INTERLINGWISTYKA / INTERLINGUISTICS

Sabine Fiedler

Planned languages and languages created for fantasy and science-fiction literature or films: A study on some points of contact[1]

Abstrakt (Języki planowe a języki stworzone na potrzeby literatury lub filmów fantasy i science fiction: studium niektórych punktów zbieżności). Języki wymyślone (lub skonstruowane) można zasadniczo podzielić na dwie grupy. Pierwsza obejmuje systemy językowe, które zostały stworzone świadomie według określonych kryteriów w celu ułatwienia komunikacji między ludźmi o różnych językach rodzimych. Volapük (Schleyer 1880), Latino sine flexione (Peano 1903), Ido (1907) i Interlingua (Gode 1951) są przykładami tych tzw. planowych systemów językowych. Najbardziej znaczącym z nich jest esperanto (Zamenhof 1887). Rozwinął się on z projektu do pełnoprawnego języka z aktywną wspólnotą językową, która gwarantuje jego dalszy rozwój. Te systemy językowe są badane przez interlingwistykę (z esperantologią jako jej subdyscypliną). Druga grupa obejmuje systemy językowe, które zostały stworzone głównie po to, aby nadać żywy i pseudoautentyczny charakter dziełom literatury fantasy i science-fiction. Tworzenie języków z powodów artystycznych, kiedyś nazywane przez J.R.R. Tolkiena „Sekretnym złym nawykiem" ("A Secret Vice"), stało się tymczasem bardzo produktywną i popularną dziedziną. Języki elfickie Tolkiena, nadsat A. Burgessa (nastoletni slang w „Mechanicznej pomarańczy"), na'vi P. Frommera, dothracki D.J. Petersona i klingoński M. Okranda to znane przykłady. Chociaż oba typy systemów językowych bardzo się od siebie różnią pod względem funkcji i właściwości, można znaleźć między nimi wiele punktów stycznych. W niniejszym artykule omówiono te punkty zbieżności, skupiając się na anglojęzycznych pisarzach Jonathanie Swifcie i George'u Orwellu oraz ich zainteresowaniu planowanymi językami.

Abstract. Invented (or constructed) languages can basically be subdivided into two groups. The first comprises language systems that were consciously created according to certain criteria for the purpose of easing communication between people of different mother tongues. Volapük (Schleyer 1880), Latino sine flexione (Peano 1903), Ido (1907) and Interlingua (Gode 1951) are examples of these so-called planned language systems. The most successful among them is Esperanto (Zamenhof 1887). It has developed from a project to a fully-fledged language with an active speech community that guarantees its further development. These

---

[1]   A version of this paper was presented at the **s**ymposium "Planned Languages and Language Planning" held on the occasion of the 90th anniversary of the Esperanto Museum of the Austrian National Library in Vienna on October 24th, 2019.

language systems are explored by the discipline of interlinguistics (and Esperanto Studies as its subdiscipline). The second group includes language systems that were mainly created to lend liveliness and pseudo-authenticity to works of fantasy and science-fiction literature. The creation of languages for artistic reasons, once called "A Secret Vice" by J.R.R. Tolkien, has meanwhile become a very productive and popular area. Tolkien's Elvish languages, A. Burgess' "Nadsat" (teenage slang in "A Clockwork Orange"), P. Frommer's "Na'vi", D.J. Peterson's "Dothraki" and M. Okrand's "Klingon" are well-known examples. Although the two types of language systems are very different in terms of their functions and properties, a number of connecting points can be found between them. This paper addresses those points of contact focusing on the English-speaking writers Jonathan Swift and George Orwell and their interest in planned languages.

