JĘZYK
KOMUNIKACJA
INFORMACJA

LANGUAGE COMMUNICATION INFORMATION

Edited by

ILONA KOUTNY

ANNA GODZICH

MARCIN LEWANDOWSKI

PIOTR NOWAK

JANUSZ TABOREK

JĘZYK
KOMUNIKACJA
INFORMACJA

11

Pod redakcją

ILONY KOUTNY

ANNY GODZICH

MARCINA LEWANDOWSKIEGO

PIOTRA NOWAKA

JANUSZA TABORKA

PROJEKT OKŁADKI / COVER DESIGN
Wydawnictwo Rys

Spis treści

Contents

Interlinguistics

Miscelanous

Reviews

Chronicle

Od Redakcji

Artykuły opublikowane w obecnym numerze rocznika „Język. Komunikacja. Informacja" podzielone zostały na trzy wyodrębnione tematycznie części: (1) *Język sportu*, (2) *Językoznawstwo węgierskie* oraz (3) *Interlingwistyka*. Część czwartą stanowią zróżnicowane tematycznie *Varia*. Tradycyjnie także w bieżącej edycji rocznika zamieszczamy Recenzje oraz Kronikę.

Sekcja **Język sportu** zawiera wybrane referaty wygłoszone podczas sympozjum naukowego zorganizowanego przez Grupę Badawczą Języka Sportu na Wydziale Neofilologii Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu 31 marca 2016 roku (patrz Godzich/Lewandowski w tym numerze). W pierwszym artykule Katarzyna Burska analizuje strukturalne i semantyczne właściwości antroponimów oraz ich odpowiedniki w języku sportu na przykładzie m.in. wielowyrazowych nazw własnych i ich syntetycznych odpowiedników. Językowy opis i prezentacja stałych fragmentów gry jako zjawisk w wybranych grach zespołowych jest przedmiotem artykułu Beaty Grochali, która poddała analizie język sportowych sprawozdań telewizyjnych. Kolejny artykuł z grupy leksykologicznych autorstwa Ryszarda Lipczuka stanowi poparte bogatą egzemplifikacją omówienie wyrazów pochodzenia obcego w polskim i niemieckim słownictwie sportowym. Konrad Szcześniak analizuje konstrukcje gramatyczne wyrażające tzw. współ-wydarzenia (ang. *co-events*) pod kątem m.in. prawdopodobieństwa (nie)wystąpienia wydarzenia alternatywnego. Wreszcie Stefan Wiertlewski poddaje socjolekt rowerowy analizie z perspektywy leksykalnej – relacji synonimii i homonimii resp. polisemii.

W części drugiej bieżącego wydania rocznika publikujemy artykuły dotyczące różnych aspektów **hungarologii**. Ágnes Domonkosi, zajmuje się zagadnieniem perspektywy oraz społecznie warunkowanej deliksy w języku węgierskim, Ágnes Kuna natomiast problemem deixis osoby w kontekście kontaktów pomiędzy lekarzem i pacjentem. Paweł Kornatowski podejmuje próbę systematyzacji tautonimów węgiersko-polskich.

Trzecią część **Interlingwistykę** rozpoczyna artykuł Krunoslava Puskara, w którym autor snuje rozważania nad etapami planowania w językach planowych, egzamplifikując wyciągane wnioski doświadczeniami związanymi z językiem esperanto. Sebastien

Moret poświęcił swą uwagę dyskusji na temat języka wspólnego w ZSRR (do roku 1953).

Łamy czasopisma, na których publikujemy artykuły, zamykają **Varia**. W tej części rocznika pojawiają się materiały poświęcone zarówno językoznawstwu, jak i luźniej związane z problematyką, która się w jego ramach mieści. Probal Dasgupta omówił z kolei syntaktyczne i semiotyczne zdolności odzyskiwania luk pre-demonstracyjnych w języku bengalskim. Jadwiga Suwaj zajęła się użyciem języka wyjściowego i docelowego w celu identyfikacji tłumaczonych tytułów filmów, Patrycja Krysiak omówiła żeńskie formy nazw funkcji publicznych w języku polskim i francuskim, Adam Araszkiewicz podjął się opisu i wyjaśnienia skuteczności modelu medialno-propagandowego Państwa Islamskiego, natomiast Bożenna Bojar wraz z Hélène Włodarczyk dyskutują zagadnienia związane z orzekaniem i informowaniem w kontekście różnych perspektyw badawczych. Bieżący numer naszego czasopisma zamyka artykuł Katarzyny Wojan, która systematyzuje odmiany języka fińskiego,

Ten numer zawiera również przegląd 10 lat istnienia naszego czasopisma *Język. Komunikacja. Informacja* autorstwa Piotra Nowaka, redaktora naczelnego, oraz wywiad z dziennikarzami sportowymi poznańskich mediów – redaktorami Grzegorzem Hałasikiem (Radio Merkury) i Radosławem Nawrotem (Gazeta Wyborcza) reprezentującymi mówioną – radiową i pisaną – prasową odmianę komentarza wydarzeń sportowych. Artykuł jest zapisem wywiadu przeprowadzonego przez Krzysztofa Szymoniaka podczas sympozjum „Język sportu".

From the Editors

The articles published in this issue of „Język. Komunikacja. Informacja" (Language. Communication. Information) are divided into three thematically distinct sections: (1) *The language of sport*, (2) *Hungarian linguistics* and (3) *Interlinguistics*. The fourth section *Miscellaneous* is thematically diverse. The traditional Reviews and Reports are also included in this issue of this annual publication.

The section **The language of sport** contains selected papers presented during the academic symposium organized by the Research Group on the Language of Sport in the Faculty of Modern Languages and Literature at Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań on March 31, 2016 (see Godzich and Lewandowski in this issue). In the first article Katarzyna Burska examines the structural and semantic characteristics of anthroponyms as well as their equivalents in the language of sport based on the example of, among others, multi-part proper names and their synthetic equivalents. A linguistic description and presentation of set pieces of a game as a phenomenon in selected team sports is the subject of the article by Beata Grochala, who analyses the language of television sports broadcasts. Another article on lexicological groups by Ryszard Lipczuk

is a description, richly supported with examples, of foreign expressions in Polish and German sports vocabulary. Konrad Szcześniak analyses grammatical constructions that express co-events from, among other angles, that of the probability of the (non) occurence of alternative events. Steven Wiertlewski, on the other hand, examines the sociolect of cyclists from a lexical perspective – the relations of synonymity and homonymity respectively with polysemy.

The second part of the current edition features articles concerning **Hungarian linguistics**, especially related to pragmatics. Ánges Domonkosi takes on the problem of perspective and deixis in Hungarian. Ágnes Kuna, meanwhile, examines the problem of person deixis in the context of contacts between doctors and patients. Paweł Kornatowski presents a preliminary systematization of Hungarian-Polish tautonyms.

The third section, devoted to **Interlinguistics** begins with an article by Sébastien Moret who devotes his attention to the topic of a common language in the USSR (until the year 1953). Krunoslav Puškar investigates the stages of language planning applied to the planned language Esperanto.

The paper section of the journal is closed by **Miscellaneous**. Here, writings devoted to both linguistics as well as related topics appear. Probal Dasgupta describes the syntactic and semiotic capabilities of recovering pre-determiner gaps in Bengali. Jadwiga Suwaj, in turn, looks at the use of source and target languages in order to identify translated film titles, Patrycja Krysiak describes feminine forms of public functions in Polish and French, Adam Araszkiewicz undertakes a description and explanation of the effectiveness of the media-propaganda model utilized by the Islamic State, while Bożena Bojar together with Hélène Włodarczyk discuss issues related to ajudication and information within the context of different research perspectives. Katarzyna Wojan systematizes different varieties of Finnish in her paper.

The current issue contains also an overview on the 10 years of our journal *Language. Communication. Information* prepared by Piotr Nowak, editor-in-chief, and an interview with two sports journalists working in Poznań media, editors Grzegorz Hałasik (Radio Mercury) and Radosław Nawrot (Gazeta Wyborcza) representing spoken (radio) and written (printed press) varieties of sports commentary. The article is a transcript of an interview conducted by Krzystof Szymoniak during the symposium on the Language of Sport.

