have a similar environment – together with the situation of many languages, but without a common language. A planned language is often considered to be a “neutral” interlanguage, which is not the native language of any of those using it in intercommunication. Members of movements for planned languages always like this social advantage of their languages, because a neutral interlanguage can create an atmosphere of equality. The neutrality of an interlanguage can even become a motive and basis of resisting the functioning of ethnic languages in the same role. Nevertheless, we must clearly see that pidgins also have such an advantage, as a creolist has already remarked, “Pidgins may also have a social advantage, in that because they are no-one’s native language, ‘all speakers are equal’ – there are no native speakers with a ‘superior’ knowledge of the language” (Sebba 1997). Creole and mixed languages lose this advantage, because they have a set of native speakers, which also is a feature which distinguishes pidgins from creoles. The history of interlinguistics shows that the choice of a common language in a vast region depends mainly on factors outside of linguistics. Although a “neutral language” has an advantage from the viewpoint of human rights or linguistic ecology, it lacks the support of economic strength; there is no group of native speakers or political body behind it. Without this, the history of planned languages already shows that it is difficult to use such a language as an interlanguage on a large scale.

4 Of course, such a statement about a low status is only relative. “The low status of these languages is not the same for everyone. Creole speakers assign their language a higher status than the ‘fontlingvo’ (source language) which is often also present in the society in question. In sociolinguistics and dialectology one often distinguishes between ‘overt’, and ‘covert’ prestige. While the overt prestige of a creole maybe low, its covert prestige may be high. Of course, also many creolists and linguists do not have this pejorative view on creole languages, or on planned languages”(Wouter Kusters, 2 May 2000).

2.2 Birth and Death of Languages

A planned language is a conscious solution and product for the occasion requiring intercommunication among humans with different languages. A pidgin, creole, and also a normal ethnic language arises through a long process – just like a planned language. Perhaps the lengths of the processes are different, and evidently the character of the process is entirely different. A planned language has a clear date of birth – for example, Esperanto: 26 July 1887 and Interlingua: 1951; a creole language does not. Nevertheless, in comparison with ethnic languages the date of the birth of a creole can be placed within a short time period. One pidgin language (Tok Pisin) may have formed in the period between 1865 and 1890. This is useful to linguists, because linguists are often worried about the slow rate of change of their objects of study – languages. The slow development makes it difficult for linguists to observe and study linguistic phenomena more thoroughly. A planned language and a creole can help them in this respect, since they reduce the history of language change from centuries to decades. For this reason, planned languages and creoles can be called a “linguistic laboratory” (Blanke 1986: 19; Hagège 1999: 25). A planned language creator is an individual⁵ with a clearly indicated name (Esperanto: Zamenhof; Interlingua: Gode). Creole and pidgin languages are products of a group of people, so we can’t find an individual who creates them.

Geographically, a planned language often aims at all the peoples of the world who have the requirement of interlinguistic communication or at least at a region larger than one country. On the other hand, a creole language is customarily used in a smaller region, even in a small part of one country. Things are not the same for users of ethnic languages and creole languages, since a people and a nation of a planned language (Esperanto) only exist in a virtual sense; for a planned language there is no political and economic structure (people, country...).

If the progression from birth to death can be called the “life cycle” of a language, the history of a pidgin language and a planned language has already proved the existence of such a life cycle. For example, Chinese Pidgin English (CPE) was born in about 1664, but by about 1900 there weren’t any more people using it. So it had a life cycle of about 300 years.⁶ The life cycle of a planned language tends to be shorter. In 1879 the German Johann Martin Schleyer created his project Volapük, which immediately after its birth began to grow in a big way. Many people began to learn and use it. Volapük became the first planned language project to take its place in society with a considerable number of speakers, its own literature, and an international movement. Unfortunately, from 1888 on, Volapük was already on the way to its

5 Here I use the word “individual” in a wider sense. The creator may be more than one person, or a group of people, or a commission, and so on.

6 The lifespan of CPE according to Sebba (1997). Baker makes this more precise: “Chinese Pidgin English (CPE) is known to have existed since the first half of the 18th century, possibly as early as 1715 and certainly no later than 1743, the date to which the first known published sample of CPE related. CPE survived until at least 1971 but, after two and a half centuries of use, it may by now be on the verge of extinction” (Baker 1987: 164). According to him, CPE lasted about 250 years.

death.⁷ So, probably the lifespan of Volapük as the language of a planned language movement was only a little more than 10 years! It is interesting that even today, there still exist a few isolated volapükists who use the language mostly in writing. I doubt that there are still people who can speak CPE. As mentioned, a planned language is a diaspora⁸ language; its users are found all over the globe; a creole language, on the other hand, in a smaller area. Can we say that diaspora languages live longer⁹ and that a concentrated language has a larger developmental strength?

In a planned language, writing precedes speech; some projects have been used only on silent paper. In contrast, a pidgin language and a creole language first have speech, afterwards writing, although some of them remain only in spoken form. We stated above that a diaspora planned language may have a longer life than a pidgin language; that may also depend on the written precedence of a planned language. As Yzaguirre í Maura (1999) says, “Evidentas, ke la lingvoj, kiuj ne atingis skriban formon, havas pli da eblecoj malaperi pro malprestigo, malfacila transdonado al novaj generacioj, ktp.” [‘It is evident that languages which did not acquire a written form have more possibilities disappear due to lack of prestige, difficulty of being passed on to new generations, and so on’]. If we look at the Volapük website , this assertion seems to be true. We do not clearly know whether Volapük is still alive in spoken form, but it is alive on paper and in written form.

7 Why did Volapük quickly and suddenly die? This is one interesting example in the history of planned languages. This depends on many factors, both sociological and linguistic. The following statement is representative: “Oni povus diri, ke ĝuste Volapuko ne plene realiĝis de projekto al lingvo, ĉar ekzemple dum la malmultaj jaroj da praktikado ne eblis al la lingvo, ke elformiĝis relative stabila polisemio, stabila fraezologio, faka leksiko ktp. La lingvokomunumo estis tro malgranda kaj tro etviva, eble ankaŭ ne havis eblecon vere profunde enpenetri en la lingvon. La normo en Volapuko estis problemo jam pro tio, ĉar ĝi forte dependis de Schleyer unuflanke, sed aliflanke estis fortaj reformpremoj ktp.” [‘One can say that Volapük in particular did not fully progress from project to language, since for example during the few years of its use it was not possible for it to develop a relatively stable polysemy, a stable phraseology, a vocabulary for special purposes, and so on. The language community was too small and too shortlived and perhaps also did not have the opportunity to begin to explore the language in a really profound way. The norm in Volapük was a problem because on the one hand it strongly depended on Schleyer, but on the other hand there were strong pressures for reform, and so on’] (Detlev Blanke 18 March 2000, email to me).

8 The word *diaspora* often suggests that the speakers originate from the same place. Nevertheless, I here often emphasize the second aspect of the word, that is, the speakers the speakers don't have a coherent settlement area but live in very different places. The language community of a planned language has a feature which makes it very different from a true diaspora community, that is, that its speakers are almost all voluntarily learn and use the language. A diaspora language, on the other hand, usually is passed on from one generation to the next.

9 “But a diaspora language survives longer because the diasporated people use the language not only as a means of inter-communication, but also as a means to show their supposed different identity, which also often refers to other traits of the original homeland, like myths, religions, etc.” (Wouter Kusters 2 May 2000). These factors also very much influence the development of the language, as we have said many times.

2.3 Speakers of the Languages

There may be about 1,000 planned language projects (Blanke 1998a; Duličenko 1990), nevertheless less than 10 planned languages can be considered and studied like a real language sociolinguistically, and the total number of speakers of planned languages is about one million or less (of which Ido has about 100-200, Interlingua about 100; for Esperanto estimates range between one million and 300,000-500,000 according to Blanke's study in this book). In his annotated list of languages, Norval Smith registers 509 languages which are creole, pidgin, or mixed languages. He also includes languages which are no longer used; the total number of speakers of contact languages is about 93 million¹⁰ (Smith 1995: 374). According to this criterion, planned languages are smaller languages than creole languages. Although a planned language has fewer speakers than creole languages, its speakers are more highly educated than those of creole languages (Piron 1989a).

2.4 Creolization and Development

How does a pidgin language evolve into a creole language? How does a planned language project change from a small paper project to a true human language? To study this topic in detail, creolists and interlinguists customarily divide the developmental process into several stages. Mühlhäusler considers the process of creolization to be divisible into the following stages: “Jargon (pre-pidgin, multilingual idiolect, secondary hybrid) – Stable Pidgin (pidgin, basilectal pidgin, tertiary hybrid) – Expanded Pidgin – Creole” (Mühlhäusler 1997: 6). Main tendencies and directions of the development are “increasing stability → increasing vocabulary → increasing expressiveness → increasing functions” (Sebba 1997). From this path, we can see that stability is very important in the development of a creole. This argument is also valid in the development of planned languages; I have already mentioned the function of stability in the development of Esperanto.

If we consider an international language a “code-book” in interlinguistic communication, we can say that the participants need to have a “code-book” in common, and the code book should not often change in arbitrary ways. Esperanto is such a thing; other planned languages also are. But when Esperanto has used the same code-book from the beginning, other planned languages are usually perfecting their code-books. For this reason, an unstable or often changed code-book is often secret for military purposes, but nevertheless is not useful for general international communication. The history of planned language development proves that stable development is very important for the success of the language, because the special communication environment requires this. Frequent change itself means “imperfection” and “impracticality” of the language; the learner does not know whether what is learned today will still be useful tomorrow. (Liu 1998, translated from Chinese)

Certainly not all creole languages are born from pidgin languages; also not all pidgin languages change or develop into creole languages by the same routes or stages. *Hawaiian Creole English*, for example, developed directly from a jargon into a creole without inter-

10 In fact, Smith gives a remarkably exact number: 93,348,410 people!

mediate stages; *Torres Straits Broken* became a creole without the stage “extended pidgin”, but *New Guinea Tok Pisin* went through all stages. Is the creolization which went through all stages more healthy and stable? This cannot yet be answered clearly and fully, but it is certain that fully evolved creole or pidgin languages, like *Tok Pisin*, can furnish to linguists more study materials about “pidgins and pidginization, creoles and creolization, language contact in New Guinea, historical linguistics, general linguistics theory” (Mühlhäusler 1990). It seems to me that a completely evolved Tok Pisin has a place in creolistics like that of Esperanto in interlinguistics.¹¹

Detlev Blanke establishes 18 stages of planned language development from a project to a language, on the basis of practical usage. Of these, the last stage is the appearance of a (bilingual!) speaker who learned the planned language from birth (Blanke 1985: 112 Tabelle 2). He later breaks the process down into 28 stages (Blanke, in this volume), since the goals of creoles and planned languages are not the same, so if we evaluate pidgin development according to Blanke’s criteria, a creole language would not be a developed language. For example, it is difficult to find a pidgin or creole language which is used outside of the limited area of its creation, support of an international organization, a vast literature, both original and translated, users in the whole world, and so on. These stages can undoubtedly strengthen the expressiveness, stability, and functioning of the planned language, this is in accord with the developmental tendency of creolization from a pidgin language. The route crossed is not the same, but nevertheless the goal is the same. If some planned language project passed through all 28 stages in a fully satisfactory way, we can say that the language is more rich in expressiveness and functionally stable; its possibilities for intercommunication are not lower than other ethnic languages; in fact they are higher.

We emphasize the importance of the sociolinguistic classification of Detlev Blanke to show that social factors are truly influential or decisive to the development of planned languages. We cannot study planned languages while ignoring the social factors. In fact, interlinguistics is developing precisely along these two paths (Liu 1999). We also see in creolistics that a sociolinguistics study is important. Mühlhäusler says, “I would like to advocate that the study of the grammatical properties of these languages (pidgins and creoles) be integrated with the study of *sociohistorical dimensions*, and that, in particular, the communicative factors which gave birth to them be studied more seriously” (Mühlhäusler 1997: 50, my emphasis) and “it has been accepted for methodological reasons that a distinction can be made between linguistic and extralinguistic (social) factors in the development of Pidgins and Creoles” (Mühlhäusler 1997: 92). Holm also gives important position for social factors in the development of pidgin and creole: “Pidgins and creole languages cannot be defined, nor can their genesis and development be understood, without taking into account the social factors that shaped them” (Holm 2000: 68). Mufwene (1998) even uses the title “Creolization Is a Social, Not a Structural, Process” to emphasize the importance of sociological factors in the development of pidgin and creole languages.

As just mentioned, the existence of a native speaker of a planned language is seen as an important stage in the development of a language, if according to the 18 stages, it is the final

11 This statement is made with great deal of metaphor, since creolists can easily find other creoles which also go through the procedure described by Mühlhäusler.

point of its development.¹² We also see that a native speaker is just as important or more in the development of a pidgin language, if some pidgin language has enough native speakers, then the pidgin language itself will become a creole language, even under another name. According to the practical criteria of Blanke, we can classify approximately 1,000 planned language projects in three classes; project, semi-planned language, and planned language. Almost all of them can be considered only a project. The exceptions are a few planned languages which reached stages 15-16, even 19 (of the 28 stages). They are *Volapük* (1879, Johann Martin Schleyer), *Latino sine flexione* (1903, Giuseppe Peano), *Ido* (1907, Louis Couturat), *Occidental* (1922, Edgar de Wahl, from 1947 on called *Interlingue*), *Basic English* (1930, C. K. Ogden), and *Interlingua* (1951, IALA/Alexander Gode).¹³ Only *Esperanto* (1887, L. L. Zamenhof) has to some extent made the journey across all 28 stages and become the only planned language. Perhaps, in view of the importance of native speakers in the development of the language, Esperanto should be considered a creole language or one should talk of the “creolization of Esperanto”? Does creolization really happen in Esperanto? We say that creolization has to fulfill the following criteria, enough native speakers for whom the language concerned is the first language every day. According to Corsetti (1999), the percentage of native speakers in Esperanto is only 4 %, far from the 10 % of the total number required for creolization from pidgins. The quantity of native speakers in Esperanto is not only small; the community is a diaspora. Native speakers hardly use Esperanto every day outside their families. Esperanto is only used in the environment of the family. Essentially, Esperanto is still their second or third language. So, we agree with Corsetti that “Esperanto, do, el ĉi tiu vidpunkto ne estas en la kondiĉo esti rigardebla kiel kreola lingvo fare de kreolistoj” [‘So from this viewpoint Esperanto is not in a state to be considered a creole language by creolists’] (Corsetti 1999: 47). Schubert also has a similar conclusion: “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 of the development of Esperanto. ... 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” (Schubert 1989: 11).¹⁴ Versteegh argues “the acquisition of Esperanto as a first language is a special case of language

12 Of course, we cannot use the criteria so absolutely. If the development of a language is nonfinite; if some end has been arrived at, perhaps the language has also finished its life.

13 The number in parentheses indicates the year of birth; the name is the name of the author of the project. In the following discussion, we limit our comparison to contact languages and semiplanned languages or Esperanto, since untested projects cannot be considered languages. A few projects which still haven't reached the stage of semiplanned language according to the criteria of Blanke, but nevertheless have a group of speakers, such as *Glosa* and *Lojban*, also should perhaps be considered in our comparison.