Słowa kluczowe: języki skonstruowane, języki na potrzeby literatury, międzynarodowe języki pomocnicze, języki planowe, Swift, Orwell

Keywords: invented languages, constructed languages, languages for literature, international auxiliary languages, planned languages, Swift, Orwell

1. Introduction

Recent popular descriptions of constructed languages (e.g. Okrent 2009, Adams 2011, Piperski 2017) do not restrict themselves to languages created for practical purposes, i.e. for real communication, but lump everything together from Esperanto via Modern Hebrew to Klingon. Interlinguistic studies have also expanded their interest to languages created for fiction (see, e.g. Stria 2016, Gobbo 2017, Suchowolec 2017, Barandovská-Frank 2019)[2] Although in my mind interlinguistics[3] should carefully distinguish between the two types of constructed languages and should be clear about its subject of investigation, for the purpose of this paper I will concentrate on aspects that unite planned languages (such as Volapük or Esperanto) and those invented for artistic reasons. I will address a number of points of contact that can be found between the two types having a closer look at some of the authors of constructed languages.

2. Language creation and its functions

The creation of languages can be differently motivated. Interlinguistics has so far traditionally focused on planned languages, which have been defined by Detlev Blanke,

---

[2]   See also the publications of the Society for Interlinguistics (Gesellschaft für Interlinguistik e.V.), e.g. Mannewitz (1997, 1999, 2002, 2003), Sigmund (2003), Fiedler (2011), Klare (2011), Barandovská-Frank (2011, 2012).

[3]   The discipline has been differently defined (for an overview see Schubert 1989). I understand it as the study of all facets of international or interethnic communication. This includes, but is not limited to, political, linguistic, economic, and cultural issues. The focus of its work is on the structures and functions of planned languages (e.g. Esperanto) (cf. Blanke 2006; see also the homepage of the Society for Interlinguistics [Gesellschaft für Interlinguistk e.V.]: www.interlinguistik-gil.de).

following Eugen Wüster (1931), as "language systems which have been consciously created according to definite criteria by an individual or group of individuals for the purpose of making international communication easier" (Blanke 1989: 63, see also Blanke 2018: 9). Examples include Volapük (Schleyer 1880), Latino sine flexione (Peano 1903), Ido (1907), Interlingua (Gode 1951), and Esperanto (Zamenhof 1887), the hitherto most successful planned language system.

In addition, writers of science-fiction and fantasy literature, authors of computer games or TV series occasionally create languages – or have them created by linguists – for their works in order to make their imaginary worlds more plausible and authentic. What J.R.R. Tolkien called a "Secret Vice" or "A Hobby for the Home" in 1931 has recently become a burgeoning field. Conley and Cain's (2006) "Encyclopedia of Fictional and Fantastic Languages" comprises descriptions of more than 400 of those fictional languages. They are not planned languages in Wüster's sense, as their functions are different. They were not constructed to facilitate or optimize communication, but to render pseudo-authenticity to fictitious characters or ethnic groups (see Table 1). Features such as ease of learning, grammatical regularity or the international character of the vocabulary are not relevant to this group of languages. On the contrary, aesthetic qualities might take centre stage for the authors of those language systems who use them to depict their speakers as alien and exotic. Klingon, for example, includes some features that are unusual, i.e. typologically rare, in ethnic languages (e.g. the object-verb-subject word order), whereas Quenya (High-Elvish, the language spoken by the purest creatures of Middle Earth) contains, above all, open vowels to reflect the Finnish language and its sounds, which Tolkien found especially attractive. And the languages designed for computer and video games are often highly complex and intended to be difficult to learn as mastering them is sometimes part of the game (Fimi & Higgins 2016: 26f.).

Studying the literature in the area, one might gain the impression that the group of fictional and fantastic languages is attracting more attention than that of planned languages. This can be explained by two factors. The first is the limited chances of implementation in practice that planned languages have today, with English serving as a global lingua franca, in contrast to the first part of the 20th century, when there was, as Garvía (2015: 3) states, "a window of opportunity for the cause of an artificial language". The second is that contemporary readers and audiences have become increasingly demanding. It is no longer sufficient to introduce them into imaginary places or times. Imaginary worlds have to include invented cultures, with languages as an important element of these, to be attractive.