Krunoslav Puškar

Language planning of a planned language: the case of Esperanto

Abstrakt (Planowania języków planowych na przykładzie języka esperanto). W pracy omówiono problemy planowania języka w odniesieniu do międzynarodowych języków planowych. Artykuł składa się z dwóch części: pierwsza część omawia przyczyny wykluczenia międzynarodowych planowanych języków z pola planowania językowego, w drugiej natomiast zajęto się analizą najbardziej znaczącego języka międzynarodowego, jakim jest esperanto, przez pryzmat planowania języka. W szczególności od wielu wieków planowane są międzynarodowe, zaplanowane języki (zwane także sztucznymi, skonstruowanymi lub wymyślonymi), ale z jakiegoś powodu obszary planowania językowego w dużej mierze je zignorowały (zob. Tonkin 2015: 194), chociaż można znaleźć wiele podobieństw dotyczących etapów planowania języków w językach planowanych w skali międzynarodowej oraz językach etnicznych. Autor sugeruje, że jednym z powodów eliminacji tych pierwszych z pola planowania językowego może być fakt, że pojęcia sztuczne, skonstruowane i wymyślone nadal używane są dla międzynarodowych języków planowanych, co podkreśla wrodzoną wyższość języków etnicznych. W rezultacie autor popiera użycie terminu międzynarodowego języka planowego zamiast pojęć: język sztuczny, skonstruowany i wymyślony, doceniając równocześnie wagę włączenia międzynarodowych języków planowych w dziedzinę planowania języka i tym samym ich poważne traktowanie naukowe. W celu przedstawienia szerokiej dziedziny międzynarodowych języków planowych, autor analizuje najbardziej rozpowszechniony międzynarodowy język planowy, jakim jest esperanto, którego podstawy stworzył w 1887 r. dr Ludwik Zamenhof, w oparciu o fundamentalne prace Haugen (1966, 1983), wyróżniając cztery etapy planowania językowego (selekcję, kodyfikację, implementację i wypracowanie), przy okazji podkreślając wiele podobieństw, ale także różnice w porównaniu do języków etnicznych.

Abstract. This paper investigates the prospect of international planned languages in the field of language planning. It consists of two parts: the first part discusses the reasons of exclusion of international planned languages from the language planning field and the second part deals with the analysis of the most prominent international planned language Esperanto through the prism of language planning. In particular, international planned languages (also known as *artificial*, *constructed* and *invented languages*) have been planned for centuries, but the field of language planning has for some reason largely ignored them (cf. Tonkin 2015: 194), even though one can find many similarities concerning stages of language planning in inter-

national and ethnic planned languages. The author suggests that one of the reasons behind their omission from the language planning field might lie in the fact that the terms *artificial*, *constructed* and *invented languages* are still used for international planned languages, carrying a negative undertone and stressing the inherent superiority of ethnic languages. As a result, the author pleads for the usage of the term *international planned language* instead of *artificial*, *constructed* and *invented*, emphasising at the same time the importance of the inclusion of international planned languages in the language planning field and their serious scientific treatment. In order to portray the vast field of international planned languages, the author analyses the most widespread international planned language Esperanto, published in 1887 by dr L. L. Zamenhof, through primarily Haugen's (1966; 1983) four stages of language planning (selection, codification, implementation, and elaboration), highlighting the many similarities, but also differences in comparison to ethnic languages.

1. Introduction

There have been many international planned languages before and after Esperanto, but only Esperanto became relevant from a sociolinguistic point of view. The appearance of Volapük (1879), the first sociolinguistically significant international planned language, and somewhat later Esperanto (1887) instigated major discussions on language planning in which numerous renowned linguists such as Karl Brugmann, Jan Baudouin de Courtenay, Otto Jespersen, August Leskien, André Martinet, Hugo Schuchardt and others participated. However, inspite of their many invaluable conclusions, the language planning field has to date largely ignored international planned languages (cf. Tonkin 2015: 194). One of the reasons behind their omission might lie in the fact that they are, due to considerable knowledge deficits and language prejudice (cf. Puškar 2015b), still unduly considered inferior to ethnic or national languages. As Jespersen (1960: 705) famously maintained, „very much in the so-called natural languages is 'artificial', and very much in the so-called artificial languages is quite natural" (his quotation marks), clearly pointing out the unjustification of the dominantly perceived superiority of ethnic languages. In particular, as Baudouin de Courtenay (1976: 97) concluded and this article will try to show, in 'artificial' and 'natural' languages „[t]here are the same elements, the same characteristics and the same tendencies, only grouped differently and in a different quantitative relationship among each other" (transl. by K.P.).

2. Terminology problems: an *artificial*, *constructed*, *invented* or *planned language*?

In order for international planned (henceforth: IP) languages to be taken seriously and scientifically in the language planning (henceforth: LP) field, one has to first of

all dispense with anachronistic and derogatory terms often applied to them such as *artificial*, *constructed*, and *invented*, which tend to wrongly imply that ethnic standard languages are both non-artificial (natural), unconstructed, and not invented. Even though Zamenhof himself due to the lack of appropriate terminology in his time called his language artificial (Esp. *artefarita lingvo*), he was well aware, as was his contemporary Hermann Paul (1886: 350), that all languages devised according to some kind of norm are to be considered planned languages. For this very reason, Wüster came up with the term *Plansprache* (*planned language*) in 1931 in order to express a more neutral stance to languages such as Esperanto, which in time expan-ded to a more concrete designation of an IP language or „a language consciously created by an individual or group of people, in accordance with defined criteria, with the goal of facilitating international linguistic communication" (Blanke 1987: 343). However, although clear and widespread in interlinguistics, an IP language is a term which is still not widely known and accepted in general linguistics (cf. Blanke 1985: 11).

3. Language planning and interlinguistics

In Blanke's (1985: 17) terms, interlinguistics can be described as „the science of the optimisation of international language communication" (transl. by K.P.), but also, according to Tauli (1968: 167), interlinguistics „can be defined as the science of IL planning, or more precisely, the branch of TLP [theory of language planning, K.P.] which investigates the principles, methods and tactics of IL-planning." The very term was introduced by Jules Meysmans in as early as 1911 and interlinguistics as a new discipline was introduced by Jespersen in the early 1930s. As it is evident, interlinguistics has employed the same principles, methods and tactics of LP, even before the official rise of the LP field, but, due to its subject of research which has largely been considered linguistic utopianism, interlinguistics does not enjoy the same amount of popularity as the LP field. However, it is a fact that the LP field itself is often defined as a field dealing with both national and international languages, that is, as „the methodical activity of regulating and improving existing languages or creating new common regional, national or international languages", comprising „all spheres of the oral and written form of the language: phonology, morphology, syntax, lexicology (vocabulary) and orthography" (Tauli 1968: 27).

One reason behind the greater popularity of the LP field among national languages in comparison to international languages lies in the interest of those who support it. According to Cooper (1989: 183), „[l]anguage planning may be initiated at any level of a social hierarchy, but it is unlikely to succeed unless it is embraced and promoted by elites or by counterelites." He adds that „[n]either elites nor counterelites are likely to embrace the language-planning initiatives of

others unless they perceive it to be in their own interest to do so" (*ibid.*). In other words, LP of national languages flourishes due to serious actions taken by numerous members of any level of a social hierarchy who comprehend the gravity of it, whereas LP of international languages has not met the same amount of interest by as many people.

It is interesting to note that those who promote IP languages are less likely to be considered an elite. In particular, whereas LP of national languages is usually „undertaken by some authoritative organisation – most frequently by governments, but increasingly by other organisations" (Baldauf 2012: 234), LP of international languages is more often than not undertaken by individuals who are unfortunately incapable of exerting the same influence as the elite. However, these individuals understand the present language problem better than anyone else, as well as its history. As Cooper (1989: 183) concluded, „[l]anguage planning cannot be understood apart from its social context or apart from the history which produced the context (...)", and the adherents of IP languages understand the history of the international language problem very well. It originated at the end of the 19th century when with a spread and promotion of a multitude of standardised national languages in a time of rapid technological, industrial and traffic development, a common neutral language was needed in order to overcome the ever greater language barriers. It seems that now, more than a century later, the international language problem still remains a burning issue, and the LP field along with interlinguistics the only possible solutions to the problem.