14 Although Esperanto functions mainly as a second language, nevertheless, it is not similar to other languages having this function. Wood rightly says, “the status of Esperanto as a second language for its users is different from that ethnic languages which have been acquired as second languages by learners faced by the economic, political and educational pressures which make such acquisition necessary or desirable” (Wood 1979: 435).

acquisition with restricted input, since the monitoring parents are not native speakers of Esperanto themselves. Consequently, the case of the *denaskaj esperantistoj* (native speaker esperantists) may be compared with the process of creolization, in which children acquire a language variety that is by definition not the native language of the parents” (Versteegh 1993: 593). If we follow Versteegh’s definition in understanding the notion “creolization”, creolization of Esperanto is comparable to pidgins. Therefore we think that Gledhill is also right: “The relationship between Esperanto and creoles is therefore more abstract: the transformation of Pidgins into Creoles may be reflected in the development of Esperanto from a schematic design to a relatively widely-used language” (2000: 42). It follows that the “creolization” of pidgins is somewhat similar to the socialization of planned languages. In summary, I think that the statement about creolization of Esperanto is only metaphorical.¹⁵ As for its status, a planned language is more similar to a pidgin language,¹⁶ although it aims at wider usage than a pidgin language. The title of Chaudenson (1992), *Des îles, des hommes, des langues*, shows well the areas in which creole and pidgin languages are used. In the same way, Wood also provides the following title to summarize the main sociolinguistic features of Esperanto: “A voluntary non-ethnic, non-territorial speech community” (Wood 1979).

3 Linguistic Aspects

In this section we focus our attention on linguistic features of contact languages and planned languages. We will begin with a common property which two languages possess. That is, a hard to classify property in a language family. Subsequently, we will compare the two languages with respect to phonetics, lexicon and syntax. A few paragraphs are dedicated to naturalness or spontaneity as well as plannedness or awareness in language development; this is of interest for interlinguists and creolists.

15 “I think the difference in these two kinds of creolization lies in the difference between ‘creolization’ within creoles, in which the creolized language receives a *social* status, while within Esperanto, ‘creolization’ remains an *individual* phenomenon” (Wouter Kusters, 2 May 2000).

16 We found an interesting similarity in a well known introduction to linguistics. “Esperanto is essentially a Romance-based pidgin with Greek and Germanic influence, albeit a highly developed one with an immense vocabulary” (Fromkin/Rodman 1988: 288). We will see that the property of being Romance-based is only valid for the lexicon.

3.1 Do Pidgin and Creole Languages Belong to Language Families?

Genetically, a pidgin, creole, or mixed language does not have a clear position in the tree of language families.¹⁷ As Bakker says,

The resulting language is a language which cannot be classified genetically. Intertwined languages have a lexicon which belongs to language family B and a grammatical system which belongs to language family A. If one looks at the lexicon, it would be classified as belonging to the family of language B, if one looks at the grammar it would belong to the family of language A. (Bakker 1997)

This assertion is appropriate not only for mixed languages, also for creoles and pidgins, even for planned languages. In planned languages, one can clearly place some projects (especially lexically) in a specific language family, for example, Interlingua (IALA) in the Romance family, but some languages are more complex. Lexically, Esperanto is considered mainly a Romance language; morphologically, it is an agglutinating language with a strong similarity to an isolating language. Stylistically, Slavic languages have had a lot of influence on it; and functionally it is an interlanguage (Janton 1973/1993; Piron 1981). It is interesting that a pidgin language and a planned language can itself also be the source of a language family tree. For example, from Chinese Pidgin English were born Australian PE, Hawaiian PE and early Beach-la-Mar, and from Beach-la-Mar followed Neo-Melanesian (Tok Pisin), Solomon Islands PE (Micronesian PE) (Mühlhäusler 1997:17). From Esperanto there were created Esperanta, Esperantida, Esperanto reformita, Esperaniusho, Esperanto II, Neo-Esperanto, Nov-Esperanto, Reformesperanto, Universal-Esperanto, and Ido. And from Ido there came Ido avancit, Ido reformate, Nov-Ido, Ido-Novialista, Ido simpligata (Blanke 1985). When compared with the tree in historical linguistics, a short history of planned languages and creole languages can provide us more facts concerning the development of language and formation of a language family.

3.2 Contact, Intercommunication, and Naturalness

Linguistically, *pidgin languages* have the following main properties: the creation of contact between two or more populations, which are called the source languages of a pidgin language; the lack of intercommunication by means of the source languages; the speakers of the source don't understand the pidgin language if they don't learn it; their own grammars, which are simpler than those of the source languages; normally, the lexicon of a pidgin language comes from *one* language (the lexifier). *Creole languages* have native speakers; that evidently distinguishes it from pidgin languages. It has the same fundamental properties as a pidgin

¹⁷ Although the authors which we mention do not see an easy way to place pidgins in the tree of language families, a development of several hundred years might be able to give them an undoubted position in this tree. It would be interesting to speculate whether planned languages couldn't likewise be placed in the tree, if they continue to live several centuries (see Saussure in the beginning of this article).

language, but in a less simple form. Sociolinguistically, a *mixed language* is very similar to a pidgin and creole language. It has native speakers and also is born from a multi-language (more precisely two-language) situation. For this reason, few creolists deny the existence of a mixed language as an independent type.¹⁸ Linguistically, a mixed language is not the same as a pidgin language or creole language; in a mixed language the traces of source languages are clear, unlike in creole languages, which “are related to one language with respect to the lexicon, but they do not have the grammatical system in common with any other language” (Bakker 1997). More importantly, the grammar of a mixed language is just as complex as the source language, not simple as in a creole language. The property of a clear relationship with source languages makes a mixed language somewhat similar to a planned language. Nuessel gives Esperanto the following properties: “a planned, *a posteriori* language, an *amalgamation* of the linguistic elements of the various ethnic languages including Yiddish, Germanic, and Slavic tongues that were a part of Zamenhof’s socially rancorous environment. The language also contained grammatical features of certain Romance languages with which Zamenhof was familiar” (Nuessel 2000: 41, my emphasis).

Communication between creole or pidgin languages and their source languages is not possible. Nevertheless, a planned language becomes more complex because of different ways the creators used in constructing their language. According to a classification of planned language by interlinguists (Couturat/Leau 1903/1979), there are three types: “a priori”, “a posteriori”, and “mixed”. This is mainly concerned with ethnolinguistic elements in planned languages. Except for *Volapük* as “mixed”, all other semi-planned languages are *a posteriori* languages, that is, they have intimate relationships with ethnic languages. In fact, *Latino sine flexione* is only simplified Latin; it abandons the complex Latin grammar. The author’s opinion is that minimization of the grammar helps one study the language. In the same way, *Basic English* is simplified English, but not of the grammar of English and its supply of words. This language has only 850 words; notions which are not included among these have to be expressed in a roundabout way, for example, *a white root that makes eyes full of water* means ‘garlic’. Speakers of Latin and English can undoubtedly understand other variations of planned language. Although *Esperanto*, *Ido*, *Occidental*, and *Interlingua* likewise belong to *a posteriori* languages, they are generally classified into two types: schematic and naturalistic. Schematicism (*Esperanto*, *Ido*) strives for the regularity, simplicity, logic, and autonomy of language structure. This is useful for furthering the user’s active mastery. In contrast, naturalism (*Occidental*, *Interlingua*) prefers the property called “immediate understandability”, that is, one can immediately understand the language without learning it. The *Interlingua student* Gopsill describes the following experience.

On one occasion he (Gopsill) had the opportunity to speak to four women at once: a French woman, an Italian, a Portuguese, and a Spaniard in *Interlingua*. Although none of the four

18 Concerning mixed and creole languages, Wouter Kusters give us a clear summary in outline form: “However, the source languages of mixed languages are restricted to two languages, while creoles are influenced by several. In addition, the socio-historical circumstances of creoles are often characterized by slavery, a dominant small population of oppressors against a large mixed groups of slaves, and last but not least the displacement of a large group of people from the original homeland (this is valid for most plantation creoles in the Atlantic at least)” (Kusters 2 May 2000).

could speak the other's language, they all understood the present writer's Interlingua with little difficulty, each thinking he was speaking her own separate language imperfectly.

(Gopsill 1990: 237-238)

If Gopsill is telling the truth, perhaps we no longer need to compare creoles/pidgin languages with simplified and naturalistic planned languages. Imagining that a naturalistic planned language even more natural than natural languages in interlinguistic communication is a very interesting phenomenon.

Occidental and *Interlingua* can rightly be considered Romance languages, so evidently “immediate understandability” works only for speakers of Romance languages or people who know such languages. As a native speaker of Chinese who can read a few European languages, I can read texts in *Interlingua* and *Occidental* without problem, but it is difficult for me to write in them.¹⁹ For the purpose of active usage, I prefer schematic languages (*Esperanto* and *Ido*). We agree with the following opinion: “facileco de la lingvo ĝenerale estas prijuĝinda per taksado de mezuro (grado) de tiuj ĉi tri bazaj aspektoj: 1. lernebleco, 2. manipulebleco, 3. komprenebleco” [‘The level of difficulty of a language can generally be judged by estimating the level of the following three fundamental features: 1. learnability, 2. manipulability, 3. understandability’] (Košecký 1987: 105). So, understandability is only one of three criteria, not everything.

In any case, we now touch on the naturalness of language, the theme which researchers in the two areas are interested in. Differences of opinion nevertheless exist not only between interlinguists and creolists, but even within each of these two groups. In my opinion, the naturalness of language is a relative criterion. Early in 1921, Schuchardt provided a penetrating statement about naturalness and artificiality in language: “Aber ... ein solcher Gegensatz besteht in Bezug auf die Sprache gar nicht: künstliche Sprachen sind mehr oder weniger auch natürlich, natürliche Sprachen mehr oder weniger auch künstlich” (Schuchardt 1921/1928/1976: 375 taken from Sakaguchi 1998: 63). In other words, natural languages have unnatural (artificial) elements; planned (artificial) languages also have natural elements. The problem is a variation, or something similar, of “spontaneity” and “plannedness” in language. We see that planned language projects, that have succeeded to some extent are all *a posteriori*. Sakaguchi arranges the following languages in one axis with two ends, *Spontaneität* vs. *Standardisierung*: “Sprachrelikte, Dialekte, Vernakulare (Umgangssprachen), Nationale Standardsprachen (z.B. Schriftdeutsch, -ungarisch, -polnisch), Basic (Minimum-) Sprachen (z.B. Basic English, Français Fondamental, Grunddeutsch), Klassische Sprachen (z.B. Latein, Sanskrit), Lingua-franca-Sprachen, Pidginsprachen, Kreolsprachen, Aposteriorische naturalistische Plansprachen (z.B. Occidental, Interlingua), Aposterioristische rationalistische Plansprachen (z.B. Occidental Interlingua), Aposterioristische rationalistische Plansprachen (z.B. Intal, Neo), Vereinfachte klassische Sprachen (z.B. Latino sine flexione), Vereinfachte Nationalsprachen (sog. Reformsprachen; z.B. Wede), Formalsprachen (z.B. Algol, Cobol), A-priori-Sprachen” (Sakaguchi 1983: 347). Since the “A-posteriori integrierte Sprachprojekte” all projects can be

19 In other words, this immediate understandability is only valid for speakers of the languages concerned (mainly Romance).

considered only as “Theoretische Systeme” or previous “Realisierte (angewandte) Systeme”. In the ordering, pidgin and creole languages are found in the middle between planned languages and ethnic languages. In Schubert (1989: 22-23) and Frank (1981: 15) we also can find similar axes concerning *spontaneity/naturalness* and *plannedness/artificiality*. Sakaguchi (1996) analyzes in detail these two notions and the historical evolution of the functioning planned language (Esperanto). Concerning linguistic naturalness, Mühlhäusler states,

In a loose sense, the label “natural language” is used to contrast vernaculars such as English, Hindi, or Quechua with artificially created languages such as Volapük, Esperanto, or computer languages. The naturalness of the former systems is related to the fact that their rules and conventions are mainly *unconscious* and, it is argued, are not directly amenable to *human interference*.
(Mühlhäusler 1997: 60, my emphasis)

In the same place, he also says

The morphological complexity of many Melanesian languages appears to be man-made. ... It would thus seem more realistic to admit that most of so-called “natural languages” are in fact a mixture of nature and culture. ... Naturalness goes hand in hand with unconscious language development.
(Mühlhäusler 1997: 60)

So, according to the criterion “unconscious”, Mühlhäusler rightly calls pidgin languages languages with “maximum naturalness”. He also remarks that such “maximum naturalness” becomes reduced with the development of a pidgin language to a creole language. His conclusion essentially agrees with that of interlinguists, although creolists do not willingly give such a position to planned languages. If we think that a creator of planned languages, especially of *a posteriori* and naturalistic projects, take massive amounts of language materials from natural languages, can we still insist that the result of this is unnatural? If it is not natural, why is “unnatural” Interlingua probably more natural than natural languages in interlinguistic communication of Romance users? When we turn to a more general discussion of the distinction between naturalness and artificialness, without difficulty finding a similar assertion:

Im strengen Sinne ist somit aufgrund der globalen Vernetztheit kein System mehr natürlich. Will man dennoch die o.g. Unterscheidung beibehalten, so läßt sich zweckmäßigerweise ein Kontinuum unterstellen; Systeme können mehr oder weniger natürlich oder künstlich sein. Hierbei sind der Grad der kulturellen Beeinflussung und der Entstehungszusammenhang zu berücksichtigen.
(Trampe 1990: 46-47)

Although Trampe aims at a wider area of system theory, this statement also fits our topic well. According to definition, a language is a *system* of signs for human communication. If we agree that planned languages also have “naturalness” in themselves, can we also agree with the following statement by Mühlhäusler? “Deliberate human interference ... can only survive if in agreement with natural development tendencies. Those who are in the business of designing new and/or modifying existing auxiliary languages are well advised to take a closer look at pidgins” (Mühlhäusler 1992). What is a natural tendency of development? Can we create a planned language more natural than Interlingua, or modify and require Esperanto to develop more naturally? The history of planned languages has already proved that schematic Esperanto is more successful than the more naturalistic Interlingua and Occidental, and also better than a

more natural schematic project (Ido). How does one explain this according to the criteria of creolistics?²⁰

Before comparing linguistic properties, we would like to provide a few remarks from a creolist. “There have been several attempts to invent artificial languages for international communication, of which Esperanto is probably the most famous and successful – but none of these have much resemblance to pidgins, and all have actually been more complex than any of the known pidgins” (Sebba 1997). We are somewhat doubtful of the validity of this statement. In the following section, we compare creole languages and planned languages from the linguistic viewpoint.

First, we continue the text just cited in Lefebvre (1998) concerning features of pidgin and creole languages.