Constructed languages	
Planned languages (international auxiliary l. and philosophical l.)	**Fictional languages** (art-langs)
Function: for rationalizing international communication (Wüster 1931)	*Function*: for aesthetic and other reasons
Features: ease of learning, regularity, internationality	*Features*: aesthetic qualities (exotic character), pseudo-authenticity
Examples: Volapük (Schleyer 1880), Latino sine flexione (Peano 1903), Ido (1907) and Interlingua (Gode 1951), Esperanto (Zamenhof 1887)	*Examples*: Tolkien's "Quenya", Burgess' "Nadsat", Frommer's "Na'vi", Peterson's "Dothraki", Okrand's "Klingon"

Table 1: Planned vs. fictional languages (functions, features and examples)

3. Planned languages and languages in fiction: points of contact

The links that exist between the two types of constructed languages include the following seven aspects:

The *first* and most obvious thing that the two groups of constructed languages have in common is of course their genesis (or origin). This makes them special. Both types are distinct from ordinary languages (i.e. ethnic or national languages), which come into being with an ethnic group and which evolve in its spoken form first, in that they were deliberately created. They do not emerge "naturally", but are created "artificially", as it is often put.

A *second* aspect is the fact that the languages created for fiction and other purposes (I called them fictional in table 1) do not necessarily remain fictional, but might become real or utilitarian languages. Examples are the speakers of Klingon with regular meetings at which the language is practised and several translation projects and the Elvish Linguistic Fellowship with its regular publications.[4] The evolution (or socialisation) of fictional languages seems to be marked by levels of application which are similar to those described by Blanke (1985) for Esperanto (e.g. translations, publication of journals, meetings). Occasionally, the authors already seem to envisage such a development of their language projects when they create them by providing grammar books and other material, as with Na'vi, the language designed by linguist Paul Frommer for the film "Avatar" (2009).

---

[4]   See the websites of the Klingon Language Institute (www.kli.org) and the Elvish Linguistic Fellowship (www.elvish.org). [last access: 17 Feb 2020]

Thirdly, we find, at least partly, concurrent motives among the supporters of planned languages and of fictional languages, common motivations for their occupation with these languages. These include the interest in language and language play, the need for social contact and acknowledgement and the enjoyment of something extraordinary and exotic (cf. Blanke 1998: 51, Wahlgren 2004).

Fourthly, a strict separation is also made difficult by the fact that planned languages are occasionally used as languages in science-fiction. Examples include the novels of Eberhardt DEL'ANTONIO (cf. Mannewitz 1997) and Harry Harrison's series, in which Esperanto is spoken. The latter even included a description of Esperanto in the appendices of his books. In H.G. Wells' novel "The Shape of Things to Come" (1933) the world in 2050, as is known, is speaking Basic English:

> One of the unanticipated achievements of the twenty-first century was the rapid diffusion of Basic English as the lingua franca of the world (...) (p. 404)

> It was made the official medium of communication throughout the world by the Air and Sea Control, and by 2020 there was hardly anyone in the world who could not talk and understand it. (p. 405)

Fifthly, both for the authors of planned language systems and those of languages for literary purposes, linguistic theories and the intention to either verify or falsify them sometimes represent the point of departure. This is in particular the case with the Sapir-Worf-Hypothesis about the influence that the structure of a language has on the modes of its speakers' thinking and the culture in which it is spoken. Examples from the group of planned language systems include James C. Brown's project "Logical Language (Loglan)" (Blanke 1985: 137-138) and Alexander Gode's idea of an Average Standard European that was supposed to find its expression in "Interlingua" (Blanke 1985: 69, 174-177). The diminishing of words in "Newspeak" in the dystopian novel "1984", which will be discussed in 3.2, is an imaginative exploration of the Sapir-Worf-Hypothesis (Fimi & Higgins 2016: 25).[5] Suzette Haden Elgin's feminist language "Láadan" (from the novel "Native Tongue") was also constructed to test the Sapir-Worf-Hypothesis.

The *sixth* aspect is that it does not matter whether a constructed language was originally designed for real communication or for an imaginary world. Its study can provide insight into how the fundamental principles of languages are structured and how they work. A number of linguistics teachers have recently started to realize this potential by making the analysis or even the construction of invented languages a topic of their instruction (cf. Sanders 2016), and books like Rosenfelder's (2010) "Language Construction Kit" and Peterson's (2015) "The Art of Language Invention" support this idea.