4. Language planning of (international) planned languages

Any serious textbook on LP will always emphasise two vital and interconnected aspects of LP. The first aspect is its constant orientation towards the future. As Rubin and Jernudd (1971: xvi) pointed out, „language planning is focused on problem-solving and is characterized by the formulation and evaluation of alternatives for solving language problems to find the best (or optimal, most efficient) decision. In all cases it is *future-oriented*; that is, the outcomes of policies and strategies must be specified in advance of action taken" (their emphasis). In order to be successful at problem-solving which is always future-oriented, the second inevitable aspect of LP has to be its detailed organisation. As Baldauf (2012: 234) concluded, „[t]he discipline of language planning has been defined as systematic, future-oriented change in language code (corpus planning), use (status planning), learning and speaking (language-in-education planning) and/or language promotion (prestige planning) (...)." Those two aspects, constant orientation towards the future and detailed, systematic organisation, can be found at all four stages of LP.

The famous four stages of LP are, according to Haugen (1966), (1) selection, (2) codification, (3) implementation (or acceptance), and (4) elaboration. As Haugen

stressed in his work, stages (1) and (3) are the responsibility of society, and stages (2) and (4) are the responsibility of linguists and authors, or, as Cooper (1989: 99–121) concluded, Haugen's stages of selection (1) and acceptance (3) clearly resemble status planning, whereas codification (2) and elaboration (4) resemble corpus planning. Corpus and status planning are widely considered two major levels of LP. Having revised Haugen's original LP model (see Figure 1.), Kaplan and Baldauf (1997: 29) summarised all these facts in one comprehensible table.

	Form (policy planning)	Function (language cultivation)
Society (status planning)	1. Selection (decision procedures) a) problem identification b) allocation of norms	3. Acceptance (educational spread) a) correction procedures b) evaluation
Language (corpus planning)	2. Codification (standardisation procedures) a) graphisation b) grammatication c) lexication	4. Elaboration (functional development) a) terminological modernisation b) stylistic development c) internationalisation

Figure 1. Haugen's (1983: 275) LP model according to Kaplan and Baldauf (1997: 29)

The purpose of this paper is to show that IP languages (on the example of Esperanto – the only successful IP language) are languages as well, since they go through the same four stages of LP as do ethnic languages, being in itself future-oriented and organised, and not mummified and disorganised, as they are often so perceived. Both IP languages and ethnic languages have the same origin (they are planned), but have a different function (Esperanto is an IP language), and this tends to be the greatest difference among these two types of languages. As Blanke (1997: 1) concluded, „Esperanto is a **planned** language in its genesis and an **international** language in its function" (his emphasis).

5. Language planning of Esperanto

As is clearly known in the vast field of interlinguistics, Esperanto is not an isolated IP language. By the end of the 19th century, when Esperanto was initiated, more than 200 mainly planned language projects had occured (Dulichenko 2006) and until now more than 1000 mainly planned language projects are widely known (Blanke 2009).

However, as already stated in the introduction, Esperanto can be considered the only completely developed IP language since it has passed through all the 28 needed stages as established by Blanke (2006: 64–71). As Fiedler (2006: 67) pointed out, Esperanto is „the only planned language system that has managed the successful transition from the status of a mere project to a full-fledged language. This is partly due to linguostructural properties, but above all to extralinguistic factors". It was noticed quite early on that Esperanto is considerably different from all previous language inventions considering its high stage of development that it, as a result, received its own discipline named esperantology which was founded by René de Saussure in 1910. Since that very time, esperantology has dealt with the description of the language, but also prescription, which ultimately shows that this very *a posteriori* planned language tends to be just like any other planned (standard) language.

5.1. Language planning of Esperanto: selection

The first stage of LP is called *selection* and it refers to the choice of a language variety which will fulfil certain functions in a given society. Although Zamenhof was not a professional linguist, he understood quite well what kind of planned language is needed in a global society: a) a simple, logical, and a regular language, and b) an international language. For this reason he initiated: a) an agglutinative language, and b) a lexically mixed language consisting of 70–75 % of Romance lexical material, 20 % of Germanic, and 5–10 % of other lexical material (Janton 1978: 12). In other words, Zamenhof initiated a predominately Eurocentric international language which originated on the multinational and multilingual area on which Polish, Russian, Belarusian, Ukrainian, Lithuanian, Yiddish, German, Romani, Karaim and other languages were spoken (cf. Lindstedt 2009).

5.1.1. The issue of neutrality

Closely connected with the issue of internationality which Zamenhof pursued is the issue of neutrality. Even though predominately Romance and Germanic at the time of publication of his first textbook of Esperanto called *Unua Libro* (*First Book*), Zamenhof left many possibilities for his language, which will be touched upon later, to incorporate and develop the lexical material of other language families, making it both more international and neutral in that way. Zamenhof was conscious of the fact, which he also famously stated on the first pages of *Unua Libro*, that „[f]or a language to be universal, it is not enough to call it that." Even though this Zamenhof's statement actually referred to the dissemination of the language, and not its structure, they are both inextricably intertwined, for Zamenhof's intention from the very start was to leave the language to its speakers all over the world so that they would use and enrich it

through their usage, but on a stable foundation (cf. sections 5.3.5., 5.3.7–5.3.8. of this paper). As Zamenhof would conclude, an international language has to be open to all languages, not only selected few, no matter how great their degree of internationality is. As Blanke (1985: 95) pointed out, „[t]he stronger a planned language inclines towards absolute internationality, the less certain ethnicities are preferred, the more *neutral* is the planned language" (his italics) (transl. by K.P.).

5.1.2. The issue of ownership

Also inextricably related to the issue of internationality is the issue of ownership. In particular, an international language cannot be considered international if it is owned by a certain nation or a person (in this case, the author). As Tonkin and Fettes (1996: 2) conclude, „[a]ll language projects (...) if they are owned by the author they cannot survive; if they are the common property of a collective, there is some hope of survival and growth". International language history has confirmed this conclusion many times and, luckily for Esperanto, Zamenhof did learn from the mistakes of others. Already in *Unua Libro* he emphasised that „[a]n international language, like every national one, is the property of society, and the author renounces all personal rights in it forever" (transl. by K.P.), which he confirmed next year in the first chapter of his *Dua Libro* (*Second Book*) by saying „I do not want to be a *creator* of the language, I only want to be its *initiator*" (his emphasis) (transl. by K.P.). Having relinquished the rights to his own language, Zamenhof in effect stressed the importance of a shared ownership according to which language can freely grow and develop on a firm basis, taking into account any community approved language contribution from its speakers. If we take a look at the LP of many current languages with an international standing, different perspectives of ownership can easily be seen which are in no way as flexible as that of Esperanto, which makes Zamenhof's language policy a highly interesting one.

5.2. Language planning of Esperanto: codification

Also interesting is Esperanto's stage of *codification* which implies the creation of a linguistic standard for a certain language code and which is usually divided into three substages: a) **graphisation** (developing a writing system), b) **grammatication** (deciding on norms of grammar), and c) **lexication** (vocabulary identification). Zamenhof solved this stage at the very beginning with the publication of the already mentioned Esperanto textbook called *Unua Libro* which included: the Lord's Prayer, some Bible verses, a poem by Heine and two original poems in Esperanto (*Mia Penso* and *Ho, Mia Kor'*), a letter specimen, the 16 rules of grammar, and a list of 904 roots of vocabulary. Although actually a booklet of 40 pages, *Unua Libro* managed to give a description of the language that is both short and instructive.

a) **graphisation**. While planning his language at the orthographic and phonetic level, Zamenhof decided on 28 letters with a *one letter – one sound* relationship. These letters included 22 usual letters such as: *a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i, j, k, l, m, n, o, p, r, s, t, u, v*, and *z*, but also six 'unusual' supersigned letters called *ĉapelitaj literoj* (Esp. for 'hatted letters'): *ĉ* (*ĉapitro* 'chapter'), *ĝ* (*ĝermana* 'Germanic'), *ĥ* (*ĥemio* 'chemistry'), *ĵ* (*ĵaluza* 'jealous'), *ŝ* (*ŝilingo* 'shilling'), and *ŭ* (*ŭato* 'Watt'). By doing so, Zamenhof succeeded in planning out an orthographically transparent and systematised language without graphically redundant bigrams or trigrams.