Third, in communities where creole languages emerge, speakers of the substrate languages generally have very little access to the superstratum language. A fourth point is that, ordinarily, languages change gradually. Fifth, creole languages tend to be isolating languages. Sixth, it has long been noted in the literature that creole languages are mixed languages in that they derive some of their properties from those of the substrate languages and some from those of the superstratum language. (Lefebvre 1998)

It is necessary to point out that a creole language is a product of contact between superstrate language and substrate languages. So it possesses the features of both types; in fact either type can be a source language. Why does such a thing appear?²¹ As for the genesis of

20 Certainly the naturalness of language interests not only creolists and interlinguists; it is one of the basic properties of language development. This notion can be understood from various viewpoints. Detlev Blanke provides an enlightening comment about this: “oni en tiu diskuto devus distingi i.a. jenajn aspektojn: (a) natureco laŭ simileco/malsimileco de la fonta materialo (Interlingua estas pli natura ol Esperanto ..., kompare al la romanaj lingvoj); (b) natureco laŭ ĝena/senĝena esprimmanieroj liverataj de la lingvo (Esperanto ebligas pli liberan, do pli naturan vortfaradon ol Interlingua, kiu devas rigardi la modellingvojn); (c) natureco laŭ lingva estiĝo kaj evoluo ([i] Interlingua kaj Esperanto estas produkto de planlingva akto, en sia unua fazo ambaŭ artefaritaj, do ‘nenaturaj’. [ii] Pro fakta kaj virtuoza uzado pere de homoj el pli ol 100 landoj, Esperanto evoluas pli nature ol Interlingua.) ktp.” [‘the following factors have to be distinguished in this discussion (a) naturalness according to the similarities to or differences from the source material (Interlingua is more natural than Esperanto ..., on the basis of its greater similarity to the Romance languages); (b) naturalness according to clumsy/elegant ways of expression provided by the language (Esperanto facilitates freer, therefore more natural, construction of words than Interlingua, which has to follow the source languages); (c) naturalness according to language creation and development ([i] Interlingua and Esperanto are products of a planned language act; in their first phase, they were both artificial, and therefore ‘unnatural’; [ii] due to active and skillful usage by people in more than 100 countries, Esperanto has evolved more naturally than Interlingua), and so on” (Blanke 18 March 2000, email to me).

21 Certainly the problem is not so simple. The difficulty of the language is only one of many factors which create a pidgin. Contact between languages plays the main role in the creation of a pidgin. Schubert summarizes this nicely as follows: “En piĝinestiĝa situacio ne estas ofertata ebleco sisteme lerni la koncernajn lingvojn, nek estas ebleco uzi la servojn de interpretistoj, sed ekestas kontakto inter la koncernaj lingvanoj kaj ili estas devigitaj elturniĝi spontanee” [‘in a situation which creates a pidgin, there is no possibility of learning the languages concerned or of using the services of an interpreter. Rather there is contact between members of the language groups concerned, and they are obligated to make the best of the situation without preparation’] (Schubert 4 April 2000, email). Creolist Wouter Kusters has also similar viewpoint “Creolists generally agree that it is the inaccessibility of the superstrate which prevents the substrate speaker to perfectly acquire the

creole and pidgin languages, creolists have many disputes, but there are a few theories and hypotheses about this. This is certainly not the place to discuss this subject further. But now we want to demand ourselves the following: if a member of a substrate group can learn a superstrate language, or a member of a superstrate group wants to learn a substrate language, will the phenomenon of pidgin languages perhaps fail to arise? How should we understand the sentence of Lefebvre, “languages change gradually”? According to second language learning theory, pidgins arise in the same way as other language knowledge, but the language learners never attain mastery of the target language. So the variant being learned stabilizes as a language of a larger community of people, and the speakers of the target languages adapt.

It is also worth noting that a pidgin is collective, not individual. For this reason, a pidgin language is basically not stable.²² It often finds itself somewhere in a continuum between the endpoints (the substrate and superstrate languages, pidgin and creole languages, interlanguage and intralanguage...). According to a study by a creolist, the development from pidgin to creole language makes this more complex and somewhat difficult. We can understand this, because a developmental tendency of language is to get closer to the superstrate language (ethnic language), which is generally a more difficult language. Interlinguistically, a pidgin language is not an autonomous language; it has too intimate a relationship with its source languages. So it is not difficult to understand why a creolist (Mühlhäusler) always emphasizes the variation of pidgin and creole languages: “Development is of supreme importance. ... Pidgins and Creoles should be regarded as dynamically evolving and changing systems, not as states or a sequence of states” (Mühlhäusler 1997: 127). If the users of pidgin and creole languages can perfectly master the superstrate language, then “decreolization” takes place.²³ On the contrary, Esperanto²⁴ is even developing autonomously; the users are plumbing the depths of the

language. It has nothing to do with incapability. In fact, the degree of imperfection correlates with the distance between the substrate speaker and superstrate speaker (e.g. fort creoles versus plantation creoles)” (Kusters, 2 May 2000). Likewise, social factors again play the important role in the creation of pidgins and creoles.

- 22 This of course does not mean that all pidgins are unstable. In fact, “Some pidgins, however, are stable, namely those which never develop into a creole, but remain codes of inter-communication”(Wouter Kusters, 2 May 2000).
- 23 It is interesting to cite a few words of a Chinese linguistic work:”*The future of pidgins*: 1. With the development and progress of society and raising of the cultural level of peoples, it will naturally disappear; 2. and will change into a creole which will function as a universal means of communication in some regions” (Wu 1994).
- 24 Our comparison is not truly scientific, because a pidgin/creole language can decreolize due to its speakers’ complete acquisition of the source language. Esperanto, however, cannot do this, since it does not have one source language, the acquisition of which would be a goal of some possible evolution. Basic English must be one more suitable representative of planned languages, but sociolinguistically Basic English has not reached a sufficiently high degree of evolution. If we don’t forget that the creator of Basic English at one time hoped that his creation could serve as an introductory language for the learning of English. If this should happen, would we perhaps be able to say that also in the development of planned languages the phenomenon of decreolization (or more precisely “deplanization”) exists?

language more profoundly.²⁵ Although the language becomes richer in means of expression, the essence of its easy learnability does not change much (Piron 1989b, Vaha 1998), because the users of a planned language know clearly that their language is born from ethnic languages, aiming to be a more easily learnable interlinguistic means of communication. If the language again accepts the complexity of ethnic languages (specifically their source languages), a planned language no longer has its values and reasons to exist.²⁶ When we analyze the structure of Esperanto speakers, we find that many of them speak at least one foreign language (Piron 1989a). This is certainly a clear contrast with the situation of pidgin and creole languages.

Why does a pidgin language to have its lexicon from the superstrate language and its grammar from the substrate language?²⁷ According to Bakker,

All nomadic and bilingual groups of traders who would use a mixed language as a secret language, would use the grammatical system of the local language and the vocabulary of the non-local language. ...The language of the mothers provides the grammatical system and the language of the fathers provides the lexicon. (Bakker 1997)

Although Bakker arrives at this conclusion from a study of the mixed language *Michif*, it is also useful for an understanding of the question concerning pidgin and creole structures.²⁸ To a learner of a language, lexical mastery is easier than grammar.²⁹ Practical causes determine the

25 Concerning this topic, see Piron (1989b), Vaha (1998) and Janton (1973/1993). Here are a few examples: *en-angl-ig-i* ‘in-English-cause-inf’ ‘translate into English’; *sam-vagon-ar-e* ‘same-car-collection-adv’ ‘in the same train’; *lern-em-ul-o* ‘learn-like-person-noun’ ‘one who likes to learn’; *kaf-trink-i* ‘coffee-drink-inf’ ‘drink coffee’; *sub-akv-ig-i* ‘under-water-cause-inf’ ‘put under water’.

26 Here I do not mean that a linguistic property is the only or main factor which determines the success or lack of success of some language (natural or planned) in interlinguistic communication. We can also test planned language projects which are more difficult to use than natural languages. Elsewhere we also argue that extralinguistic factors are more important in the development of a language. Nevertheless, when we discuss structural traits of planned languages and natural languages, we need to emphasize the simplicity of planned languages compared to natural languages. In this note I use the term “natural language” in a normal way, without including pidgins and creoles. Strictly speaking, I shouldn’t do this, because pidgins and creoles are also “natural languages”.

27 Here I use the word “substrate”, but do not wish to imply that speakers of substrate languages speak the same language. Some studies of creoles show that a pidgins or creoles also are means of communication among speakers of substrate languages.

28 The statement of Bakker is only one of the theories available about the formation of grammar and lexicon: “There is no general agreement about where the grammar of creoles comes from. Some say it is the unmarked innate grammar, others say it is indeed mainly a mix of several substrate grammars, others say it is a result of mixing both substrate and superstrate aspects. However, I do not think that substrate grammar was used to maintain a secret language. To that purpose the lexicon of the substrate language would serve better. Actually, that is what happens in some secret languages as also Bakker describes” (Wouter Kusters 2 May 2000).

29 Concerning this, Dan Maxwell says: “I suppose that pidgin languages in their earliest stages have only a lexicon (perhaps with a lot of handwaving), but no grammar. This seems to me to be an inevitable situation in communication between people without a common language” (Maxwell 23 April 2000, email). Maxwell is right that practical causes play an important role in the formation of pidgins. Perhaps that explains to some

features of creole languages and simplify the language. Nevertheless, such a restriction probably does not exist for a planned language. Of course we don't deny that the level of learnedness of the creators of some planned languages will certainly influence the quality of their product.

3.3 Sound Systems

Compared with its source languages, a pidgin/creole sound system is simpler. In a planned language, such a simplification generally does not exist. But this does not mean that a planned language has a more complex sound system than pidgin and creole languages. For example, Esperanto has some sort of average sound system compared to European languages, so it is not simple, at least not to the speakers of Romance languages. Volapük has a sound system similar to that of German, and this is undoubtedly more difficult than that of Esperanto. Of course, naturalistic *Interlingua* and *Occidental*, as planned Romance languages have sound systems which are similar to natural descendants of Latin. By the way, the number of phonemes is not the only criterion for estimating the phonetic quality of the language. For example, Esperanto has been called a language with phonological orthography. That is, it has a regular phonetic system which facilitates learning and expressiveness of the language (Wells 1989). According to Wells, languages “much more commonly have vowel systems with five members, /i,e,a,o,u/” (Wells 1989: 17). Esperanto has precisely this system. If we consider the vowel systems of pidgin languages, perhaps we will doubt the simplicity of a pidgin sound system. For example, *West African PE*, *Torres Straits Broken* and *Tok Pisin* “all appear to have had a five-vowel system during early stabilization. After some time, this was replaced by a seven-vowel system” (Mühlhäusler 1997: 164). Does such a complication in the development of a pidgin imply that “language change” in a pidgin language always moves toward a more complex system? Nevertheless, such a development is in agreement with what I describe above: development bringing a pidgin closer to the source language.

Philippe (1991a) compares in detail the sound system of Esperanto and French-based creole languages. The result also shows that French creole languages have a more complex sound system than Esperanto. Haitian Creole also has seven vowels. Incidentally, a few creole languages have already been confirmed as tone languages. At least in the semiplanned languages mentioned, tones, which have often been shown to be hard to learn, do not exist.³⁰

extent why pidgins have a simple grammar. If this is right, we can connect the formation of pidgins with the coming discussion of the supposed ideal of Peano – to create a language without grammar. Specifically for Peano, “grammar” was equivalent to “inflections”, so “without grammar” in fact means “without inflections”. We can say that although creators of planned languages do not intend to learn from pidgins, they have nevertheless, perhaps unconsciously, already done something similar in the creation of a pidgin.

30 According to Klaus Schubert, “Eble la lemmalfacileco estas nur duaranga argumento. La unuaranga ŝajnas al mi esti, ke la plej multaj aŭtoroj de planlingvoj estis eŭroplingvanoj and do anoj de lingvoj sentonaj. Ili supozeble eĉ ne ekhavis la ideon uzi tonojn” [‘Perhaps the difficulty in learning them is of secondary importance. The primary one seems to me to be that most authors of planned languages were Europeans and therefore speakers of toneless languages. They supposedly didn’t even have the idea that it would be possible to use tones’] (Schubert 4 April 2000, email).

Modern technology for recognition and generation of speech also has discovered the advantages of the Esperanto sound system (Sherwood 1985; Koutny, this volume).

3.4 Lexicon

A pidgin language customarily takes its lexicon from only one source language,³¹ so we often hear that some pidgins or creoles are said to be French-based or English-based. Here are a few lexical examples of words in English-based creoles (from Mühlhäusler 1997: 133):

Tolai	Early Tok Pisin	Source Words in English
palet	plet, pelet	plate
tarautete	trausis, tarausis	trousers
galat	glas, galas	glass
tito	stua, situa	store
torong	sitirong, strong	strong
patiket	bisket	biscuit

In planned languages, such one source products also exists, such as *Latino sine flexione* and *Basic English*. More often, the creators of planned languages take lexical materials from some language family or a few languages belonging to various language families. These include *Occidental* and *Interlingua* from Romance languages, and *Glosa* from Latin and Greek. Here are some simple statistics concerning the lexical sources of three languages:³²

Source	Language Analyzed	Number of Lexemes	French	Non-French
Chaudenson (1974)	Réunion	2,211	89 %	11 %
Gregor (1977)	Esperanto	2,638	61 %	39 %
Couturat ³³	Ido	5,379	80 % (Romance)	20 % (non-Romance)
			91 %	

In order to consider the importance of the most often used 100 and 1,000 words in any language (Crystal 1995:139, or section 3.15), Gledhill (2000) analyzes the language sources of the two groups of words in Esperanto. Here is the result:

-
- 31 Here is a further clarification: creoles and pidgins take their lexicon mainly from one source language; but that does not necessarily mean the absence of words from local languages.
- 32 Concerning such statistics, it is necessary to mention whether they concern lexical or text frequency. In theory we also have to answer: is the source language the one from which the word enters the language being studied by direct contact? Or is the source language the one from which the word originates, even if it passed through several others on the way? Unfortunately, compared with normal languages, especially so called “big languages”, statistical studies concerning creoles and planned languages are not well developed. We can not provide more precise information, and for this reason I use the word “crude” as an epithet.
- 33 Here is a more precise analysis of Ido by Couturat: 91 % from French, 83 % from Italian, 79 % from Spanish, 61 % from German, 52 % from Russian (cited in Jacob 1947: 93). It is obvious from the lexicon that Ido is more naturalistic or Romance than Esperanto.

Romance	Esperanto ³⁴	German	Indo-European	Greek	Balto-Slavic
70 %	12 %	10 %	5 %	< 2 %	< 1 %

In this way, it is easy to see that Ido is more strongly Romance than Esperanto. Because in the eyes of many creators of planned languages, a latinate origin may add an international quality, at least from the lexical viewpoint. Lexically, a few semiplanned languages are probably latinate or Romance (Schmidt-Radefeldt 1998). From the data we see that the property of being from “one source” or “many sources” is only relative. It is worth noting that the words of Esperanto itself (mainly *tabelo*-words³⁵) are found a high percentage of the time in the stock of basic words in the language. This plannedness evidently distinguishes Esperanto from a pidgin or creole language. Some thoughtful linguists may ask themselves the following: if creators of planned languages are aiming at international application, why do they prefer a Romance lexicon? Why can't we make a more international lexicon on the basis of a mathematical statistical calculation? Concerning the last point, Janton has a good explanation: “it would be naive to believe that the property of being international lies in the greatest diversity of word origins. A language consisting of words of all languages would be statistically, but not linguistically international. The proportion of every language in the whole is so small, that the total of all contributions would seem foreign to everyone” (Janton 1973/1993: 137-138). For example, *Antibabele* (1950, Gaj Magli) derives its lexicon from 75 languages of the whole world, but as Janton foresees, it cannot succeed.

We list the following words for comparison, in order to observe the lexical problem in more detail.³⁶

34 According to the author, this part contains mainly tables and other artificial structures. Not everyone agrees with him, of course. Klaus Schubert said, “La tabelvortoj ja estas forte inspiritaj de etnaj modeloj, ekz. la franca. Multaj eŭropaj lingvoj havas similajn tabelojn, kvankam tiuj ne estas same striktaj and regulaj kiel la esperanta. Do mi ne dirus, ke la tabelo estas apriora elemento en Esperanto. Ĝi estas aposteriora, sed forte skema” [“the table words are strongly inspired by ethnic models, for example, French. Many European languages have similar tables, although these are not as strict and regular as Esperanto. So I wouldn't say that Zamenhof's table is an apriori element in Esperanto. It is aposteriori, but strongly schematic”] (Schubert 4 April 2000, email). I agree with Schubert on this, if we consider only the source of the idea of table words. Nevertheless, Gledhill can say this etymologically.