The *final* point of contact, and this is the one I would like to deal with in more detail in the remaining sections of this paper, is the fact that the authors of fictional languages

---

[5]   Cf. the following passage: *The word* free *still existed in Newspeak, but it could only be used in such statements as 'This dog is free from lice' or 'This field is free from weeds'. It could not be used in its old sense of 'politically free' or 'intellectually free' since political and intellectual freedom no longer existed even as concepts, and were therefore of necessity nameless.* (Orwell 1949: 315)

have often been influenced by planned languages,[6] and some of them refer to these languages in their works or use elements of these in their own fictional languages. The two authors I would like to focus on in this context are Jonathan Swift and "Gulliver's Travels" (1726) and George Orwell and Newspeak in his novel "1984" (1949). The two have in common that they were not only authors of literary works, but also published studies on language and language planning.

3.1. Jonathan Swift (1667-1745) ("Gulliver's Travels")

In "The Cambridge Companion to Jonathan Swift", in a chapter by Higgins (2003:146) we read the following about the linguistic interest of the Irish writer and satirist:

> Jonathan Swift had a lifelong interest in the English language. The extent of this interest is extraordinary. It includes language history and theories; dialect, jargon, and slang; vocabulary, orthography, and punctuation; etymology; rhetoric and dialectic; code and private languages; puns and language games; the social and political function of language and its abuse in propaganda.

Swift was one of the most prominent representatives of purism in the 18th century. He criticized the English language for its non-uniform usage and demanded panels of experts to fix and regulate its orthography and grammar. In those days, language Academies already existed for other languages (e.g. the Accademia della Crusca in Italy, founded in 1584, the Académie Français, founded in 1635, and the Real Academia de la Lengua Española, founded in 1713). In his pamphlet "A Proposal for Correcting, Improving, and Ascertaining the English Tongue" (1712: 7) he writes: "For I am of Opinion, that it is better a Language should not be wholly perfect, than that it should be perpetually changing." None of his ideas were ever adopted. [7]

Swift's well-known novel "Gulliver's Travels"[8] (1726) has been published in many different versions and is often mistaken as a children's book. It is a political satire full of allusions to conflicts in British society of the early 18th century, and it is also a mirror by which human flaws in general are reflected. Languages play an important role in all

---

[6]   J.R.R. Tolkien, for example, learnt Esperanto at the age of 16-17, kept a diary in this language (the *Book of Foxroo*k, 1909 – cf. Smith & Wynne 2000, see also Cilli et al. 2017). David J. Peterson, the creator of Dothraki, said in an interview in *Conlangs Monthly* (2/2015) that he had his first contact with constructed languages while still at Berkeley studying linguistics, after attending an Esperanto class in 2000.

[7]   Aitchison (2001) criticizes Swift and other purist writers of the 18th century as follows: "The best known of these would-be language purifiers was Jonathan Swift. (...) Swift is sometimes regarded as a high-minded individual who cared lovingly for English. In fact, he wanted the language to be fixed so his own writings might survive. If English were fixed, he suggested, "then our best Writings might probably be preserved with Care, and grow into Esteem, and the Authors have a Chance for Immortality".

[8]   Its original title was *Travels into Several Remote Nations of the World. In Four Parts. By Lemuel Gulliver, First a Surgeon, and then a Captain of Several Ships.*

four parts of the book. "Gulliver's Travels" is also one of the few sources that provides evidence for the existence of the Lingua franca.[9] In Part I, when Gulliver meets the people of Lilliput, he describes his problems of communication:

> His Imperial Majesty spoke often to me, and I returned Answers, but neither of us could understand a Syllable. There were several of his Priests and Lawyers present (as I conjectured by their Habits) who were commanded to address themselves to me, and I spoke to them in as many Languages as I had the least Smattering of, which were *High* and *Low Dutch*, *Latin*, *French*, *Spanish*, *Italian*, and *Lingua Franca*, but all to no purpose. (Swift 1726, p. 17; original emphasis)

For the topic of this paper, Part III is the most interesting one, in which Gulliver is situated on the isle of Laputa where he visits the Academy of Lagado. The whole part is a mockery of academics. Scientists not only try to extract sunlight from cucumbers and produce food from excrement here, they also work at language projects which focus on deleting verbs and participles and, finally, aim to abolish words as such. This is the situation where Swift mocks the Royal Society and one of its founders, Bishop John Wilkins, and his project of a rational language.