b) **grammatication**. As far as grammar is concerned, Zamenhof managed to give the briefest and, at the same time, most informative grammar sketch of Esperanto. Having presented only 16 rules of grammar, which can be subdivided into at least 40 different rules, Zamenhof succeeded in covering the differentiation of parts of speech (eight rules) and some general rules (also eight rules) of his language, making it thus the easiest language to learn. Of course, Esperanto does not consist of only 16 rules. While preparing his language for publication, Zamenhof methodically highlighted only those rules which he felt most important for language learning. During the years of usage and grammar analysis, the study of Esperanto became quite substantial, as can be seen from the 1980 *Plena Analiza Gramatiko de Esperanto* (*Complete Analytical Grammar of Esperanto*) by Kalocsay and Waringhien, which is one of the most extensive and elaborate grammar description of Esperanto written and is 598 pages long.

c) **lexication**. By comparison, Zamenhof incorporated in his *Unua Libro* only 904 basic roots which were, however, optimal for a conversation to be held in the language. Today, there are over 46,890 lexical units of Esperanto, which can be found in *La Nova Plena Ilustrita Vortaro de Esperanto* (*The New Complete Illustrated Dictionary of Esperanto,* 2002), commonly known as 'The New PIV', a monolingual Esperanto dictionary, which clearly shows how much the language has developed since its inception.

5.3. Language planning of Esperanto: acceptance

The next stage of LP is called *acceptance* (also known as *implementation*) and it involves the promotion of the decisions made in the stages of selection and codification (textbooks publishing, newspapers, and books).

5.3.1. Textbooks

Concerning textbooks, there have been to date at least 1000 manuals for learning Esperanto with varied teaching methods. After *Unua Libro*, it is important to mention *Dua Libro* (1888) as a significant textbook, even though it is not a typical manual of instruction. Consisting only of samples of reading material which appeared entirely

in Esperanto, *Dua Libro* actually approved the decisions made before since virtually no changes were made to Esperanto as described in *Unua Libro*. In other words, it enabled the very needed grammatical stability of the language and a great number of instructive textbooks which followed after it. Owing to this tradition, it is now possible to learn Esperanto online via various language learning sites such as *lernu.net* and *Duolingo*.

5.3.2. Periodicals

The language endured also thanks to numerous periodicals published in Esperanto from the very beginning. The first Esperanto magazine was *La Esperantisto* (*The Esperantist*), which began its publication on 1 September 1889, two years after *Unua Libro*, and continued until 1895 (it was succeeded by *Lingvo Internacia*, 1895–1914). Soon many more followed, making to date an extensive periodical press of several hundred Esperanto magazines, some of them having more than a century's worth of tradition. It was vital to start magazines in the very language in order to keep a growing language community together which would in turn promote the language sketched by Zamenhof, but also encourage language development.

5.3.3. Original and translated literature

Also important for language promotion and development is literature. Zamenhof was quite aware of this fact and, being industrious as he was, he undertook in 1891 the translation of Dickens' *The Battle of Life* (*La Batalo de l' Vivo*), which appeared in parts in *La Esperantisto*, but was, in addition, published as a complete translated work in 1910. All by himself, he also translated *Hamlet* (*Hamleto*) in 1894, and later many other works, such as *The Government Inspector* (*La Revizoro*) by Gogol in 1907, *George Dandin* (*Georgo Dandin*) by Molière, *Iphigenia in Tauris* (*Ifigenio en Taŭrido*) by Goethe, *The Robbers* (*La Rabistoj*) by Schiller, all in 1908, *The Old Testament* (*La Malnova Testamento*) in 1915 and others. Instructed by Zamenhof's example, many other Esperantists have also tried their hand at literary translation to this day, having created together more than 1200 translated titles. However, apart from translating literature, many Esperantists also attempted to create their own original literature, having produced to date over 800 works of prose and poetry, as it is widely known. Together they have generated a large and influential body of original and translated literature which can even be classified into various schools (cf. Sutton 2008; Minnaja and Silfer 2015). Without such an active and open participation of the speech community in language development, Esperanto would have failed not long after its inception. As Fiedler (2006: 67) concluded, „Esperanto has found a sufficiently diverse and productive speech community which guarantees the constant and sustained dissemination of the language."

5.3.4. Language reforms

However, not all were satisfied with the standard presented for Esperanto and its development, but demanded language reforms instead. By 1894, seven years after the inception of the language, its widespread promotion, rapid literary development, and the formation of a sizable and still growing language community, many criticisms of Esperanto occurred which threatened the acceptance of the language as it was. Zamenhof was well aware of the fact that even a minor reform of Esperanto could trigger many other reforms and, as a result, make the language unstable that he had no other way to avoid the complete desintegration of the language and its community than by doing the following. He collected all the commonly criticised features of Esperanto and offered them for a public vote in the magazine *La Esperantisto* in the same year, cunningly stressing that either all the features are reformed or none at all. Of course, not everybody was willing to accept such a substantial reform of the language at that very moment, confirming in turn the original norm of Esperanto.

Unfortunately, calls for language reforms did not stop in 1894, but continued in the following years, although not as seriously. In 1907, this covert unsatisfaction of part of the language community eventually resulted in *Ido*, a reform project of Esperanto, which reforms of many of the more criticised features. The sudden appearance of Ido prompted the defection of unsatisfied members of the Esperanto language community, leaving in the end those loyal to the language. However, the promotion of Ido did not take root due to the fact that the language in its early stages never achieved stability, but continued with more reforms, which in turn prevented the formation of a stable language community. In other words, the proponents of Ido, having never taken into consideration Zamenhof's principle of language stability, invited language failure from the very start.

Here, it is interesting to note that the Esperanto community, being primarily a language community, has always been susceptible to calls for language reforms. As Thomas (1991: 112) concluded, „[l]anguage reform rarely, if ever, begins as a grass-roots, mass movement. It is most often instigated by an individual or group of like-minded individuals, who may see wisdom in forming themselves into some institution in order both to consolidate their position and to organise the propagation of their common viewpoint in the wider community". From the viewpoint of IP languages, most notably Esperanto, language reforms are also instigated by individuals who most often do not need to form an institution in order to express their opinion on the language. It seems that the fact that someone is a speaker of an IP language has always given this individual the unwritten right to be a reformer of the same IP language. However, the very specificity of these kinds of languages does not allow their structure to be subject to whimsical and radical changes on a daily basis, as has been the case with some other planned languages.

5.3.5. Laying the *Foundation* in 1905

In order to stamp out constant calls for reforms by part of the language community, Zamenhof had to change his original lenient relationship towards his language, in which he is considered only its initiator, and show that he was actually its author and an authority. In 1905, he thus published *Fundamento de Esperanto* (*Foundation of Esperanto*), a textbook consisting of core grammar and vocabulary as well as a collection of exercises, which became the ultimate authority on Esperanto norms. This *Foundation* was welcomed by the language community and made official the very same year at the First World Congress of Esperanto taking place in Boulogne-sur-Mer (the Declaration of Boulogne), ensuring both the very needed stability of the language and progress as well, as it was clearly stated by Zamenhof himself already in the preface to his *Fundamento*: „If any authoritative central institution finds that this or the other word or rule in our language is *too inconvenient*, it must not *remove* or *change* the very form, but may propose a *new* form which it will recommend to be used *parallel* with the old form. In time, the new form will gradually push out the old form which will in turn become an *archaism*, as this is seen in every natural language" (his italics) (transl. by K.P.).

5.3.6. Language conservatism

The *Foundation* of Esperanto, as well as the mentioned Declaration of Boulogne, thus served not only as cornerstones of language conservatism, but also of language progress, allowing the language community to participate in the lexical enrichment of Esperanto by creating new words. As Zamenhof also mentioned in the preface to his *Fundamento*, „when the largest part of the new words has already become completely mature, an authoritative institution will introduce them in the official vocabulary" (transl. by K.P.). With this sentence Zamenhof actually foretold the foundation of the Academy of Esperanto (originally known as *Lingva Komitato* or ʿLanguage Committee') which was founded at the same congress, even though he desired its establishment since the very inception of the language. With its foundation, the language norm can finally be considered sealed and the language community stabilised.