35 The so-called 'tabelo-words', a series of 50 words of Esperanto sharing similarities in form and function. Most introductory grammars of Esperanto present them in detail.

36 Words from planned languages are taken from Monnerot-Dumaine (1960: 113), creoles from Joseph Sauveur (Haitian Creole), and Philip Baker (Mauritian, Tok Pisin).

Volapük	Esperanto	Interlingua	Haitian Creole	Mauritian Creole	Tok Pisin	French	English
ladet	adreso	adresse	adrès	ladres	adres	adresse	address
vom	virino	femina	fanm	fam	meri	femme	woman
nedetik	maldekstra	sinistre	goch	gos	kais	gauche	left
kap	kapo	testa	tèt	latet	het	tête	head
lifön	vivi	viver	viv	viv	sindaun	vivre	life
valik	čiu	omne	tout	tu	olgeta	tout	all
famül	familio	familia	fanmi	fami	famili	famille	family
nisul	insulo	insula	zile	lil	ailan	île	island
jevod	êvalo	cavallo	chwal	suval	hos	cheval	horse
süperik	bonega	excellente	ekselan	byë	nambawan	excellent	excellent
din	ažo	cosa	bagay	kitsoz	samting	chose	thing
glüg	preĝejo	ecclesia	legliz	legliz	(haus) sios	église	church
mot	patrino	matre	manman	mama	mama	mère	mother
nemodit	malmulte	pauc	tikras	tipe	liklik hap	peu	little
täno	tiam	alora	alò	alors	nau	alors	then

Besides simplified and strictly naturalistic planned languages, pidgin/creole languages and planned languages generally change the source form of the lexeme according to the sound system or other rules/criteria. In planned languages, Volapük is an outstanding representative of lexeme deformation. Its stock of words come forty percent from English, the rest from Latin, French, and German. To maintain one syllable root and other, mainly phonetic rules, the word form is changed a lot. with even the source word being hardly recognized, for example:

Volapük	Source Languages	Esperanto
dol	dolor	doloro
gul	angulus	angulo
nim	animal	animalo
bel	Berg	monto
fat	father	patro
flen	friend	amiko
noI	knowledge	scio
plim	compliment	komplimento
pük	speak	lingvo
vol	world	mondo
yel	year	jaro
gad	garden	ĝardeno
cil	child	infano
bür	bureau	buroo
mag	image	imago
rig	origine	origino

Too serious deformation of a word of course makes learning a language more difficult. This also loses the advantage that a planned language gains by taking its lexicon from ethnic

languages. The lexicon of Volapük indicates how naturalism has been lost due to too rigorous regulation. It is good that Esperanto is probably in a position of equilibrium. For example, Fr. *commencer* = Esp. *komenci* ‘begin’, Lat. *timere* = Esp. *timi* ‘be afraid’, Germ. *laut* = Esp. *laŭte* ‘loud’, Russ. *xor* = Esp. *ĥoro* ‘choir’, Gr. *kai* = Esp. *and* ‘and’, Lat. *locus* = Esp. *loko* ‘place’, Fr. *cigarette* = Esp. *cigaredo* ‘cigarette’, Fr. *mine* = Esp. *mino* ‘mine’ and Esp. *mieno* ‘facial expression’. The table of comparison shows that there really exists an international stock of words, for example, almost all languages use similar forms of *familio* ‘family’. The table also supports the claim that planned languages prefer a lexicon from Romance languages. It is also interesting that between Haitian and Mauritian there is a long distance and a wide ocean, but nevertheless many of their words are similar. Such a similarity can even be broadened to include planned languages based on Romance languages. Listing a few words from French in Esperanto and French-based creole languages may be useful to understand the similarities between them and the changes from one to the other (words taken from Philippe 1991a: 11-12):

French-based Creole Language	Esperanto	French
atake	ataki	attaquer
beni	beni	bénir
dans	danci	danser
dòn	doni	donner
dorm	dormi	dormir
frape	frapi	frapper
kone	koni	connaître
plen	pleni	être plein
rest	resti	rester
viv	vivi	vivre

Although the table lists only a few words similar in form, we can at least see from them that a creole language and planned language have something in common, especially if their source languages are the same. In general, a pidgin language has a small lexicon; that may be related to the way it is applied – mainly in everyday affairs. If the range of use is increased, the size of the vocabulary is increased; the history of a planned language proves this. Looking at the first publication of Esperanto (1887), we see that the vocabulary includes somewhat more than 900 words. Although this first vocabulary still meets everyday requirements, we today have the enormous *Plena Ilustrita Vortaro de Esperanto* (Waringhien [editor-in-chief] 1970) with articles covering a number of specialized areas, in addition to the basic stock of words. If we lack a way to concisely express notions like ‘computer’ and ‘internet’, can we still use old words from the year 1887? Above we give an example of a roundabout way of saying something from the 850 words of Basic English. This shows that simply exaggerating a pidgin language as a “maximum use of a minimum lexicon” is not suitable. Use of such a limited lexicon can be effective only in a very limited area and it is supposedly not stable in development, certainly not in a language used for speech. How many times does a speaker say *a white root that makes eyes full of water*, before spontaneously inventing a more convenient expression?

According to Sebba, a pidgin language has the property of having a *semantically transparent* relationship between words and senses. He defines the notion as follows: “We can describe as ‘semantically transparent’ those words where the meaning can be relatively easily determined from the component morphemes” (Sebba 1997). This feature usefully minimizes the effort necessary to learn or computationally process the language. Sebba also says that “Mühlhäusler calls the principle which underlies this kind of semantic transparency the ‘one form = one meaning’ principle” (Sebba 1997). In my opinion, Mühlhäusler’s principle is not exactly the same as Sebba’s. In a coming section, we will discuss in detail the notion “univocité”, which is similar to Mühlhäusler’s, but not Sebba’s principle. We will see that the notion itself comes from interlinguistics. The study of planned languages and the already available achievements of general linguistics also proves that such a feature is not possible in natural language. In her amplex work on linguistic ecology, Skutnabb-Kangas also describes the central feature of Esperanto:

Esperanto takes much less time to learn than any “natural” languages, because it is so regular and logical – there are no exceptions. But still you can say whatever you want in Esperanto, because everyone can easily create new words which are immediately understandable for everybody else once the root is explained – the words are relatively *transparent*.

(Skutnabb-Kangas 2000: 200)

In fact, at least one interlinguist (Maxwell 1989a, principle II) considers this property to be one of the fundamental principles for constructing planned languages. Concerning the “semantic transparency” mentioned by Sebba, Schubert (1993) studies the structure of Esperanto in detail and concludes that Esperanto has this to a greater extent than ethnic languages.

3.5 Syntax

Pidgin languages often have a fixed word order. The syntactic function of a word depends very much on its position in a sentence. In theory, one word can fulfill substantival, adjectival, and verbal functions. There also exist words which are inserted before or after the central words, and having grammatical functions. Almost all creole languages have SVO (subject-verb-object) word order. But in pidgins the word order is more varied (Bakker 1995: 33-34). Morphologically, pidgin and creole languages are more reduced than their source languages, and typologically they are generally isolating or agglutinating. According to Sebba, “the preference for isolating and agglutinating morphology can probably be explained in terms of the need for pidgins to be easily learnable” (Sebba 1997). If Sebba is correct that an isolating language is easier to learn, perhaps we can also usefully borrow this claim for planned languages. This is not shown wrong by Esperanto, whose typological properties include that of agglutination with a tendency for isolation. If we go back to Zamenhof’s first instruction book of Esperanto, we can see that Zamenhof indeed intends to create an isolating language:

"Mi aranĝis plenan *dismembrigon* de la ideoj en memstarajn vortojn, tiel ke la tuta lingvo, anstataŭ vortoj en diversaj gramatikaj formoj, konsistas sole nur el *senŝanĝaj* vortoj. Se vi prenos verkon, skribitan en mia lingvo, vi trovos, ke tie ĉiu vorto sin trovas *ĉiam* kaj *sole* en unu konstanta formo, nome en tiu formo, en kiu ĝi estas presita en la vortaro. Kaj la diversaj formoj gramatikaj, la reciprokaj rilatoj inter la vortoj k.t.p. estas esprimataj per la kunigo de senŝanĝaj vortoj. Sed ĉar simila konstruo de lingvo estas tute fremda por la Eŭropaj popoloj kaj al kutimiĝi al ĝi estus por ili afero malfacila, tiel mi tute alkonformigis tiun ĉi dismembrigon de la lingvo al la spirito de la lingvoj Eŭropaj, tiel ke se iu lernas mian lingvon laŭ lernolibro, ne tra leginte antaŭe la anstaŭparolon, - li eĉ ne supozas, ke la konstruo de tiu ĉi lingvo per io diferencas de la konstruo de lia patra lingvo“(I split the ideas into independent words, so that the whole language, instead of words in various grammatical forms, consists only of *unchanging* words. If you take a work written in my language, you will find that every word is found *always* and *only in one* constant form, specifically in that form in which it is printed in the dictionary. And the various grammatical forms, the reciprocal relationships between words, and so on, are expressed by combining the unchanging words. But because a similar construction of a language is totally foreign for European peoples, and getting used to this word be difficult for them, I modified this splitting to the spirit of the European languages, so that if anyone learns my language from the instruction book without first reading the preface, he won't even suppose that the construction of this language is in any way different from the construction of his native language). (Zamenhof 1887: 11-12)

We can see that Esperanto, at least according to this statement, is an isolating language which rigorously obeys the principle “univocité” (one form = one sense), at least at its date of birth. Unfortunately, for educational and propagandistic purposes, Esperanto is usually analyzed according to traditional theories and procedures (this is the intention from the beginning), this hides its isolating properties to some extent.

Among planned languages, one project has been constructed according to the principles of isolating languages, namely Interglossa (Hogben 1943), whose modern variant is Glosa (Ashby/Clark 1992). It is interesting that Glosa is syntactically isolating (like Chinese, among other languages), with its lexicon from Latin and Greek, and its alphabet from Latin. It is necessary to provide a few sentences in this language to show its at least superficial similarity to a pidgin or creole language:

<i>Fe pa lava plu vesti de auto.</i>	‘She washed her shirt.’
<i>Id es u-mi.</i>	‘It is mine.’
<i>Qe tu ski u gina; tu vide pa-di mana?</i>	‘Do you know the woman you saw yesterday morning?’
<i>English fu es u munda lingua.</i>	‘English will be the world language.’

Lexically, although lexemes in Glosa are mainly taken from Latin and Greek, they are drastically shortened compared to ethnic languages. For example, the words Lat. *sani* and Gr. *hygie* appear in ethnic languages as Fr. *sanitaire*, *hygiénique*, Germ. *sanitär*, *hygienisch*, Engl. *sanitary*, *hygiene*, Russ. *sanitarnyj*, *gigieniĉeskij*, Ital. *sanitario*, *igienico*. But in Glosa *sani*, *higie*. Syntactically, Glosa has an intimate relationship with Chinese; even Hogben himself said, “In all this (Parts of Speech) there is nothing new to the Chinese nor to the Malay speech-community” (Hogben 1943: 32). We elsewhere compare Glosa with Chinese; the result is interesting. Glosa is probably Chinese using a Latin alphabet (Liu 1993b). Typologically among planned languages Glosa has the properties of an isolating language more strongly than Esperanto, although Esperanto has certainly developed successfully to a greater extent than Glosa.

Pidgin and creole languages do not have special endings for word classes and grammatical functions. As is well known, such endings do exist in Esperanto. Many linguists (not only creolists and interlinguists) consider such elements superfluous. Extra time has to be spent to learn these elements. In practical communication, this redundancy is necessary, since they can raise the level of comprehension and improve the quality of communication. Computational linguists also confirm that functional endings in Esperanto are useful for language processing by computer. So we doubt the correctness of the statement in Mühlhäusler that “one application of these insights concerns the development of pivot languages in translating computers. The pivot language into which and out of which translation occurs could well be a naturally developed pidgin rather than Esperanto as suggested by Maxwell (1989b: 61)” (Mühlhäusler 1992).³⁷ As a Chinese computational linguist, I know that Chinese (an isolating language) is syntactically more difficult to process by computer. On the advantage of Esperanto as language in NLP, quite a few theoretical studies and practical experience have already indicated this (Schubert 1992, Liu 1993a). Unfortunately, there is no profound theoretical study and practical project, as far as I know, concerning the use of a pidgin language for machine translation or other similar computational applications. We will return to this topic when we discuss regularity of languages.

In a statistical study of 1,045 uses of Esperanto, the word order distribution is: SVO 67.5 %, OSV 24.7 %, SOV 4.9 %, OVS 2.6 %, VOS 0.3 %, VSO 0.1 % (Gledhill 2000). The data indicate that the freedom of word order in Esperanto is limited; it is not equally distributed among all types of word order. SVO is the unmarked word order in Esperanto. So it is perhaps more appropriate to call Esperanto a language with flexible rather than “free” word order. Although the free word order and syntactic markers can faithfully imitate languages of various word orders, Esperanto has an unmarked word order. For an international language, the property of flexibility is probably useful.³⁸ The following sentences show the similarities and differences of syntactic structure between pidgins and creoles, planned languages, and ethnic languages.³⁹

37 The role of planned language (and controlled languages) in machine translation is further discussed by Schubert (this volume).

38 Concerning free word order, Klaus Schubert rightly states, “la t.n. libera vortordo en multaj lingvoj ne estas libera en tiu senco, ke parolantoj povas variigi la vortordon laŭ sia gusto sen modifado de la signifo. ‘Libera’ vortordo estas libera de la funkcio signi la sintaksajn dependrilatojn interne de sintagmo – sed ĝi do povas havi aliajn funkciojn. En multaj lingvoj, ekz. la rusa kaj Esperanto, la vortordo kontribuas al la komunika strukturigo de la frazo en konatan kaj novan informon” [‘the so-called free word order is not free in the sense that speakers can vary the word order according to their taste without modifying the meaning. ‘Free’ word order is free of the need to signal the syntactic dependency relationships within the syntagm – but it can have other functions. In many languages, e.g. in Russian and Esperanto, the word order contributes to the communicative articulation of the sentence into old and new information’] (Schubert 4 April 2000, email).

39 The pidgin and creole examples are mainly from Sebba (1997). Contributions also came from Philip Baker (Mauritian, Seychelles), Manuel Veiga (Cap-Vert), Peter Bakker (Saramaccan), Peter Patrick (Jamaican), Emmanuel Faure (Martinique), E.Vedrine (Haitian), I. Blyden (Krio), Louis Shanks (Askan). Concerning planned languages, Tazio Carlevaro provided Occidental and improved Volapük and Bob LeChevalier Lojban. Otto Haszpra provided Hungarian. – All sentences mean ‘I did not see him’.