Wilkins' project published in his work "An Essay Towards a Real Character and a Philosophical Language" in 1668 is an a-priori language system. As Blanke (1985: 128) and, in more detail, Eco (1995: 238-258) and Okrent (2009: 21-75) describe, Wilkins categorises the knowledge of his time into 40 different classes that are marked by particular initial letters (e.g. Da – *world*, De – *element*, Di – *stone*) (see Figure 1). These are further extended and marked by additional letters (e.g. Deb – *fire*, Ded – *air*, Deg – *water*). Through further subdivisions, Wilkins establishes a system of altogether 1200 elements, which constitute his world lexicon. The system includes word-formation rules, for example, for the creation of antonyms, and there are several levels of expression by specific signs. Bodmer (1955) characterized Wilkins' system as a "potpourri of Aristotelian fabrication, theological superstition, natural-scientific imagination and much factual evidence"[10] (quoted in Blanke 1985: 128, my translation). Hüllen (1984: 117) describes it as a "failed linguistic experiment" ("ein gescheitertes linguistisches Experiment"), at the same time stressing that it provides important insight into the state of knowledge of that time and that it influenced the development of the taxonomy for plants in biology as well as the system of Roget's Thesaurus.

Swift must have known Wilkins' "An Essay Towards a Real Character and a Philosophical Language". It was published by the Royal Society. In addition, Swift mentions Wilkins in his satire "The Battle of the Books" (1704), and Swift is also the editor of William Temple's "Some Thoughts Upon Reviewing the Essay of Ancient and Modern

---

[9]   The original Lingua Franca was a pidgin adopted as an auxiliary language among European, African and Arab traders, sailors and pirates along the Mediterranean coast from the Middle Ages up to the 19th century.

[10]   "ein Potpourri aus aristotelischer Erdichtung, theologischem Aberglauben, naturwissenschaftlicher Phantasie und viel Tatsachenmaterial" (Blanke 1985: 128)

Learning" (1701), in which we find a mocking comment on Wilkins' work. An important principle of Wilkins' universal language is the claim that its elements be based in the things themselves and not on the words describing them.

> (…) if men should generally consent upon the same way or manner of *Expression*, as they do agree in the same *Notion*, we should then be freed from that Curse in the Confusion of Tongues, with all the unhappy consequences of it. (Wilkins 1668: 20; original emphasis)

> If to every thing and notion there were assigned a distinct *Mark*, together with some Provision to express Grammatical *Derivations* and *Inflexions*; this might suffice as to one great end of a *Real Character*, namely, the expression of our Conceptions by *Marks* which should signifie things, and not words. (p. 21; original emphasis)

And this is exactly what Gulliver learns at the Academy of Lagado, especially at the School of Languages – where he is informed about a project for the abolition of words ("a Scheme for entirely abolishing all Words whatsoever"), "since Words are only Names for Things" (p. 177). If we do not refer to the denotations of the things in the individual languages, Gulliver learns, but to the things themselves, communication and understanding is universally possible:

> Another great Advantage proposed by this Invention, was, that it would serve as an universal Language to be understood in all civilized Nations, whose Goods and Utensils are generally of the same Kind, or nearly resembling, so that their Uses might easily be comprehended. And thus, Embassadors would be qualified to treat with foreign Princes or Ministers of State, to whose Tongues they were utter Strangers. (p. 178)

There is probably a further, rather concrete reference to Wilkins in the book (cf. Walker 1973). The number 40 – the Professor has 40 pupils and the frame, i.e. the machine for the arrangement of words in any possible combination, is equipped with 40 handles – might be a sideswipe at Wilkin's project, which, we remember, divides the world's knowledge into 40 categories.