5.3.7. Language variation

Being open to lexical enrichment, the whole language community takes part in language cultivation, achieving in effect language variation and creating a richer language than it is often thought. In particular, Zamenhof's original 15th rule of Esperanto encourages the borrowing of 'international words' (e.g. *trajno* 'train' and *hospitalo* 'hospital') alongside the usage of basic roots, affixes and compounds (*vagonaro*

'train' and **mal**san**ulejo** 'hospital'), resorting to either endogenous (compounds) or exogenous (loanwords) ways of word-building, depending on the speaker's preferences. Although highly flexible, this rule is also highly disputed since for one concept there can even be up to three and more lexemes in Esperanto, as it is the case with the lexeme 'prison' with forms such as *malliberejo*, *karcero*, or *prizono*, depending on the preferred way of word-building. However, this profusion of synonyms should not be stigmatised since complete synonymy is virtually non-existent. The only thing one should do here is to have Esperanto dictionaries which would clearly recommend one lexeme over the other (cf. Puškar 2015b: 106–107). By doing so, one would then decidedly show the presence and overlappping of the two dominant sociocultural determinants of attitudes to variation in Esperanto: standardisation and vitality. According to Thomas (1991: 39), „[b] oth factors are evident in various aspects of purism: standardisation in the desire to conserve what is best of the past and vitality in the need to remove unwanted elements and revitalise the expressive capabilities of the language." At any rate, as Blanke (1985: 287) pointed out, „[t]he allowed variation within the norm is larger in Esperanto than in some ethnic language." This non-rigid and non-stigmatising view towards language variation is definitely something every planned language (ethnic or not) should aspire to follow.

5.3.8. Language purism

Another healthy view towards language in the LP of Esperanto can be seen in speakers' attitude towards lexical purism. As already mentioned, *Fundamento* had the final say in the future lexical stability and development of Esperanto having codified the 15th rule of grammar which allows both the endogenous and exogenous way of word-building, minimalizing in this way puristic endeavours. For instance, a *Fundamento*-lexeme in Esperanto meaning 'expect' is *atendi* (which can, of course, be found in PIV), whereas a newer, non-orthodox lexeme for the same concept is *ekspekti* (cannot be found in PIV). Both lexemes are used in the Esperanto community, *atendi* far more widely than *ekspekti*, but no superiority of one lexeme over the other can be perceived. It can be hypothesised (which the analysis of usage-based examples in a speech corpus should either approve or disapprove) that the only difference lies in the fact that the newer lexeme has not yet found its way into PIV only due to its lower frequency of usage. In Esperanto, a certain word can be subject to strong puristic disapproval only if it does not fit into particular stylistic registers.

5.3.9. A stable grammar

As far as Esperanto grammar is concerned, with the publication of *Fundamento*, it has been accepted as Zamenhof envisioned it. After *Fundamento*, subsequent gram-

mars only elaborated on the grammatical structure of Esperanto, the most complex being the above mentioned *Plena Analiza Gramatiko de Esperanto* (1980), with 436 paragraphs on 598 pages. As Blanke (1985: 286) concluded, „[w]ith the publication of Plena Ilustrita Vortaro (1970) and Plena Analiza Gramatiko (1980) the codification of the Esperanto norm is temporarily finished at an adequate level, even though this primarily applies to the common and literary language" (transl. by K.P.). After this grammar, in 2005 another extensive and elaborate grammar was published by Wennergren called *Plena Manlibro de Esperanta Gramatiko* (*Complete Manual of Esperanto Grammar*) with 696 pages, commonly known as PMEG. As with any Esperanto grammar, the only thing in which Wennergren's grammar could have differed from the one by Kalocsay and Waringhien is in the approach (Wennergren's is more user-friendly) and in the inclusion and treatment of new affixes or grammatical features which have appeared in the meantime.

5.3.10. The language community

As can be concluded, the Esperanto community has been included in the development and progress of the language from the very start. Soon after the publication of *Unua Libro*, first local Esperanto clubs were established, then national associations followed, and not long after them international associations occurred, which clearly shows the interconnections in the Esperanto community. Also, since 1905, as has been already mentioned, every year a weekly world Esperanto congress has taken place (with the exception of the years 1914, 1916–1919, 1940–1946), in which generally 1500–3000 Esperantists participate, speaking the language and demonstrating its stability and vitality, despite all the adversities they had to face throughout history to do so (cf. Lins 1988). Also, the advent of various media (first radio and then later the Internet) has made the spread of Esperanto only easier. Coming from different and diverse language backgrounds, Esperantists contribute to Esperanto with their mother tongue influenced innovations, but the World Congresses, the Internet, radio broadcasts, literature, periodicals etc., all serve as unifying factors and stabilising elements which approve or disapprove a certain innovation by the language community. As Fiedler pointed out (2006: 82), „[t]he present development of the language is taking place in a field of tension between diversifying and unifying forces", which makes it a unique case among planned languages.

Also unique is the case of Esperanto speakers usually with a different mother tongue who marry and continue using Esperanto as a common and a family language. In most instances they manage to pass on Esperanto to their children, making them at least bilingual and fluent in Esperanto. Estimates vary considerably concerning the number of native speakers in Esperanto (Esp. *denaskuloj*), but the most likely number is approximately one thousand (cf. Lindstedt 2010). Various case studies of native speakers have determined significant phonological and grammatical changes in their

usage of Esperanto (cf. Bergen 2001), but also creativity, especially in word-formation (Corsetti 2003; Corsetti et al. 2004), which are of great importance in interlinguistic research. However, as Fiedler (2010; 2012) tends to point out, native speakers of Esperanto are not norm-givers: although their language innovations could point out to the possible future development of Esperanto, they are obliged to use the norm of Esperanto as laid down by Zamenhof. At any rate, as Lindstedt (2010: 70) concluded, „[t]he fact that Esperanto can be acquired as a first language can be regarded as a further proof that it has all the basic properties of a natural language."

The turbulent history of the Esperanto community has only made Esperantists more self-conscious about their language and more connected to it, safeguarding it according to Zamenhof's conception, but also being fully invested in using its expressive possibilities to produce and promote new terms. As a result, the common vocabulary considerably expanded, as described above, but also many Esperantisms originated such as *verda* 'green, related to Esperanto', *krokodili* 'to speak one's own language in an Esperanto environment, not Esperanto', *aligatori* 'to speak a third language (not one's own, not Esperanto) in an Esperanto environment', *samideano* 'fellow-idealist' etc., which made the language even more special. According to Blanke (1985: 272), these Esperantisms (or *esperantonyms* as he calls them here) are actually „[l]exemes which can be understood only by knowing the history of the language community of Esperanto and only by Esperantists. They are proof of the close connection which has been achieved between the language and its community. In this community, specific social processes take place which are then reflected in the language" (transl. by K.P.). In other words, Esperantisms reflect the community's intrinsic attitudes towards the language and, in that way, linguistic loyalty and group solidarity.

5.4. Language planning of Esperanto: elaboration

Elaboration, being the final stage of LP, refers to the terminological and stylistic development of a codified language in order to meet the communicative demands of modern life and technology. In the case of Esperanto, the terminological and stylistic development occurred early on since the language's inception.

5.4.1. Lexicography

How influential the Esperanto community and Esperanto literature actually were for the very development of the language, can be vividly seen in the language vocabulary which gradually expanded from *Unua Libro* to "The New PIV", from 904 basic roots to over 46,890 lexical units. In particular, the first Esperanto dictionary, published already in 1894 by the diligent Zamenhof, was *Universala Vortaro* (*Universal Diction-*

ary) comprising 2641 roots (or 1737 new roots on top of 904 roots from *Unua Libro*). Only 15 years later, owing to extensive literary works, the Esperanto vocabulary grew to roughly 10,000 roots (cf. Boirac's dictionary published in 1909). However, the Esperanto vocabulary grew not only due to literature, but also due to the terminological development of the language. Already in 1910, Verax's dictionary produced about 12,000 lexical units from science, art, and craft (8000 roots and 4000 compounds), which clearly shows the pace of the stylistic and terminological development of the language.