Pidgins and Creoles

Tok Pisin	<i>mi no bin lukim em.</i>
Chinese Pidgin English ⁴⁰	<i>mai no hav si.</i>
Haitian Creole	<i>mwen pa te wè li.</i>
Réunion Creole	<i>mwin la pa vi ali.</i>
Papiamentu	<i>mi n' a mir' e.</i>
Cap-Vert Creole	<i>mi N ka odja-l.</i>
Sranan Tongo	<i>mi no ben si en.</i>
Saramaccan	<i>m'a bi si'en.</i>
Aukan or Ndyuka (Suriname)	<i>mi á be si en.</i>
Krio (Sierra Leone)	<i>mi no bin see am.</i>
Jamaican Creole	<i>mi neva sii im.</i>
Martinique	<i>man pa wè-y.</i>
Mauritian Creole	<i>mo pa ti truv li</i>
Seychelles Creole	<i>mo pa ti war li</i>

Planned Languages

Esperanto	<i>mi ne vidis lin.</i>
Ido	<i>me ne vidis ilun.</i>
Interlingua	<i>io non le videva.</i>
Occidental	yo ne videt il.
Latino sine flexione	<i>me non jam vide illo.</i>
Glosa	<i>mi ne pa vide an.</i>
Volapük	<i>no älogob omi.</i>
Lojban ⁴¹	<i>mi na pu viska ko'a.</i>

Ethnic Languages

English	<i>I did not see him.</i>
German	<i>Ich habe ihn nicht gesehen.</i>
French	<i>je ne l'ai pas vu.</i>
Portuguese	<i>Eu não o vi.</i>
Chinese	<i>wo mei jian guo ta.</i>
Hungarian	<i>nem láttam (őt).</i>

40 According to Philip Baker (private communication), CPE should be *mai no hab si hi*. He also observes that CPE has changed recently. His translation was in the middle of the 19th century. This fact shows that a pidgin language is not stable in linguistic form.

41 Lojban is a variant of Loglan (Brown 1960). For detailed information, visit <http://www.lojban.org>. Strictly speaking, the example should be *mi na pu viska le nakni* 'I did not see the male one'. It is interesting that the lexicon of Loglan (Lojban) has been algorithmically taken from a few world languages: Chinese, English, Hindi, Russian, French, German, Spanish, and Arabic. The calculation of lexemic internationality is strange and difficult to understand. For example, in the word *blanu* 'blue', Chinese has a very high percentage, but to a Chinese person, the learnability of the word is not so obvious. Maybe the internationality of letters derived from calculations is not true internationality. Such a product is only a mathematicality, not a language.

From these sentences, we see that almost all creole and pidgin languages have similar word order: subject pronoun, negator, word for the past tense, main verb, object pronoun. *Glosa* and *Lojban* and *Latino sine flexione* have precisely the same word orders as contact languages, because these three languages publically recognize their similarities with Chinese (an isolating language). Esperanto is closer to creole languages than English and French are. If we equate ending Esp. *-is* with the Hanzi *guo*, Esperanto is very similar to Chinese. The similarity of Interlingua to French and Portuguese shows that it is a Romance language. Volapük shows its similarity to Hungarian, which is a typical agglutinating language. So Volapük is similar to agglutinating languages more than other planned languages are. Occidental is a more regular naturalistic project than Interlingua, so in this way it is more similar to schematic projects (Esperanto, Ido). Ido, as an offspring of Esperanto, as is probably evident from the example sentence. Except for Volapük, other planned languages all use the root *vid-*, whose latinate properties indicate that a planned language lexicon prefer this language subfamily. Such a property is not very evident in contact languages, but we can nevertheless divide the above contact languages into two groups, the French-based and the English-based. on the basis of the words *si* ‘see’ and *we* (< Fr. *vu* ‘seen’). Volapük has deformed its lexicon a great deal; it is difficult to recognize its root in an ethnic language.

It is interesting that a few contact languages (Tok Pisin, Sranan Tongo, Papiamentu, Jamaican, Krio, Aukan, Cap-Vert) and three planned languages (Esperanto, Glosa, Lojban) use *mi* as a pronoun; it is perhaps difficult to explain this as a result of chance alone.

Many times we have touched on the point that a pidgin language is not as stable as a creole language. Sociolinguistically, it is more similar to semiplanned languages in interlinguistics. In a following syntactic comparison, we prefer to make such a comparison mainly between Esperanto and French-based creole languages, because the materials about them are relatively rich, and the degree of development is also probably closer.

Substantive

Creole languages and planned languages do not have grammatical gender. In a creole language, words are used to distinguish the sex of an animal. Haitian Creole *mal burik* = French *l’âne* ‘donkey’, *fimèl burik* ‘female donkey’. In Esperanto, the suffix *-in-* can be used to derive the female form: Esp. *patro* ‘father’, *patrino* ‘mother’. Creole languages do not possess a marker for number, but nevertheless have a special word to express the notion. Esperanto has the ending *-j* to create the plural. In pidgin and creole language, from the form alone, one cannot decide whether a substantive is the subject or the object; that is, there is no obvious marker for case. Rather these notions are intimately related to its position in the sentence. Esperanto, on the other hand, has the ending *-n* as a marker for the accusative.

Article and pronoun

The function of the article in Creole languages and Esperanto becomes somewhat smaller than in their source languages. Esperanto has only one definite article *la*. However, French-based creole languages have a more complex use of the article than Esperanto, for example, the creole language of Réunion has four articles: *le, la, lé, ë* (Chaudenson 1974: 355). Creole languages and

Esperanto both have complete system of personal pronouns, but in a creole language, the forms of pronouns change somewhat according to the following sound (either consonant or vowel). In Esperanto, a possessive pronoun can be formed from a personal pronoun (with the ending *-a*), or an object pronoun (with the ending *-n*). Creoles have a more complex system.

Adjective

Like substantives, a creole adjective also has only one unchanging form. In addition, Esperanto has an adjective ending *-a*; we have not been able to find other essential differences between the syntaxes of the two languages. It is worth remarking that in French creole languages, the adjective is normally found after the noun, but in Esperanto, it is most often found in front of the noun. Of course, in two languages, it is not difficult to find a counterexample; such an order is only the unmarked one. Perhaps the source language (French) is an important influence on the order in this matter. For example, Indian ocean creole: *sezon tro sek*; Esperanto: *tro seka sezono*; French: *une saison trop sèche*.

Tense, Mood, Aspect

The Tense, mood, and aspect (TMA) of a verb are often one of the main objects of study in a creole language; through it the development and other properties of contact languages can be observed. Verbs are, as far as I know, the main element of all sentences in all languages, except in cases of ellipsis and certain special expressions. In general, pidgin languages do not have morphemes to fulfill such functions; so they use temporal words (adverbs) as in isolating languages. As already stated, creole languages develop further and fill in the grammatical system of pidgin languages. It is useful to compare the creole language and Esperanto in this respect. Here are a few sentences for the Saramaccan creole language and their equivalents in Esperanto (Bakker/Post/van der Voort 1995; Corsetti 1999):

<i>Mi lóbi dí físi.</i>	<i>Mi bi-lóbi dí físi.</i>	<i>Mi o-lóbi dí físi.</i>
Mi šatas fišon	Mi šatis fišon.	Mi šatos/us fišon.
I like fish.	I liked fish.	I will like fish/I would like fish
<i>Mi ta-lóbi dí físi.</i>	<i>Mi bi-o-lóbi dí físi.</i>	<i>Mi bi-o-ta-lóbi dí físi.</i>
Mi šatadas/is fišon.	Mi estus šatinta fišon.	Mi estus šatadinta fišon.
I keep/kept liking fish.	I would have kept liking fish.	I would have kept liking fish.
<i>Mi o-ta-lóbi dí físi.</i>		
Mi estos šatadanta fišon.		
I will keep liking fish.		

From these sentences it can be seen that this creole language is rich in ways to express TMA. Although the the linguistic resources in the creole language and Esperanto are not the same, the difference is superficial rather than essential.

Structural Analysis

From the above discussions, we know that contact languages and planned languages are syntactically more reduced than ethnic languages. Nevertheless, the description is not sufficient to know the degree of the reduction. I also do not clearly know whether a creole language is more reduced than a planned language with respect to grammar. If it is, how large is the degree of reduction? Thanks to Anett Heil (1999), we now have the data required to answer this question.

In her very detailed and linguistically carefully worked out doctoral dissertation, Heil uses a method involving grammatical categories to analyze the problem quantitatively. She marks specific categories in 10 sentences of 7 languages (French, Mauritian Creole, Réunion Creole, Haitian Creole, Esperanto, Ido, and Latino sine flexione). In her analysis, she arrives at the following proportions:

Language	Number of Markers	Number of Words	Proportion
French	293	105	279
Mauritian Creole	131	122	107
Réunion Creole	167	115	145
Haitian Creole ⁴²	98 or 129	121	0.81 or 1.07
Esperanto	211	104	201
Ido	180	124	145
Latino sine flexione	3	45	0.07 (first 5 sentences)
	28	50	0.56 (last 5 sentences)

In my opinion, the result has been influenced by the selection of sentences, which certainly do not have the same significance in all languages. If the author were to use the same text with translations from various languages, the result might be still better. In spite of that, the result is identical with our qualitative description. French has the highest position in the list, because it is the only “normal” language of the seven.⁴³ Three creole languages have values of less than 2.00. Two of these have only about 1.00. This is interesting, if we think that some linguists consider that Réunion is only some kind of variant of the French norm, not a real creole language. When we praise the explicit grammatical markers in Esperanto, we can understand its high value in this calculation. Ido is somewhat lower than Esperanto, because it uses fewer markers in the language itself. In this respect, Latino sine flexione is outstanding; it is said to be a language without grammar (*lingua sine grammatica*).⁴⁴ According to Peano, grammar is not useful “grammatica, tormento de puerita, es quasisemper inutile pro intelligentio. Viatore in natione extraneo stude pauco vocabulo de isto natione, et sine grammatica construe phrasi, que publico intellege” (Peano 1910, cited by Barandovská-Frank

42 In this linguistic analysis, Heil uses two sets of markers, so for this reason we see two results. If we measure the two results, the result is 0.94.

43 Here I use the strange term *normal language* because I do not know how to treat this notion. I can not use *natural*, *ethnic*, or *national*, as an epithet of *language*, because pidgin and creole languages also have such properties. Therefore I – unwillingly of course – indicate that another six of the seven languages are “no normal”! It is clear that many of these “normal” languages may have passed a pidgin/creole phase at some time in their history. It is well known that French went through this phase when the Germanic Franks conquered the Latin (and Celtic) Gaul, which after that was named France. English went through this phase a few centuries later. “So it seems that decreolization can result in a language which, several centuries later is found to be ‘normal’” (Klaus Schubert, 4 April 2000). In my opinion, Schubert is perhaps correct about this, but this is certainly too complex to be covered in detail here.

44 I cite the statement from Falk (1995: 246); according to her the source of the statement is Peano himself.

1995: 117). Concerning this, Jespersen (1928) says, “Peano’s ideal would be no grammar, or what he thinks is the same thing, the Chinese grammar.” Interlinguists, especially creators of planned languages, have always dreamed of such a thing. Even linguists call Esperanto such a language (Oostendorp 1991). A language without a grammar, such a statement is only metaphorical. For example, in Chinese, the word order plays an important role in grammatical analysis. If one analyzes Chinese according to theories born from European languages, the conclusion perhaps does not show real problem in Chinese.⁴⁵ For example, I once asked myself, “Esperanto has plural and accusative endings in *-j* and *-n*, respectively, for both nouns and adjectives, thereby increasing the grammatical complexity of its nouns, whereas in creoles these functions are realized by individual words. Does this mean that creoles are simpler than Esperanto?” (Liu, to appear). The answer is certainly not easy. Falk (1995) summarizes the problem in detail concerning languages said to be without grammar and usefully refers to what is really intended in the statement. We must point out that the low value does not at all mean that the language is easier to learn and use than the languages with a high value for all users and situations. From the quantitative analysis, we can only conclude that some languages have more reduced grammars than others according to grammatical theories originating in Europe and the United States.

Certainly we have to mention here that to some extent the ease with which a language is learned lies in its regularity as a language (Blanke 1985: 83-87; Sakaguchi 1998: 374-384). Regularity is one of the more essential properties of a planned language; not only interlinguists have this opinion; even creolists acknowledge that Esperanto has such an advantage.

I’m a creolist and I understand Esperanto. In fact, I studied it some years ago. From time to time, I use it as an example of a language with optimum grammar. It is important to make explicit what I understand by simple or optimal grammar. For me, simplicity refers mainly to the exceptionless of the rules of grammar, which is the case of Esperanto. In this sense, Esperanto has a simple grammar, although it has some redundant rules. ... But the important thing to be remarked is that all Esperanto rules are *exceptionless*. There are no irregular verbs, no irregular inflection and so on. Because of that, it is a language with a very simple (optimum) grammar. (Hildo Honório de Conto, 11/14 April 2000, email)

His opinion is similar to the one we have expressed in the just mentioned review of Heil (1999). If a regular language is close to an easy language, a planned language would be simpler than a creole. According to my personal experience, a regular and exceptionless language is learned and used actively with greater ease. Sebba (1997) lists a few properties of pidgins and creoles among which I did not find the property of regularity. I also have carefully looked through a few books about creolistics (Chaudenson 1992, Arends 1995 , Mühlhäusler 1997, Holm 2000). Unfortunately, I also cannot find the notion mentioned (regularity of pidgins and creoles) in works of interlinguists. For this reason, I think that creoles do not have such an

45 Results of natural language processing of Chinese shows that it is more difficult than other languages with obvious grammatical markers. For examples the sentence *chunfeng lü dadi*, from which *lü* ‘green’ is normally an adjective, nevertheless in this case functions like a verb. This is difficult for a computer, perhaps also for a foreigner who learns Chinese. In Esperanto, the translation of the sentence becomes ‘ *printempa vento verdas la teron*(A spring wind makes the earth green’). The ending *-as* clearly indicate the verbal feature of the word ‘verd-’(green). Such a structure is no doubt very useful to computers and human beings, especially in an interlinguistic situation.

evident regularity as planned languages. Mühlhäusler wrote, “While a mathematical notion of simplicity (= rule optimization) could be used in the development of artificial languages, its use in studying pidgins was very limited” (Mühlhäusler 1997). We probably also need to point out that a regular language is more easily processed by a computer.

4 Relationships between the Study of Planned Languages and Creolistics

In the above discussions, we see that an intimate relationship exists between planned languages and creole languages. The linguistic disciplines which study these two types of languages can learn from one another. In this section, I summarize the present state of interrelationships between the two areas. I will also track the history of one term in the two areas to prove the existence of a long relationship between them. Creolists often say that a creator of planned languages has to learn from creolistics; this might improve the quality of planned languages.⁴⁶ But a creolist can also benefit from the development of planned languages. According to studies of creolists and interlinguists, these two areas of general linguistics seem to have similar functions. This can undoubtedly become a basis for cooperation between scholars in the two disciplines.