3.2. George Orwell (Eric Arthur Blair) (1903-1950)

George Orwell's interest in language and especially in the relationship between language and thought becomes evident in the large number of works (newspaper articles and columns, essays, letters and radio commentaries) that are devoted to the topic. Among his most popular essays are
– "The English People"
– "Propaganda and Demotic Speech"
– "Politics and the English Language"
– "New Words".

Particularly popular is his criticism of the pompous style of political speech, of the use of empty formulations, clichés and dead metaphors, with examples that seem to have lost nothing of their relevance.[11]

From an interlinguistic perspective, his essay "New Words" (first published in 1940) is interesting, in which Orwell criticizes that the vocabulary of the English language is often not sufficiently expressive and precise ("And it seems to me that from the point of view of exactitude and expressiveness our language has remained in the Stone Age") and pleads for the creation of new words. He first addresses the counterarguments that invented languages are regarded as lacking character and vividness and that the meanings of a word evolves only gradually by its use, but he then comes to the conclusion that if our knowledge develops so fast, language cannot stand still and that the creation of new words has at least to be taken into consideration.

> If you say to any thinking person 'Let us form a society for the invention of new and subtler words', he will first of all object that it is the idea of a crank, and then probably say that our present words, properly handled, will meet all difficulties. (This last, of course, is only a theoretical objection. In practice everyone recognizes the inadequacy of language — consider such expressions as 'Words fail', 'It wasn't what he said, it was the way he said it', etc.) but finally he will give you an answer something like this: 'Things cannot be done in that pedantic way. Languages can only grow slowly, like flowers; you can't patch them up like pieces of machinery. Any made-up language must be characterless and lifeless — look at Esperanto, etc. The whole meaning of a word is in its slowly-acquired associations', etc.

> In the first place, this argument, like most of the arguments produced when one suggests changing anything, is a long-winded way of saying that what is must be. Hitherto we have never set ourselves to the deliberate creation of words, and all living languages have grown slowly and haphazard; (…)

> What is wanted is several thousands of gifted but normal people who would give themselves to word-invention as seriously as people now give themselves to Shakespearean research. Given these, I believe we could work wonders with language. (…)

> It is curious that when our knowledge, the complication of our lives and therefore (I think it must follow) our minds, develop so fast, language, the chief means of communication, should scarcely stir. For this reason I think that the idea of the deliberate invention of words is at least worth thinking over.

Orwell's linguo-critical ideas expressed in his essays cannot be separated from his literary work. "Newspeak", the official language of Oceania in his dystopia "1984", which is described in the supplement of the book, is of utmost importance for the novel: *The Revolution will be complete when the language is perfect. Newspeak is Ingsoc and Ingsoc is Newspeak* (p. 55). Newspeak has a number of features that Orwell criticized

---

[11]   Cf. the following examples of bombastic diction in "Politics and the English Language" (1946: 34): "a consideration which we should do well to bear in mind; a conclusion to which all of us would readily assert".

previously in his essay "Politics and the English Language", including the use of phrases and fixed constructions in political communication which turn its user into a machine uttering them without thinking about their contents:

> (…) mechanically repeating the familiar phrases – *bestial atrocities, iron heel, blood-stained tyranny, free peoples of the world, stand shoulder to shoulder-* (...) A speaker that uses that kind of phraseology has gone some distance towards turning himself into a machine. (...) he may be almost unconscious of what he is saying (...) And this reduced state of consciousness, if not indispensable, is at any rate favourable to political conformity. (p. 135/136)

The principle described is characteristic of Newspeak. Words like *goodthink* ('politically orthodoxy as defined by the Party'), *bellyfeel* ('the blind, enthusiastic acceptance of an idea') or *prolefeed* ('popular culture for the entertainment of the proletariat of Oceania'), we read in the description of Newspeak, are designed in structure and sound that they can be used unconsciously without thinking about them.