At any rate, regardless of the rapid vocabulary growth, official dictionaries were more selective concerning lexemes entering the standard usage. For instance, the 1930 *Plena Vortaro de Esperanto* (PV, *Complete Dictionary of Esperanto*), the first standard monolingual reference dictionary and a predecessor to the PIV, included only 6900 roots, whereas the original 1970 PIV contained only ca. 15,250 roots. This does not mean the non-PIV' roots were stigmatised or disapproved in the real language usage. These roots were nonetheless widely used in the language community and were either waiting for officialisation or were being attentively collected in other non-standard dictionaries, such as the 1983 *Neologisma glosaro* (*Glossary of neologisms*) by Vatré with ca. 1000 roots not found in PIV, but existing in practice. Because of such a lexicographical procedure, the processes of inclusion of new roots in PIV have often been considered non-transparent and not reflecting actual usage (cf. Corsetti 1999). However, such criticism is unneeded and a bit exaggerated. It is natural to say that since it is a highly respected dictionary, it carries great responsibility for the adoption of new roots.

5.4.2. Terminology

As mentioned above, the terminological development of Esperanto started already in 1910 with the publication of Verax's dictionary. Still, the official beginning of the Esperanto terminology is to be found in the 1920s and in the influential terminology work of Eugen Wüster (1898–1977), father of terminology science. His many terminological works, such as *Enciklopedia vortaro Esperanta-germana* (*Encyclopaedical dictionary Esperanto-German*) from 1923 and *Esperanto und der Techniker* (*Esperanto and the Technician*) from 1924, paved the way for the gradual, but highly professional, development of Esperanto terminology. As a result, in 1987 *Terminologia Esperanto-Centro* was founded, the Esperanto terminology centre still active today.

5.4.3. Language planning of Esperanto: the Academy of Esperanto

As in the standardisation history of any language, so has its Academy played a pivotal role in the standardisation of Esperanto. Since its foundation in 1905, then known

as *Lingva Komitato*, it has taken over the advice-giving authority of Zamenhof, as can be seen from his own words (Zamenhof 2001[1936]: 3): „(...) Responses should be regarded as opinions and pieces of advice absolutely *private*; only our *Academy* has the right to make an official *decision* for this or some other dubious language question (...)" (his emphasis) (transl. by K.P.). Here, *Responses* refers to *Lingvaj Respondoj*, Zamenhof's invaluable collection of linguistic suggestions concerning burning linguistic issues in the language community, which appeared in the magazine *La Esperantisto* (1889–1895).

As far as the Academy of Esperanto is concerned, it is an independent body of 45 language scholars consisting of a president, vice-presidents, members, and a secretary. As the Statute of the Academy postulates, every academician needs to display „fidelity to Fundamento" (Article 9), and the Academy's own task is „to conserve and protect the fundamental principles of the language Esperanto and control its evolution" (Article 1). In other words, its task is to monitor and safeguard the evolution of Esperanto according to the underlying principles of Zamenhof's *Fundamento*. Because of this, there is a frequent criticism that the Academy of Esperanto does nothing but simply approve or disapprove the words introduced by authors and used by the community, not trying to coin new terms as some other academies do, which is not true. As it is stated in Article 2 of the Statute, the Academy actually „produces vocabulary of Esperanto with definitions in Esperanto. It produces technical terminology or controls and approves the terminology introduced by other authors." However, since it takes a lot of time to carry out the needs of the language community, one does get the notion that editors and writers tend to be more influential today than the Academy of Esperanto, as Corsetti (1999) pointed out. But one has to bear in mind that it is the very task of editors and writers to be more influential than academicians. The Academy relies on their language production perhaps more than other academies do. As Blanke (1985: 286) concluded, „[t]he norm results primarily from the real language usage and is registered by grammarians and lexicologists. They are oriented on the language usage of the best writers and publicists as long as it is in line with the frame established by ''Fundamento''. The Academy of Esperanto standardises parts of the vocabulary and grammar of the standard language by making official word lists, making suggestions and decisions which take into consideration the usage as well as the traditional norm as given by ZAMENHOF'S writings and Fundamento" (his emphasis) (transl. by K.P.). As Bormann (1999) succinctly concluded, „Esperanto and its Academy are inseparable. The Academy is an essential element of the language policy of Esperanto" (transl. by K.P.).

5.4.4. Language planning of Esperanto: UEA

Another essential element of the LP of Esperanto is *Universala Esperanto-Asocio* (UEA, *Universal Esperanto Association*), founded in 1908 by the Swiss journalist Hector Hodler. Although it is widely considered that the Esperanto community is disorganised and dispersed, the UEA, the largest international organisation of Esperanto speakers which has official relations with both the United Nations and UNESCO, proves this is not true. This organisation, with its headquarters in Rotterdam since the 1950s, plays a pivotal role in the stability and progress of the Esperanto community by collecting a variety of Esperanto speakers under one roof. According to the 1301 issue of the *Esperanto* magazine (April 2016: 94), the UEA's main organ, there were in 2015 5501 individual members in 121 countries and 9215 through national associations, which is a considerable number.

As far as the goals of the UEA are concerned, its Statute in Article 3 lists four goals, of which first two goals refer to international languages, most notably Esperanto: 1) to promote the use of the international language Esperanto, 2) to act for the solution of the language problem in international relations and to facilitate international communication, 3) to encourage all types of spiritual and material relations among people, irrespective of differences of nationality, race, sex, religion, politics, or language, and 4) to nurture among its members a strong sense of solidarity, and to develop in them understanding and respect for other peoples. Of course, the official language of the UEA is Esperanto, as it is clearly stated in Article 6 of the Statute: „The official language of the UEA is the International Language Esperanto as defined by its Fundamento, by the works of its initiator Zamenhof, and by the general language usage as controlled by the Academy of Esperanto" (transl. by K.P.).

5.5. Language planning of Esperanto: change and development

As pointed out above, the Academy's safeguard of Esperanto according to Zamenhof's *Fundamento* does not mean that the language has stopped changing and developing. Quite the contrary. It has evolved to cater for the needs of the speech community whose usage determined some changes at all linguistic levels. For instance, at the phonological level the near-loss of the sounds $\hat{h}$ and $\breve{u}$ has occurred especially word initially (replaced by *k* and *u*, respectively), at the morphological level the suffix *-i-* designating a country is used more frequent than the original *–uj-* suffix, that is, one can hear *Kroatio* more often than *Kroatujo* for 'Croatia', and at the syntactic level it has also become common to use stative verbs instead of a copula-plus-adjective structure (that is, verbalisation of adjectives occurred): e.g. one also hears *Ŝi belas.* alongside *Ŝi estas bela.* ('She is beautiful.').

On top of all that, the Esperanto vocabulary is changing, always welcoming new roots (e.g. *aspekti* 'to look, appear') and making the original ones with the same

meaning archaic (*elrigardi*), experiencing semantic change (e.g. *klopodi* initially meant 'to take pains' and now it means 'to try'), as well as semantic narrowing (e.g. *ami* shifted from 'to like; to love' to 'to love' only) and broadening over time (e.g. *muso* 'a mouse' now also referring to 'a computer mouse'). This lexical and semantic expansion occurs under the unavoidable influence of Esperanto speakers who alongside Esperanto also speak at least one other language, that is, who have diverse linguistic backgrounds. Since Esperanto is generally open to loanwords (remember Zamenhof's 15th rule) and its clear and simple grammatical structure makes borrowing widely possible, loanwords are quite easily adapted to Esperanto. The only thing one has to bear in mind is the number of loanwords one will allow in the language, that is, how much precedence will be given to exogenous ways of lexical enrichment in comparison to endogenous ways. As Blanke (2006: 236) maintained, „[a]s it is with all languages, external and internal factors also influence the development of Esperanto. To external factors belongs, among other things, the constant requirement to adapt the planned language to changing communicative needs, which is especially reflected in the lexicon. To internal factors belong, among other things, selection processes (e.g. from complicated to simple morpheme structures), which result from the tension between varying articulation bases and habits of internationally scattered language community" (transl. by K.P.).