4.1 The Present State of These Relationships

We say above that it is worthwhile and necessary for the two areas to work together. Unfortunately, the actual situation is just the opposite. Concerning the present relationship between the two areas, Probal Dasgupta states, “... I find the later coolness of the creolists a consequence of the coolness of the Esperanto community towards gypsies, members of creole communities, and other marginal members of the groups, whose acknowledgment is very much desired for the ‘victory’ of Esperanto” (Dasgupta, 2 April 2000, email to Usui Hiroyuki). It is difficult to read anything about planned languages in the work of present-day creolists, for example: in an often used introduction to pidgin and creole languages (Arends 1995), the word *Esperanto* cannot even be found; in Mühlhäusler (1997) and Sebba (1997), we can find something about Esperanto and planned languages, but with serious disapproval and discrimination. Mühlhäusler explains the reasons why the two areas live in isolation:

The reason why pidgins and artificial languages have tended to be studied in isolation include: (1) The relative recentness of pidgin studies, (2) Attitudinal factors on the part of artificial language creators, (3) Attitudinal factors on the part of pidginists, (4) Lack of agreement on central notions such as simplicity and naturalness, (5) Other... Most workers on artificial

46 The following statement of creolist Philip Baker is very typical: “I feel it (Esperanto) was a badly planned language which could have been better if its inventor had been familiar with creole languages” (27 March 2000, email to me).

language continue to ignore or dismiss the study of pidgins as irrelevant to artificial language. For example, Large (1985) makes no reference to this topic in his history of the artificial language movement. (Mühlhäusler 1992)

It is interesting that according to Mühlhäusler interlinguists (in his words: “workers on artificial language”) prefer to ignore pidgin and creole languages. The work by Large plays the role of witness to this inattention. The problem may lie in the fact that Large (1985) is itself not an authoritative work on planned languages. Although it also is often referred to in works of interlinguists, it is usually considered as one work outside the group of interlinguists. Large also included “greater stress on the intellectual and social context of planned languages as well as their structures” (Tonkin/Fettes 1996: 1). We do not deny that Large (1985) is useful for spreading language knowledge in English-speaking parts of the world. Large himself is probably not an informed member of the circle of interlinguists. We attentively searched through the bibliographical part of the book, from which most references are in English. Perhaps Large wants to open the opportunity to readers to find and read them. Unfortunately, English is itself not one of the main languages for publications on planned languages and interlinguistics.⁴⁷ Outstanding works can be found in German and Russian. According to my statistics, a few of the important languages for publications on planned languages are, in order, German, Russian, Hungarian, English, and French. More importantly, 60 % of interlinguistic documentation, according to research by Blanke(1985: 294), is published in a planned language, and of this, 90 to 95 % is in Esperanto. If any author were to ignore the documentation in non-English languages and planned languages, his or her work would undoubtedly be incomplete and untrustworthy. Since Large (1985) does just this, we can doubt the conclusion based on this source.

4.2 History of One Term

In fact, the relationship between the two areas begins early. In the same article, Mühlhäusler himself also writes that

It is interesting to note, however, that one of the fathers of the pidgin discipline, Hugo Schuchardt, was at the same time very active in the study of artificial languages, in particular Volapük. At one stage he goes so far as to call pidgins and creoles Volapükian. When reviewing proposals for Latin- and Romance-based artificial languages, he suggested that “one could equally well elevate one of the creole dialects of Romance to the status of international auxiliary language. They possess a regular and simple grammar and fixed word order. They avoid difficult sound combinations, favor bisyllabic words and have demonstrated that they are capable of being used for literary purpose”.

(Mühlhäusler 1992)⁴⁸

Schuchardt certainly contributed to the foundation of creolistics and widely be acknowledged as the father of creolistics.(Holm 2000: 29) He also is often cited as a supporter

47 At least this was real when Large wrote his book. Now the situation has improved somewhat. For example, the English publication of Janton (1973/1993), Schubert (ed.) (1989), and a series of publications edited by Tonkin have now enriched the English-language documentation on the topic.

48 Schuchardt is quoted by Mühlhäusler from Schuchardt (1921/1928/1976: 328).

and researcher of interlinguistics (Schuchardt 1888, 1904). We are glad to see that Schuchardt proposes that the creator of planned languages should learn the structure of pidgins and creole languages. This is correct, but nevertheless, the learning should certainly be in two directions; the study of creolistics also can take something from the study of planned languages. In the following, we trace back the source and development of one term (or notion) in creolistics. Hjelmslev at one time defined creolization as *optimisation*:

Or il est significatif que dans les langues créoles l'expression des morphèmes est à l'optimum; ces langues ne distinguent ni les déclinaisons ni les conjugaisons; à chaque morphème correspond un seul formant; dans la chaîne parlée, chaque morphème a son formant à lui; il n'y a pas fusion de plusieurs morphèmes dans un seul et même formant. On est en présence d'une "univocité" absolue, pour utiliser un terme forgé par Couturat. Et il semble tout indiqué a priori que cette situation simple et nette doit être considérée comme l'optimum. (Hjelmslev 1938: 285)

Hjelmslev uses the term *univocité*, which was created by Couturat. Couturat was a famous philosopher, mathematician, and logician, as well as being the creator of the planned language Ido.⁴⁹ In fact, the notion *univocité* is one of the main principles, on the basis of which Couturat wanted to construct his language Ido (more precisely, to reform Esperanto). Couturat defines this principle as follows:

L'un des deux principes généraux de l'évolution linguistique est, selon M. Meillet, le principe de régularité ou d'uniformité: Toute fonction grammaticale tend à s'exprimer par une seule et même forme. Or c'est là le principe d'univocité, que M. Ostwald a formulé, et que nous appliquons constamment en Ido: Chaque notion ou relation doit s'exprimer toujours par le même signe. Ce principe d'univocité est plus général, puisqu'il s'applique au vocabulaire et à la dérivation (aux affixes) comme à la grammaire; mais dans le domaine grammatical il coïncide avec le principe de régularité. (Couturat 1912: 13)

Just as Couturat says that the principle of regularity has Meillet as its source, *univocité* comes from Ostwald, who received the Nobel Prize for chemistry. Ostwald took an active part in the movement for planned languages, especially in the Ido-movement. Concerning *univocité*, he says, "Das (eindeutig) heisst, ein jeder Begriff soll nur ein einziges Zeichen haben, und jedes Zeichen soll nur einen einzigen Begriff haben" (Ostwald 1910, cited in Blanke 1998b).⁵⁰ He also insightfully remarks that such a principle may not exist in natural languages and can only be implemented in a planned language. "Es bleibt also auch von dieser Seite nichts anderes übrig, als durch eine künstliche Sprachbildung alle diese Fehler und Schwierigkeiten der natürlichen Sprachen zu vermeiden" (Ostwald 1910; same source). It is interesting that Mühlhäusler himself also in other places mentions and uses the term with modifiers, i.e. 'Paradigmatic Univocity' and 'Syntagmatic Univocity'. He explains, "this term, introduced by Hjelmslev, means that a stable relationship obtains between a content and an expression-level unit" (Mühlhäusler 1997: 232). When following the development of the word, we see that

49 Concerning the author of Ido, others think that the author is de Beaufront, or both Couturat and de Beaufront, or both of them together with Michaux (Waringhien 1980: 139-154).

50 Perhaps it would be more accurate and appropriate, to use the word *Eindeutigkeit* in the pages up to here, rather than *univocité*, but in order to follow the way the word changes, I have refrained from doing this.

although the sense for creolists is not fully the same as the sense for interlinguists, its essence probably does not change very much. Interlinguistically, the notion is an unmoving (static) or design criterion (Maxwell 1989a, principle III); creolistically, it is the notion for estimating the degree of development of the language. The source of the term in planned languages can not be changed in creolistics.

4.3 Community and Intercomprehension

Besides the just mentioned historical relationships, there are several works on planned languages and interlinguistics in which pidgin/creole languages and the relationship between the two areas is often mentioned, for example, Blanke (1985), Schubert (1989), Drezen (1991), Albani/Buonarroti (1994), Szerdahelyi (1997), and so on. These works are important reference sources for planned languages and interlinguistics. We also have special studies on creole languages and planned languages done by interlinguists like Philippe (1991a), Corsetti (1999) and Heil (1999).⁵¹ There are a few works about creole and pidgin languages in the bibliography of this article, but unfortunately, we find hardly a trace of a reference to a planned language among them, especially not an indication of approval! I flipped through the bibliography of Hazaël-Massieux (1991), which has 1,020 entries, but I didn't find anything about a planned language even there. In a new textbook about creolistics (Holm 2000), we also can not find any traces of planned languages. The only exception was Kees Versteegh (1984, 1993), who is perhaps one of the truly few creolists who know Esperanto.⁵²

Planned languages are often ignored by orthodox linguists because of their plannedness (artificiality) and unnaturalness; in the same way, pidgin and creole languages also have a similar fate in the eyes of linguists due to their imperfections and incompleteness. But creolistics has developed better than the study of planned languages. Creolists can often take pride in the naturalness of creole and pidgin languages; planned languages don't have this. For this reason, creolists often underestimate the value of planned languages. We say that creolistics has developed somewhat better than interlinguistics. It does not depend on the linguistic factor, but rather more on factors outside of language itself. We also find a similar (but opposite) opinion from the hand of a supporter of planned languages, the famous linguist Jespersen once looked at a pidgin language from above:

The simpler the morphological structure is, the less inducement will there be to make grammatical mistakes from a recollection of the grammatical rules of one's native language. But that simplicity does not mean that the language we construct is to be a kind of "Pidgin" incapable of expressing nuances of thought which are necessary to highly cultivated Europeans. I have devoted a long chapter of my book *Language* to a study of Pidgin English, Beach-la-Mar and similar exotic minimum-languages or makeshift-languages, so I speak with

51 Strictly speaking, Heil is a Romance specialist, not an interlinguist. Philippe is also a Romance language specialist, but he got a doctorate on the development of Esperanto (Philippe 1991b).

52 When I wanted to request a few creolists to comment on a draft of this article, Philip Baker told me (25 March 2000, email), "However, I think you will have great difficulty in finding any creolist who is interested in Esperanto." The following search has proven him to be correct.

some knowledge of the matter when I say that the interlanguage I am advocating in this book is totally different from such languages through being expressive and efficient, though extremely simple in its grammatical structure. (Jespersen 1928)

Famous semiotician Umberto Eco in his book about ‘perfect languages’ has also similar conclusion, he explain why he will not consider ‘pidgins’ as the topics of ‘perfect languages’ :

Zusammengebastelte Sprache, das heißt solche, die spontan aus dem Zusammenprall zweier Kulturen mit verschiedenen Sprachen entstehen. Typisch dafür sind die *Pidgin*-Idiome in kolonialen Gebieten. Obgleich supranational, sind diese Sprachen doch nicht universal, sondern partiell und alles andere als vollkommen, ihr Wortschatz und ihre Syntax sind sehr elementar und nur dazu da, einige gleichfalls sehr elementare Tätigkeiten auszudrücken, etwa kommerzielle Transaktionen, aber es fehlt ihnen an der nötigen Fülle und Flexibilität zum Ausdruck komplexerer Erfahrungen.

(Eco 1994: 17)

In my opinion, linguists, like any scientists, should not denigrate each other’s objects of study. Languages are means of communications among human beings, and if experience shows that a given language is capable of playing such a role, it should have the right of becoming the object of study of linguists. We should not judge the skills of children on the basis of their parents. On the contrary, the observation of how children grow is an interesting and important occupation. Because many problems have to be solved and observed during the growth of children, such solutions can not be found by observing only the activity of mature people. For linguists, planned languages and creole languages are the same kind of lovable children. This is the place to cite the opinion of a “neutral” (or more precisely “rational”) linguist:

For a linguist, particularly the student of linguistic universals and the typology of socio-linguistic communities, and for the *pidginist* and *creolist* and student of *language contact*, language planning and the emergence of new speech communities, it is particularly fascinating to observe the diachronic development of Esperanto from merely one of numerous quasi-linguistic projects lacking in the sociological concomitants of human speech, into a human language characterized by a complete linguistic structure, a form-generative capacity, and a body of speakers adhering to common linguistic and cultural patterns.

(Wood 1979: 439, my emphasis)

A planned language is the basis of interlinguistics,⁵³ so for this reason, it may be interesting to also check for any connection between planned languages and creoles. Schubert analyzes a few possible definitions of interlinguistics. Of these the second is the following, “Interlinguistics is the study of vehicular languages for interethnic communication” (Schubert

53 According to Blanke interlinguistics is "la interdisciplina, multifaceta esploro de la problemo de la internacia lingva komunikado, kun ĉiuj siaj rimedoj, kondiĉoj, efikoj kaj kun ĉiuj aspektojn: politiko, ekonomia, lingvistika, jura, sociologia, informadika, psikologia, kulturologia k.a." (the interdisciplinary, multi-faceted investigation of the problem of international language communication, with all its resources, conditions, effects, and all its facets: political, economical, linguistic, legal, sociological, computer-science, psychological, cultural, among others) (Blanke 1998a: 15). As already discussed in Liu (1999), the two main theoretical approaches to interlinguistics are the sociological one and the linguistic one. Although interlinguistics in principle includes the scientific study and systematic improvement of international linguistic communication in general, the creation and use of planned languages (international auxiliary languages) remains its main object.

1989: 11). According to this definition, pidgin and creole languages also become objects of interlinguistics. Wandruszka also believes that mixed languages and creolistics are a branch of interlinguistics; according to Wandruszka, interlinguistics is the “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). Unfortunately or interestingly, although Wandruszka clearly knows the history of interlinguistics (see the footnote on the same page of his book), he did not hesitate to exclude planned languages from his definition. Just as Wandruszka keeps planned languages out of his definition, pidgin and creole languages are not included in the present terrain of interlinguistics. As early as 1931, Szilágyi (1931/1976: 165) excluded them: “Interlinguistica non es occupato cum pidgins... Motivos speciale de isto limitatione es sequente. Etsi nos pote vide in pidgins quasi modellos naturale, sociale, de interlinguas individuale, tamen illos, non formatos consciente” [‘Interlinguistics is not concerned with pidgins... Particular motives for this limitation are the following. Although we can see something like natural, social models of individual interlinguas in pidgins, they are nevertheless not consciously formed’]. Nevertheless, there is also an exception among interlinguists:

Heute wird unter Interlinguistik die Teildisziplin der Linguistik verstanden, die sich mit dem Studium der geplanten Sprachen beschäftigt. Im weiteren Sinne werden darunter auch die Phänomene des Sprachkontaktes natürlicher Sprachen, Pidgin- und Kreolsprachen, Bi- und Multilingualismus verstanden. (Ölberg 1999: 379)

From the above mentioned facts, it is certain that there exists some intimate relationship between pidgin/creole languages and planned languages, as well as between creolistics and interlinguistics. Nevertheless, the present state of the combination of the two areas is not very satisfying. Mühlhäusler explains this as follows:

Perhaps the most important reason for the lack of contact between pidgin and artificial language studies is the absence of a theoretical foundation that allows for the integration of the two subdisciplines. The notions of simplicity and reduction, while encountered in the traditions of both pidgin and artificial language study for a long time were insufficiently developed to be of use for such integration. Any understanding of shared properties and differences between pidgins and artificial language crucially depends on the study of the notions of simplicity, markedness and naturalness. (Mühlhäusler 1992)

Mühlhäusler is undoubtedly correct in some respects. We need a theoretical foundation which is capable of combining the two areas; we have to study the topics of naturalness, markedness, and simplicity in more depth. Above all, it seems to me, scholars in each area have to get to know the topic from the other side. Unfortunately, we hardly see any serious work on planned languages and interlinguistics in the main works of creolists. Without mutual understanding, cooperation is impossible.