6. What can be learnt from the language planning of Esperanto?

If all the previous is taken into consideration, it can be readily concluded that IP languages tend to be not much different from other languages, that is, the term LP can be used for both national (ethnic) and international languages. In Tauli's (1968: 27) terms once again, LP is „the methodical activity of regulating and improving existing languages or creating new common regional, national or international languages. Language planning comprises all spheres of the oral and written form of the language: phonology, morphology, syntax, lexicology (vocabulary) and orthography". In other words, as Krägeloh and Neha pointed out (2014: 77), „the boundaries between language planning and planned languages are fuzzy." IP languages consist of the same elements as national planned languages do, being only different in their quantity, as Baudouin de Courtenay (1976: 97) correctly concluded long time ago.

The difference of IP languages from national planned languages also lies in many aspects which can be considered favourable and to which national planned languages should aspire. The most prominent ones will be briefly enumerated here. The first one would be openness to both endogenous and exogenous ways of lexical enrichment. In particular, Esperanto makes wide use of its original lexical elements as well as borrowed ones, not discriminating against non-orthodox elements, as many national planned languages do. The fact that a certain element is not original but borrowed in Esperanto

does not make it less valuable. What is important is the fact that if a certain foreign element can be adapted to Esperanto and if its meaning is understood to the language community, it can be used in Esperanto. Connected with this is the second difference of IP languages from national planned languages and this is moderate puristic endeavours. Being widely open to foreign influence, it is the Esperanto community which decides on the usage of a certain borrowed element, as long as it does not interfere with the *Fundamento* of Esperanto. For that reason, particular non-orthodox affixes, for instance, which could potentially introduce confusion or disorder in the system of Esperanto, are often subject to criticism and avoided by the Academy, but also the community of speakers. As long as all the lexical innovations are in line with Zamenhof's *Fundamento*, Esperanto will show its third difference from national planned languages and that is a healthy relationship to variation and language ownership, which are interconnected. As Zamenhof pointed out, he should not be considered the authority on Esperanto, but its initiator. The language is not his own property, but the community's. It is the community of speakers who have the permission, or better said the opportunity, to freely participate in the development and evolution of the language. Zamenhof did put Esperanto on the right track, but it is Esperantists who openly contribute and will continue contributing to the growth of the language, doing so on its firm basis. Here, one has to ask oneself why it is not so in all languages? Why do national planned languages have a rigid relationship to variation and, accordingly, language ownership?

7. Concluding remarks

As can be concluded from everything mentioned above, Esperanto today has become in every respect a stable and vital language with a sizable language community. It has developed from a planned language project to a fully fledged IP language (Blanke 2006), as this paper tried to show, having also completed all the necessary stages of LP to be considered so (Haugen 1966; 1983). Of course, the fact that all the completed stages of an IP language (as described by Blanke) and of LP (as described by Haugen) can be found in Esperanto should not be considered undeniable proof that Esperanto is a fully fledged language, at least not for the speakers of the language. Having been immersed in the 130-year-long tradition of the language, having tried its expressiveness and precision for literary, scholarly, and every other purpose, and having freely contributed to its change and development, Esperantists do not need any scientific confirmation that their language has developed naturally, in a similar way as ethnic languages have. However, non-Esperantists are in need of a scientific confirmation and for that reason it is to be hoped that this paper has imparted enough convincing information on that front, even though this is a topic which actually deserves a monograph form and a deeper scholarly presentation. As Blanke (1985: 16) concluded, „[e]lementary facts whose existence is not debatable any more and which often only await more conclusive interpretations are repeatedly called into question (e.g. expressiveness, the development and literary

usability of a planned language, its suitability for scientific purposes etc.)" (transl. by K.P.). The purpose of this paper was, therefore, to cast more light on conclusive evidence that Esperanto has indeed developed, having become in every aspect an IP language, fit for every function, as it claims to be.

As a result, Esperanto should not be designated any more as an *artificial*, *constructed* or *invented* language, but a *planned* language, just like any other. All these outdated terms actually originate from the binary opposition *natural–artificial*, which is in turn a result of language Darwinism, and which has become outdated as well. In the author's view, one cannot invent a language, one can only initiate or propose a project and the speech community makes it a language, as can be seen in every language, either an IP or an ethnic language. The only difference between these two types of languages lies in the fact, as Gobbo (2011: 46) concluded, that „[i]n the case of planned language, the language planning force is stronger (…), especially in the beginning."

Since it is a fully functional planned language, Esperanto has also shown that it is a language subject to change, and not a mummifed language, as it is often presented. However, from Esperanto's point of view, language change is not considered negative. By being open to both endogenous and exogenous ways of lexical enrichment, by displaying moderate puristic endeavours, and by exhibiting a healthy relationship towards variation and language ownership, Esperanto has demonstrated the positive aspect of language change, as well as the importance of the language community in the evolution of the language. It is the author's view that many national languages have much to learn from the example of the LP of Esperanto.

Acknowledgements

Bibliography

Baldauf, Richard B., Jr. 2012: Language planning: Where have we been? Where might we be going?. *Revista Brasileira de Lingüística Aplicada* 12(2): 233–248.

Baudouin de Courtenay, Jan 1976: Zur Kritik der künstlichen Weltsprachen. In: Reinhard Haupenthal (ed.): *Plansprachen. Beiträge zur Interlinguistik.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 59–110.

Bausani, Alessandro 1970: *Geheim- und Universalsprachen: Entwicklung und Typologie*. Stuttgart – Berlin – Köln – Mainz: Verlag W. Kohlhammer.

Bergen, Benjamin K. 2001: Nativization Processes in L1 Esperanto. *Child Language* 28(3): 575–595.

Blanke, Detlev 1985: *Internationale Plansprachen. Eine Einführung*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Blanke, Detlev 1987: The term ''planned language''. *Language Problems & Language Planning* 11(3): 335–349.

Blanke, Detlev 1989: Planned languages – a survey of some of the main problems. In: Klaus Schubert (ed.): *Interlinguistics: Aspects of the Science of Planned Languages*. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 63–87.

Blanke, Detlev 1997: The Term ''Planned Language''. In: Humphrey Tonkin (ed.): *Esperanto, Interlinguistics, and Planned Language.* Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1–20.

Blanke, Detlev 2000: Vom Entwurf zur Sprache. *INTERFACE: Journal of Applied Linguistics* 15(1): 37–89.

Blanke, Detlev 2006: *Interlinguistische Beiträge. Zum Wesen und zur Funktion internationaler Plansprachen*. Frankfurt am Main – Paris – Bern – Bruxelles – New York – Oxford – Wien: Peter Lang.

Blanke, Detlev 2009: Causes of the relative success of Esperanto. *Language Problems & Language Planning* 33(3): 251–266

Blanke, Detlev 2010: Sprachwandel im Esperanto – gezeigt an Beispielen aus der Lexik. In: Kristin Reinke & Carsten Sinner (eds.): *Sprache als Spiegel der Gesellschaft. Festschrift für Johannes Klare zum 80. Geburtstag*. München: /peniope/ – Verlag Anja Urbanek, 51–77.

Blanke, Wera 2008: *Esperanto – Terminologie und Terminologiearbeit*. New York: Mondial.

Blanke, Wera 2010: Planlingvaj impulsoj por terminologoj: Wüster, Drezen, Warner. In: Detlev Blanke & Ulrich Lins (eds.): *La arto labori kune. Festlibro por Humphrey Tonkin.* Rotterdam: Universala Esperanto-Asocio, 223–232.

Bormann, Werner 1999: Novaj defioj antaŭ la Akademio de Esperanto. In: Detlev Blanke, Roy McCoy, & Osmo Buller (eds.): *Por aktiva lingvopolitiko*. Rotterdam: Universala Esperanto-Asocio, 35–42.

Cooper, Robert Leon 1989: *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Corsetti, Renato 1999: Kreoliĝo de Esperanto inter personaj gustoj kaj oficiala normo. In: Detlev Blanke, Roy McCoy, & Osmo Buller (eds.): *Por aktiva lingvopolitiko*. Rotterdam: Universala Esperanto-Asocio, 43–60.

Corsetti, Renato 2003: Reguligo de regula lingvo. *Brita Esperantisto* 2003/printempo: http://esperanto.org.uk/lbe/arkivo/954/14.html.

Corsetti, Renato, La Torre, Mauro, & Vessella, Nina 1980: Pliriĉigo de la morfemaro en Internacia Lingvo. In: István Szerdahelyi (ed.): *Miscellanea interlinguistica*. Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó, 368–379.

Corsetti, Renato, Pinto, Maria Antonietta, & Tolomeo, Maria 2004: Regularizing the Regular: The Phenomenon of Overregularization in Esperanto-speaking children. *Language Problems & Language Planning* 28(3): 261–282.

Dulichenko, Aleksandr Dmitrievich 2006: *En la serĉado de la mondolingvo – aŭ interlingvistiko por ĉiuj*. Kaliningrad: Sezonoj.

Fettes, Mark 1997: Language planning and education. In: Ruth Wodak & David Corson (eds.): *Language policy and political issues in education*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 12–22.

Fiedler, Sabine 2006: Standardization and self-regulation in an international speech community: the case of Esperanto. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 177: 67–90.

Fiedler, Sabine 2010: Zur Rolle des Muttersprachlers innerhalb und außerhalb der Esperanto-Sprachgemeinschaft. In: Fiedler Sabine (ed.): *Interlinguistische Informationen. Beiheft 17*. Berlin: Gesellschaft für Interlinguistik, 163–174.

Fiedler, Sabine 2012: The Esperanto denaskulo: The status of the native speaker of Esperanto within and beyond the planned language community. *Language Problems & Language Planning* 36(1): 69–84.

Gobbo, Federico 2011: The Case of Correlatives: A Comparison between Natural and Planned Languages. *Journal of Universal Language* 12(2): 45–79.

Gobbo, Federico 2012: Alan Turing creator of Artificial Languages / Alan Turing kreinto de Artefaritaj Ligvaĵoj. *InKoj. Philosophy & Artificial Languages* 3(2): 181–194.

Gobbo, Federico 2014: Interlingvistiko por Esperantistoj. La malfacila tasko klasifiki planlingvojn. *Esperanto* 7/8: 164–165.

Haugen, Einar 1959: Planning for a standard language in modern Norway. *Anthropological Linguistics* 1(3): 8–21.

Haugen, Einar 1966: Linguistics and language planning. In: William Bright (ed.): *Sociolinguistics: proceedings of the UCLA Sociolinguistic Conference, 1964*. The Hague: Mouton, 50–71.

Haugen, Einar 1983: The implementation of corpus planning: theory and practice. In: Juan Cobarrubias & Joshua A. Fishman (eds.): *Progress in Language Planning: international perspective*. Berlin: Mouton, 269–289.

Hornberger, Nancy H. 2006: Frameworks and Models in Language Policy and Planning. In: Thomas Ricento (ed.): *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*. Malden, MA – Oxford – Victoria: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 24–41.

Janton, Pierre 1977: *L'espéranto*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.

Janton, Pierre 1978: *Einführung in die Esperantologie*. Hildesheim – New York: Georg Olms Verlag.

Jespersen, Otto 1928: *An International Language*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Jespersen, Otto 1960: *Selected Writings of Otto Jespersen*. London – Tokyo: George Allen & Unwin – Senjo Publishing Co.

Kalocsay, Kálmán & Waringhien, Gaston 1980: *Plena analiza gramatiko de Esperanto*. Rotterdam: Universala Esperanto-Asocio.

Kaplan, Robert B. & Baldauf, Richard B., Jr. 1997: *Language Planning from Practice to Theory*. Clevedon – Philadelphia – Toronto – Sydney – Johannesburg: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Koutny Ilona 2015: A typological description of Esperanto as a natural language. In: Ilona Koutny (ed.): *Język. Komunikacja. Informacja* 10/*Language. Communication. Information* 10. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Rys, 43–62.

Krägeloh, Chris & Neha, Tia 2014: Lexical expansion and terminological planning in indigenous and planned language: Comparisons between Te Reo Māori and Esperanto. *Language Problems & Language Planning* 38(1): 59–86.

Lindstedt, Jouko 2009: Esperanto – an East European Contact Language?. In: Christian Voß & Alicja Nagórko (eds.): *Die Europäizität der Slavia oder die Slawizität Europas. Ein Beitrag der kultur- und sprachrelativistischen Linguistik (Studies on Language and Culture in Central and Eastern Europe)*. Berlin – München: Otto Sagner, 125–134.

Lindstedt, Jouko 2010: Esperanto as a Family Language. In: Fred Dervin (ed.): *Lingua francas. La véhicularité linguistique pour vivre, travailler et étudier*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 69–80.

Lins, Ulrich 1988: *Die gefährliche Sprache. Die Verfolgung der Esperantisten unter Hitler und Stalin*. Gerlingen: Bleicher.

Minnaja, Carlo & Silfer, Giorgio 2015: *Historio de la esperanta literaturo*. La Chaux-de-Fonds: Kooperativo de Literatura Foiro.

Okrent, Arika 2010: *In the land of invented languages: a celebration of linguistic creativity, madness, and genius*. New York: Spiegel & Grau Trade Paperbacks.

Paul, Hermann 1886: *Principien der sprachgeschichte*. Halle: Max Niemeyer.

Piron, Claude 1989a: A few notes on the evolution of Esperanto. In: Klaus Schubert (ed.): *Interlinguistics. Aspects of the Science of Planned Languages*. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 129–142.

Piron, Claude 1989b: Who are the speakers of Esperanto?. In: Klaus Schubert (ed.): *Interlinguistics. Aspects of the Science of Planned Languages*. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 157–172.

Philippe, Benoît 1991: *Sprachwandel bei einer Plansprache am Beispiel des Esperanto*. Konstanz: Hartung-Gorre Verlag.

Pool, Jonathan & Grofman, Bernard 1989: Linguistic artificiality and cognitive competence. In: Klaus Schubert (ed.): *Interlinguistics. Aspects of the Science of Planned Languages*. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 145–156.

Puškar, Krunoslav 2015a: *Esperanto (s)en perspektivo*? Croatian Esperantists on the International Auxiliary Language Esperanto. *INDECS* 13(2): 322–341.

Puškar, Krunoslav 2015b: Common criticism of Esperanto: facts and fallacies. In: Ilona Koutny (ed.): *Język. Komunikacja. Informacja* 10/*Language. Communication. Information* 10. Poznań: Wydawnictvo Rys, 85–116.

Rubin, Joan & Jernudd, Björn H. 1971: Introduction: Language planning as an element in modernization. In: Joan Rubin & Björn H. Jernudd (eds.): *Can Language Be Planned?*. The Hawaii: University Press of Hawaii, xiii–xxiv.

Schubert, Klaus 1989: Interlinguistics – its aims, its achievements, and its place in language science. In: Klaus Schubert (ed.): *Interlinguistics: Aspects of the Science of Planned Languages*. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 7–44.

Stria, Ida 2013: Classifications of artificial languages. In: Ilona Koutny (ed.): *Język. Komunikacja. Informacja / Language. Communication. Information* 8. Poznań: Wydawnictvo Rys, 125–132.

Stria, Ida 2015: Esperanto as a Natural Language. In: Ilona Koutny (ed.): *Język. Komunikacja. Informacja /Language. Communication. Information* 10. Poznań: Wydawnictvo Rys, 32–42.

Sutton, George 2008: *Concise encyclopedia of the original literature of Esperanto: 1887– 2007*. New York: Mondial.

Tauli, Valter 1968: *Introduction to a theory of language planning*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Thomas, George 1991: *Linguistic purism*. London – New York: Longman.

Tonkin, Humphrey 2015: How can planned languages inform language planning?. *INDECS* 13(2): 193–199.

Tonkin, Humphrey & Fettes, Mark 1996: Esperanto Studies: An Overview. Esperanto Document 43A. In: *Esperanto Documents*. Rotterdam: Universal Esperanto Association, 1–16.

Widdowson, Henry 1994: The Ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly* 28(2): 377–385.

Zamenhof, Ludwik Lejzer 2001[1936]: *Lingvaj respondoj*. Tyresö: Inko.