Interlinguistics (the science of planned languages) and creolistics are both useful not only to linguistics, but also to other fields. Linguists in both areas are aware of this. They all consider their objects of study to be a “linguistic laboratory” for linguistics. Concerning the utility of the study. Duličenko writes,

Esperanto is a unique model for monitoring and exploring many ideas in general linguistics. In itself, Esperanto helps us observe the process of the birth and establishment of a language before our eyes, as it were. It allows us to study development of languages by examining growth from language project to fully functioning language. It provides insight into the growth of polysemy and redundancy. We can observe through its linguistic history the growth of a language through collective action; we can study language universals; we can explore the phenomenon of social control. (Duličenko 1997)

Blanke presents the scientific value of planned languages:

Planned languages – as the most thoroughly developed products of language planning – are linguistic facts and for this reason an object of language science. At least the well developed projects and planned semilanguages, especially, however, functioning Esperanto, are proofs of successful language creation by humans. Esperanto by its existence and functioning raises a series of fundamental questions for language science. These can be examined under laboratory conditions, because the language is very young and it is possible to get an overview of its texts fairly easily. ... The Esperanto language community can be regarded as a micromodel of optimal language communication which can be examined from the point of view of various disciplines. ... This already functioning model should be able to indicate ways to future effective, non-discriminatory, international language communication. ... In addition, the concern with planned languages in general, especially Esperanto, can give valuable indications concerning a solution of problems which are not specifically linked to planned languages and their goals themselves, for example the value of instruction as an intensive general introduction to the learning of foreign languages, the role of a planned language as a bridge language in a computer for (semi-)automatic translation, or the significance of planned language studies as a stimulus for the formation of a science of terminology. (Blanke 1989: 81-82)

Mühlhäusler also has more similarities:

Pidgin and Creole studies has a large number of potential applications involving, among others, the fields of second language learning, cross-cultural and international communication, understanding of social-control mechanisms, and language planning. These languages (Pidgins and Creoles) do not just provide examples of how human beings employ a code to its limits, but, more significantly, of how human beings construct and change codes in order to meet certain communicative requirements. Pidgins and Creoles represented some universal deep structure, that they shared most (in the case of Pidgins) and all (in the case of Creoles) deep properties of human languages, but lacked certain late transformations. Their grammar was thus optimal rather than deficient or lacking, as in the previous view. The primary benefit of Pidgins lies in the fact that they permit communication between speakers of different languages. It should be noted that Pidgins, as second languages, really offer the best of worlds to their users: they can communicate with outsiders, while continuing to express their own identity through their vernacular. Those in the business of developing an international auxiliary language can learn a great deal from study of Pidgins.

(Mühlhäusler 1997: 337-342)

If we forget the language names mentioned by the three authors, can't we see a true similarity among them?

5 Conclusion

Creole and pidgin languages are often considered simplified languages unconsciously born from a practical situation of interlinguistic communication. To facilitate interlanguage communication, some people have consciously created planned languages. A common property of pidgins/creoles and planned languages is that they are special languages and languages coming into existence and further evolving under special conditions. By comparing them, we will perhaps find some solutions to the following questions: Is any language easier to learn and use than another? What kind of properties make learning and using a language easier? Is learnability the same thing as usability? How is equilibrium between simplicity and expressivity attained? Which factors (lexicon or grammar) are more influential for interlinguistic communication? Is an easy language for a human being also just as easy for a computer? Is degree of facility a quantifiable notion for a language? Are only those planned languages which draw their material from creole and pidgin languages easy? Isn't it possible to consciously create languages easier than ethnic languages or even pidgins and creoles? Can only a language which is born naturally and unconsciously be called a "language" in the true sense? Can't a planned language provide something for creolistics? Will creolists and interlinguists perhaps join forces? If a common basis exists, what is it? In this article, we have tried to answer some of the above questions, correctly or incorrectly.

Sociolinguistically, creole languages and planned languages are mainly important for situations in which interlinguistic communication is desirable, but a common interlanguage is lacking. The environment spontaneously gives birth to the creole language and the pidgin language; a person consciously creates a planned language. It is worth remarking that creole and pidgin languages often function only in a small region; a planned language is customarily intended for a larger area – as an international auxiliary language. Because there is a group to create the pidgin and creole language, a group of speakers is not lacking. In contrast, an individual creates a planned language; to stay alive, it has to draw a group of speakers to learn and use it. In pidgin and creole languages, a spoken language precedes written language; there exist pidgins and creoles without a writing system. In a planned language, writing precedes speech; there are planned languages with no use in speech. When a pidgin has enough native speakers, it becomes a creole language. One planned language (Esperanto) also has its native speakers. This is often called "creolization" of planned languages, but more often this is only metaphorical. In both quantitative and qualitative ways, the creolization of a planned language is not the same thing as that of a pidgin. Because they have different goals, even for native speakers of Esperanto, who also cannot live only by means of the language, in order to communicate with other people in the environment, he or she has to learn other languages. This is understandable, because a planned language never has the purpose of replacing ethnic languages, it only tries to function as a common second language for people in interlinguistic communication. Esperanto is not a creole, as Gledhill rightly concludes in his chapter on the topic:

Despite major differences in historical context and in basic linguistic features, we have seen that Esperanto shares some abstract and fundamental similarities with Creole languages, and that this is akin to the development of vernacular style in other ethnic and national languages. Nevertheless, it would be wrong to consider Esperanto as a creole itself.

(Gledhill 2000: 47)

A pidgin and planned language are “neutral” languages, so according to linguistic human rights, they have an advantage in interlinguistic communication more than any ethnic languages. A neutral language is probably useful to protect the ecological system of languages. In other words, such a language is an ecological interlanguage. A planned language is a conscious product to protect our language ecology. A linguist describes the procedure which Zamenhof used to create Esperanto as follows: “Zamenhof was able to translate his nascent awareness of the *ecological* factors into a signifying process by which he developed an entirely new language which was easy to learn and to speak” (Nuessel 2000: 38-39, my emphasis). If we recognize that Zamenhof used ecological elements to construct his language, then Esperanto is an ecological language. While linguists outside of interlinguistics search for a solution for linguistic ecology, interlinguists and Esperantists have been using an ecological language for a long time already. If linguists can rationally look at the functioning of Esperanto, perhaps the solution being sought is lying right in front of them.

The development of modern society speeds up the contact between members of various linguistic groups. If one prefers to use only a few big ethnic languages and interlanguages, this undoubtedly kills smaller languages more quickly. It is good that many linguists have already seen the problem from various angles (Trampe 1990; Phillipson 1992; Fill 1993; Mühlhäusler 1996; Skutnabb-Kangas 2000). Nevertheless, intercommunication requires a language, perhaps only a “neutral” interlanguage is capable of solving the problem. Esperanto will perhaps play a large role in the future. At the beginning of a new millennium, we have already seen such a prediction by Skutnabb-Kangas. She rationally and clearsightedly states:

I see Esperanto as a possible viable alternative to today’s languages for international communication. A Work Group in language options in the European Union looked at what the options are to solve the language problem in a multinational and multicultural community, using the criteria of (1) equality, (2) cultural and linguistic diversity, (3) non-discrimination, (4) democracy, and (5) efficiency. ... There is no doubt in my mind that a solution with English does not fulfill any of the criteria. Esperanto does. Esperanto is an additive, not subtractive language. Ignorance and prejudices may prevent useful solutions.

(Skutnabb-Kangas 2000: 283-284)

We can of course also consider creoles according to these criteria; it seems to me that creoles would score fewer points than planned languages. In fact, Wood already asserted more than 20 years ago:

The development and continued existence of the Esperanto language in its ideologically committed speech-community is an equally remarkable phenomenon on a non-territorial, non-political, non-ethnic basis. The latter case, rather than the former (the revitalization of Modern Spoken Hebrew in Israel), may prove, in the future, to be a more significant example of the continued linguistic development of mankind in a coming post-national, post-territorial age. ... Nowhere is this more so than in the very ability which defines mankind as distinct from the other primates and lower animals: human language.

(Wood 1979: 448)

Consider also the words of Tsuda: “In this respect, I think the Esperanto language movement deserves serious attention, not because of the Esperanto language solution, but because of the effort made by the Esperantists to document a large number of language inequality cases taking place around the world” (Tsuda 1986: 90). So, Esperanto is not only a solution; its history also provides useful material to search for a different solution.

Lexically, pidgin/creole languages and planned languages are all mixed languages. A creole language prefers to acquire its lexicon from one source language; a planned language has a greater variety of sources. It is interesting when we compare the two kinds of languages with similar source languages, we find evident lexical similarity. Typologically, pidgin and creole languages tend to be isolating or agglutinative languages. Planned languages also follow this tendency; in the history of planned languages, there have even been attempts at a language without grammar. A simple grammar certainly simplifies the learning and using of the language. Are the grammatical markers superfluous?⁵⁴ The history of planned languages would perhaps respond negatively. According to a study based on computer science, this is also necessary (Liu 2000).

In fact, a good creator of a planned language always tries to search for equilibrium between artificiality and naturalness, regularity and simplicity, passive and active use, and necessity and sufficiency. Creole and planned languages are generally simpler than ethnic languages with respect to lexicon and grammar. Stated less precisely, both are simplified versions of ethnic languages, but the procedure for creating them is not the same. Pidgin and creole arise naturally from language contact; a planned language is created subjectively by a person according to certain criteria. So, creolists usually praise their objects of study as naturally evolved simplified language which are more suitable for the purpose of interlanguage communication. Interlinguists do not often agree with this, because their objects of study have been created according to a plan, also for the purpose of interlanguage communication. If we acknowledge that a canal can serve humans better than a natural river, why could not planned languages be more outstanding than natural languages in verbal communication? Nevertheless, the question cannot be answered so easily. Because natural and artificial elements live at the same time in all languages, both natural and planned. There are planned languages which are more natural than “natural” languages like pidgin and creole languages. Interlinguists have been aware for a long time of the similarity between planned languages and pidgin/creole languages. Unfortunately, creolists seem not to recognize such a value in planned languages. Concerning the differences in point of view, it is not difficult to find out about them in a bibliography with works authored by interlinguists and creolists. A precondition of collaboration is mutual comprehension. In order to search for solutions concerning simplicity, naturalness, and other common problems in the two areas, we should do more detail and deep study from two fields. Here is a table with a comparison between pidgin/creole languages and planned languages. The various individual entries of this table are presented in more detail in earlier sections of this article.

54 Here is the answer of Wouter Kusters: “Maybe they are not superfluous. The presence versus absence of the accusative marker, however, gives Esperanto a quite distinct character from creoles, because it enables Esperanto to in contrast to creole to have a free word order – all caveats with respect to this ‘free’ notwithstanding” (Kusters 2 May 2000).

Properties	Pidgins and Creoles	Planned Languages⁵⁵
Clear day of birth?	no	yes
Conscious product?	no	yes
Creator known?	no	yes
Creating entity?	collective	individual ⁵⁶
Spoken and written language	spoken < written	written < spoken
Distribution of users	concentrated	diaspora
Region of use	small and local	large and international
Native speakers?	yes	yes (pseudo)
People or nation?	yes	no
Sound system	not complex	simple
Morphology and syntax	simplified	simplified and regular
Typology	isolating language (often)	various
Lexicon (source)	one source language	one or a few languages
Deformation of source words?	yes	yes ⁵⁷
Stock of Words	small	not big ⁵⁸

Interlinguists and creolists have to learn from one another. We must continue together on the road constructed by Schuchardt about 100 years ago. Perhaps this modest study can be useful for more profound investigation on this topic.

55 As is well known, planned languages have various types, of which a few have distinctive linguistic properties. In the table I consider mainly Esperanto, Ido, and other projects which possess simplified and regular structure compared with natural languages.

56 In planned languages, it is more precisely to say that individual (or small group) create a language, but its life be given by collective. Without collective forces language be not able to support oneself.

57 The degree of deformation is not the same in planned language projects. For example, in Loglan/Lojban, there is an extremely high degree of deformation. In Volapük, there is lot deformation. Esperanto, Ido, Occidental, and Interlingua have a declining degree of deformation.

58 Strictly speaking, our comparison has to stand on the scientific statistics for texts of planned languages and pidgin/creole languages. Unfortunately, we don't have such statistics for pidgins and creoles. For Esperanto we do, however. According to this, to deal with 80 % of the texts in Esperanto, we need about 563 words for spoken texts (Tišljär 1982) and 749 words for written texts (Dietze 1989), but in Indo-European languages to reach the same percentage, one needs 2,000 words. To put it differently, in Esperanto one needs to learn one fourth or one third as many elements as in other (ethnic) languages. If we consider the circumstances of pidgins/creoles, it would appear that they need a smaller stock of words than normal languages, or even planned languages. Of course the statistics certainly do not indicate that a planned language itself has only a really small stock of words. This is immediately disproved by a number of large dictionaries in and about planned languages. We are here concerned only with the basic stock of words in planned languages.

References

- Albani, Paolo; Berlinghiero Buonarroti (1994): *Aga magéra difúra. Dizionario delle lingue immaginarie*. Bologna: Zanichelli
- Arends, Jacques; Pieter Muysken, Norval Smith (eds.) (1995): *Pidgins and Creoles. An Introduction*. Amsterdam: Benjamins
- Ashby, Wendy; Ronald Clark (1992): *18 steps to Fluency in Euro-Glosa*. Richmond: Glosa
- Baker, Philip (1987): "Historical Developments in Chinese Pidgin English and the Nature of the Relationships between the Various Pidgin Englishes of the Pacific Region." *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Language* 2 [2]: 163-207
- Bakker, Peter (1995): "Pidgins." Arends, Muysken, Smith (eds.), 25-39
- (1997): *A language of Our Own. The Genesis of Michif, the Mixed Cree-French Language of the Canadian Metis*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Bakker, Peter; Marike Post, Hein van der Voort (1995): "TMA Particles and Auxiliaries." Arends, Muysken, Smith (eds.), 247-258
- Barandovská-Frank, Věra (1995): *La latina kiel interlingvo / Latein als internationale Sprache*. Praha: Akademia Libroservo
- Becker, Ulrich; Fritz Wollenberg (eds.) (1998): *Eine Sprache für die Wissenschaft. Interlinguistische Informationen, Beiheft 3*. Berlin: Gesellschaft für Interlinguistik
- Blanke, Detlev (1985): *Internationale Plansprachen. Eine Einführung*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag
- (1986): *Esperanto und Wissenschaft. Zur Plansprachenproblematik*. Berlin: Kulturbund der DDR
- (1989): "Planned Languages: A Survey of Some of the Main Problems." Schubert (ed.), 63-88
- (1998a): "La aktuala stato de interlingvistiko." Carlevaro (ed.), 6-90
- (1998b): "Wilhelm Ostwald, Ido und die Interlinguistik." Becker, Wollenberg (eds.), 13-31
- (this volume)
- Blanke, Detlev (ed.) (1977): *Esperanto: lingvo – movado – instruado*. Berlin: Kulturbund der DDR
- Blanke, Detlev; Roy McCoy, Osmo Buller (eds.) (1999): *Por aktiva lingvopolitiko*. Rotterdam: Universala Esperanto-Asocio
- Brown, James Cooke (1960): "Loglan." *Scientific American* 202 [6]: 53-63
- Carlevaro, Tazio (red.) (1998): *Domaine de la recherche en linguistique appliquée*. Bellinzona: Dubois
- Chaudenson, Robert (1974): *Le lexique du parler créole de La Réunion*. Vol. 1-2. Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion
- (1992): *Des îles, des hommes, des langues. Essai sur la créolisation linguistique et culturelle*. Paris: L'Harmattan
- Corsetti, Renato (1999): "Kreoliĝo de Esperanto inter personaj gustoj kaj oficiala normo." Blanke, McCoy, Buller (eds.), 43-60
- Couturat, Louis (1912): "Sur la structure logique du langage." *Bulletin de la Société française de philosophie* 12: 47-84
- Couturat, Louis; Léopold Leau (1903): *Histoire de la langue universelle*. Paris: Hachette
- , — (1907): *Les nouvelles langues internationales*. Paris: Hachette
- , — (1979): *Histoire de la langue universelle. Les nouvelles langues internationales*. Reprint of Couturat/Leau 1903 and 1907. Reinhard Haupenthal (ed.). Hildesheim/New York: Olms
- Crystal, David (1995): *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Chinese Translation. Beijing: Social Science Press of China
- Dasgupta, Probal (1997): "Toward a Dialogue between the Sociolinguistic Sciences and Esperanto Culture." Tonkin (ed.), 139-170
- Dietze, Joachim (1989): *Frequenzwörterbuch Esperanto-Deutsch: Die meistgebrauchten Wurzeln der Esperanto-Literatursprache*. Wissenschaftliche Beiträge F96. Halle: Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg
- Drezen, Ernest Karlovič (1991): *Historio de la mondlingvo*. 4th Esperanto ed. Sergej Kuznecov (ed.). Moskvo: Progreso
- Duličenko, Aleksandr Dmitrievič (1990): *Me dunarodnye vspomogatel'nye jazyki*. Tallinn: Valgus
- (1997): "Esperanto: A Unique Model for General Linguistics." Tonkin (ed.), 67-69

- Dutton, Tom; Malcolm Ross, Darrell Tryon (eds.) (1992): *The Language Game: Papers in Memory of Donald C. Laycock*. C-110. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics
- Eco, Umberto (1994): *Die Suche nach der vollkommenen Sprache*. Aus dem Italienischen von Burkhart Kroeber. München: Verlag C.H. Beck
- Falk, Julia S. (1995): "Words without Grammar: Linguists and the International Auxiliary Language Movement in the United States." *Language & Communication* 15 [3]: 241-259
- Fiedler, Sabine/LIU Haitao (eds.) (2001): *Studoj pri interlingvistiko/Studien zur Interlinguistik*. Festlibro por/Festschrift für Detlev Blanke. Dobřichovice (Praha): KAVA-PECH
- Fill, Alwin (1993): *Ökologuistik. Eine Einführung*. Tübingen: Narr
- Frank, Helmar (1981): "Kibernetiko kaj interlingvistiko: enkondukaj rimarkigoj." Frank, Yashovardhan, Cziske (eds.), 11-18
- Frank, Helmar; Yashovardhan, Reinhard Cziske (eds.): *Kibernetiko kaj homa lingvo*. Budapest: Hungara Esperanto-Asocio / Paderborn: Instituto pri Kibernetiko
- Fromkin, Victoria; Robert Rodman (1988): *An Introduction to Language*. 4th ed. Chicago: Holt, Rinehart and Winston
- Gledhill, Christopher (2000): *The Grammar of Esperanto. A Corpus-based Description*. 2nd version. München: Lincom Europa
- Gopsill, F. Peter (1990): *International Language: A Matter for Interlingua*. Sheffield: British Interlingua Society
- Gregor, D. B. (1977): "La fontoj de Esperanto." Blanke (ed.), 161-185
- Hagège, Claude (1999): *L'Homme de paroles*. – Translation by Zhang Zhujian: *Yu'anren*. Beijing: Sanlian Shudian
- Hauptenthal, Reinhard (ed.) (1976): *Plansprachen: Beiträge zur Interlinguistik*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft
- Hazaël-Massieux, Marie-Christine (1991): *Bibliographie des Études Créoles. Langues, Cultures, Sociétés*. Paris: Didier Érudition
- Heil, Anett (1999): *Grammatische Reduktion in Frankokreolsprachen und Plansprachen*. Frankfurt/Main: Lang
- Hjelmlev, Louis (1938): "Relations de parenté des langues créoles." *Revue des Études Indo-Européennes* 2 : 31-43
- Hockett, Charles (1958). *A Course in Modern Linguistics*. New York: Macmillan
- Hogben, Lancelot Thomas (1943): *Interglossa. A Draft of an Auxiliary Language for a Democratic World Order, Being an Attempt to Apply Semantic Principles to Language Design*. Harmondsworth/New York: Penguin
- Holm, John (2000). *An Introduction to Pidgins and Creoles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Holtus, Günter; Michael Metzeltin, Christian Schmitt (eds.) (1998): *Lexikon der romanistischen Linguistik*. Vol. 7. Tübingen: Niemeyer
- Hudson, Richard (1996). *Sociolinguistics*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Jacob, Henry (1947): *A Planned Auxiliary Language*. London: Dobson
- Janton, Pierre (1973): *L'espéranto*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France – Translation by Humphrey Tonkin (1993): *Esperanto: Language, Literature, and Community*. Albany: State University of New York Press
- Jespersen, Otto (1928): *An International Language*. London: George Allen & Unwin
- Košecký, Stanislav (1987): "O 'Lahkosti' esperanta (podľa troch základných aspektov)." Košecký (ed.), 98-105
- Košecký, Stanislav (ed.) (1987): *Problémy interlingvistiky*. Bratislava: Jazykovedný ústav Ľ. Štúra Slovenskej akadémie vied / Slovenský esperantský zväz / Český esperantský svaz
- Koutny, Ilona this volume
- Koutny, Ilona (ed.) (1985): *Perkomputila tekstoprilaboro*. Budapest: Scientia Eldona Centro
- Large, Andrew (1985): *The Artificial Language Movement*. Oxford & New York: Blackwell
- Lefebvre, Claire (1998): *Creole Genesis and the Acquisition of Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Liu Haitao (1993a): "Ziranyuyanchuli zhongde meijieyu wenti" ['An Intermediate Language in Natural Language Processing.']. *Information Science* 14 [2]
- (1993b): *Glosa yu rumen* ['Introduction to Glosa 1000']. Richmond: Glosa
- (1998): Shijieyuxue jiqi yanjiu lingyu ['Esperantology and Its Objects']. <http://htliu.163.net/sjyx.htm> (10 April 2000)
- (1999): "Kiel evoluas interlingvistiko? Kompara Studo." *Language Problems and Language Planning* 23: 65-77
- (2001a): Informadika aspekto de interlingvistiko. Fiedler, Sabine/LIU Haitao (Red.), 147-171.
- (2001b): "Creoles or Planned Languages: Which Have the Simpler Grammar? A Review to Heil (1999)." *Esperantologio / Esperanto Studies* 2:53-57.

- Macdonald, A. M. (ed.) (1979): *Chambers Twentieth Century Dictionary*. Reprint. Edinburgh: Chambers
- Mackey; W. F.; J. Ornstein (eds.) (1979): *Sociolinguistic Studies in Language Contact*. The Hague/New York/Paris: Mouton
- Maxwell, Dan (1989a): "Principles for Constructing Planned Languages." Schubert (ed.), 101-120
- (1989b): "Esperantology." *Language Problems and Language Planning* 13: 60-62
- Monnerot-Dumaine, Marcel (1960): *Precis d'interlinguistique générale et spéciale*. Paris: Librairie Maloine
- Mufwene, Salikoko S. (1998): Creolization is a Social, Not a Structural, Process. Paper presented at the International Symposium on Degrees of Restructuring in Creole Languages, Regensburg, 24-27 June 1998. http://humanities.uchicago.edu/humanities/linguistics/faculty/mufw_creo.html (4 April 2000)
- Mühlhäusler, Peter (1990): "Tok Pisin: Model or Special Case?" Verhaar (ed.), 171-185
- (1992): "Shared Properties of Pidgins and Artificial Languages." Dutton, Ross, Tryon (eds.), 283-290
- (1996): *Language Ecology: Linguistic Imperialism and Language Change in the Pacific Region*. London: Routledge
- (1997): *Pidgin and Creole Linguistics*. Expanded and revised edition. London: University of Westminster Press
- Muysken, Pieter; Norval Smith (1995): "The Study of Pidgin and Creole Languages." Arends, Muysken, Smith (eds.), 3-14
- Newton, John (ed.) (1992): *Computers in Translation*. London/New York: Routledge
- Nuessel, Frank (2000): *The Esperanto Language*. Ottawa: Legas
- Ohnheiser, Ingeborg; Manfred Kienpointner, Helmut Kalb (eds.) (1999): *Sprachen in Europa. Sprachsituation und Sprachpolitik in Europäischen Ländern*. Innsbruck: Verlag des Instituts für Sprachwissenschaft
- Ölberg, Hermann (1999): "Plansprachen – Interlinguistik – Esperanto." Ohnheiser, Kienpointner, Kalb (eds.), 377-391
- Oostendorp, Marc van (1991): The Syntax of a Language without Grammar. Master dissertation. Tilburg: Tilburg University
- Ostwald, Wilhelm (1910): *Die Forderung Tages*. Leipzig: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft
- Peano, Giuseppe (1910): *Academia pro Interlingua*. Torino.
- Philippe, Benoît (1991a): *Kreolsprache und Plansprache*. Wien: Internationales Esperanto-Museum
- (1991b): *Sprachwandel bei einer Plansprache am Beispiel des Esperanto*. Konstanz: Hartung-Gorre
- Phillipson, Robert (1992): *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Piron, Claude (1981): *Esperanto: European or Asiatic Language?* Rotterdam: Universala Esperanto-Asocio
- (1988): *Esperanto: nekonata, miskonata*. Paris: CELCAV
- (1989a): "Who Are the Speakers of Esperanto." Schubert (ed.), 157-172
- (1989b): "A Few Notes on the Evolution of Esperanto." Schubert (ed.), 129-142
- Sakaguchi, Alicja (1983): "Plansprachen zwischen Spontaneität und Standardisierung: Semiotik und Interlinguistik." *Zeitschrift für Semiotik* 5 [4]: 331-351
- (1996): "Die Dichotomie 'künstlich' vs. 'natürlich' und das historische Phänomen einer funktionierenden Plansprache." *Language Problems and Language Planning* 20: 18-38
- (1998): *Interlinguistik. Gegenstand, Ziele, Aufgaben, Methoden*. Frankfurt am Main etc.: Lang
- Saussure, Ferdinand de (1916): *Cours de linguistique générale*. New edition 1969. Paris: Payot
- Schmidt-Radefeldt, Jürgen (1998): "Plan- und Kunstsprachen auf romanischer Basis I. Allgemeine Problematik." Holtus, Metzeltin, Schmitt (eds.), 680-686
- Schubert, Klaus (1989): "Interlinguistics – Its Aims, Its Achievements, and Its Place in Language Science." Schubert (ed.), 7-44
- (1992): "Esperanto as an Intermediate Language for Machine Translation." Newton (ed.), 78-95
- (1993): "Semantic Compositionality: Esperanto Word Formation for Language Technology." *Linguistics* 31: 311-365
- (this volume *)
- Schubert, Klaus (with Dan Maxwell) (ed.) (1989): *Interlinguistics: Aspects of the Science of Planned Languages*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter
- Schuchardt, Hugo E. (1888): *Auf Anlass des Volapüks*. Berlin/Straßburg: Oppenheim/Trübner
- (1904): "Bericht über die auf Schaffung einer künstlichen internationalen Hilfssprache gerichtete Bewegung." *Almanach der Akademie der Wissenschaften* 54: 281-296 – Reprint (1976): Hauptenthal (ed.), 46-58
- Schuchardt, Hugo (1921): *Hugo Schuchardt-Brevier. Ein Vademecum der allgemeinen Sprachwissenschaft*. Leo Spitzer (ed.). 2nd edition 1928. Reprint 1976: Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft
- Sebba, Mark (1997): *Contact Languages: Pidgins and Creoles*. New York: St. Martin Press

- Sherwood, Bruce (1985): “Sintezo de Esperanto kaj de diversaj naturaj lingvoj.” Koutny (ed.), 49-56
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (2000): *Linguistic Genocide in Education – or Worldwide Diversity and Human Rights?* Mahwah, New Jersey: Erlbaum
- Smith, Noval (1995): “An Annotated List of Creoles, Pidgins, and Mixed Languages.” Arends, Muysken, Smith (eds.), 331-374
- Szerdahelyi, István (1977): *Bábelről. A Világnyelvig.* [‘The World Language Problem.’] Budapest: Gondolat
- Szilágyi, Dénes (1931): “Versus Interlinguistica.” *Schola et Vita* 6: 97-120 – Reprint (1976): Haupenthal (ed.), 163-187
- Tišljár, Zlatko (1982): “Pri la morfemfrekencaro en la parolata Internacia Lingvo.” *Grkg/Humankybernetik* 23 [1]: 40-47
- Tonkin, Humphrey (ed.) (1997): *Esperanto, Interlinguistics, and Planned Language.* Lanham/New York/Oxford: University Press of America
- Tonkin, Humphrey; Mark Fettes (1996): *Esperanto Studies: An Overview.* Esperanto Document 43A. Rotterdam: Universala Esperanto-Asocio
- Trampe, Wilhelm (1990): *Ökologische Linguistik. Grundlagen einer ökologischen Wissenschafts- und Sprachtheorie.* Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag
- Tsuda, Yukio (1986): *Language Inequality and Intercultural Communication.* Amsterdam: Benjamins
- Vaha, Blazio (1998): “Faktoroj de lingvoevoluo tra la historio de lingvoj, planlingvoj, Esperanto.” Varga-Haszonits (ed.), 202-267
- Varga-Haszonits, Zsuzsa (ed.) (1998): *Memorlibro. Kolekto de la prelegoj dum la solena internacia konferenco organizita okaze de la tridekjarĝo de la universitata fakto Esperantologio.* Budapest: Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem
- Verhaar, John W. M. (ed.) (1990): *Melanesian Pidgin and Tok Pisin.* Amsterdam: Benjamins
- Versteegh, Kees (1984): “Piĝiniĝado, kreoliĝado kaj Esperanto.” *Hungara Vivo* [4/1984]: 127-129
- (1993): “Esperanto as a First Language: Language Acquisition with a Restricted Input.” *Linguistics* 31: 539-555
- Wandruszka, Mario (1971): *Interlinguistik: Umriss einer neuen Sprachwissenschaft.* München: Piper
- Waringhien, Gaston (1980): *1887 kaj la sekvo... Eseoj IV.* Antverpeno: tk / La Laguna: Stafeto
- Waringhien, Gaston (editor-in-chief) (1970): *Plena ilustrita vortaro de Esperanto.* Paris: Sennacieca Asocio Tutmonda
- Wells, John C. (1989): *Lingvistikaj aspektoj de Esperanto.* 2nd edition. Rotterdam: Universala Esperanto-Asocio / Centro de Esploro kaj Dokumentado
- Wood, Richard (1979): “A Voluntary Non-Ethnic, Non-Territorial Speech Community.” Mackey, Ornstein (eds.), 433-450
- Wu Tieping (1994): *Putong yuyanxue gaiyao.* [‘General Linguistics.’] Beijing: Gaodeng jiaoyu chubanshe
- Wüster, Eugen (1931): *Internationale Sprachnormung in der Technik.* Berlin: VDI-Verlag
- Yzaguirre í Maura, Lluís de (1999): “Neŭtralaj lingviloj.” *Informilo por Interlingvistoj* 30 [3]: 6-8
- Zamenhof, L. L. (ps. Dr. Ĝesperanto) (1887): *Me dunarodnyj jazyk.* Varŝava: Kel’ter – Reprint (1992) de Moskva Gazeto. Esperanta traduko de la rusaj tekstoj, fare de L.L. Zamenhof kaj Georgo Ĉernohvostof, eldonita de Fondumo Esperanto (Helsinki, 1948/1974)