> The intention was to make speech, and especially speech on any subject not ideologically neutral, as nearly as possible independent of consciousness. (p. 321)

A further aspect bemoaned by Orwell in his essay "Politics of the English Language" is the creation and usage of political euphemisms to downplay or falsify facts – another topical criticism, when we think of expressions such as *downsize, ethnic cleansing, neutralize the target, collateral damage* and others. Orwell points out:

> Political language (...) is designed to make lies sound truthful and murder respectable. (p. 139)

The coinage and distribution of words like these is again typical for Newspeak:

> No word in the B vocabulary was ideologically neutral. A great many were euphemisms. Such words, for instance, as *joycamp* (forced-labour camp) or (Ministry of Peace, i.e. Ministry of War) meant almost the exact opposite of what they appeared to mean. (p. 319f.)

These examples suffice to illustrate how Orwell's attitude to language influenced the character of Newspeak. His linguo-critical ideas can be considered a first pillar on which Newspeak was constructed.

As a second important element for the creation of Newspeak, Soviet rhetoric should be mentioned. Orwell copies word-formation patterns typically used in Soviet Russia, for instance, for naming institutions on Oceania, e.g. *Ministry of Plenty* → *Miniplenty*. Also, as Mannewitz (1997) shows, he alludes to Stalin's rhetorical techniques.

> Winston thought for a moment, then pulled the speak-write towards him and began dictating in Big Brother's familiar style: a style at once military and pedantic, and,

because of a trick of asking questions and then promptly answering them ('What lessons do we learn from this fact, comrades? The lesson – which is also one of the fundamental principles of Ingsoc – that,' etc. etc.), easy to imitate. (p. 49)

The third and most important basis for the language of Oceania, however, are the planned language projects that Orwell knew: Charles K. Ogden's Basic English (1930), Lancelot Hogben's Interglossa (1943), and Esperanto. Newspeak caricatures the principle of limiting the size of the vocabulary that is characteristic of the first two projects (cf. Rai 1988: 125; Dittmann 1984). Basic English comprises 850 words and Interglossa, a project combining Basic English, Graeco und Latino sine flexione, 880 (cf. Blanke 1985: 156). Newspeak, we read, is "the only language in the world whose vocabulary gets smaller every year" (p. 55), and Syme, the language engineer in "1984" is enthusiastic about the shrinking dictionary:

It's a beautiful thing, the destruction of words. Of course the great wastage is in the verbs and adjectives, but there are hundreds of nouns that can be got rid of as well. (p. 54)

Orwell's attitude towards Basic English was ambivalent and changed over time. He was an acquaintance of Inez Holden, an author and journalist who wrote stories in Basic English, he corresponded with Ogden and, during the years when he worked for the BBC (1941-1943), he produced a radio programme by Leonara Lockhart about Basic English (broadcast on 2nd October 1942) (Rai 1988: 125). In context with his criticism about public speech, Orwell was of the opinion that it was impossible to utter vague or empty statement in Basic English without their meaninglessness being obvious. He writes in the Tribune (18 October 1944):

One argument for Basic English is that by existing side by side with Standard English it can act as a sort of corrective to the oratory of statesmen and publicists. High sounding phrases, when translated into Basic, are often deflated in a surprising way. (…) In Basic, I was told, you cannot make a meaningless statement without its being apparent that it is meaningless – which is quite enough to explain why so many schoolmasters, editors, politicians and literary critics object to it.

In those days he also joined the supporters of Basic English who claimed that its dissemination was in agreement with the aims of international understanding (cf. Fink 1971: 156f.). Later he took a more differentiated position towards it recognizing that linguistic simplifications might hold dangers, which is what he then describes in a parodic manner in "1984" in relation to the Big-Brother State (cf. Dittmann 1984: 41).

When we have a closer look at Newspeak, we see that Orwell also included elements from Esperanto. Parallels can be seen as regards the regularity of grammatical form, e.g. the consistent use of the past tense ending -ed ("all inflections followed the same rules. Thus, in all verbs the preterite and the past participle were the same and ended in -ed. The preterite of *steal* was *stealed*, the preterite of *think* was *thinked*" p. 315) or the regular derivation of adjectives by means of -ful and of adverbs by means of

-wise. Furthermore, when we think of the classic Newspeak word, *doubleplusgood*, it seems reasonable to suppose that the agglutinating word-formation of Esperanto was the inspiration for it.

The novel runs:

> Take "good", for instance. If you have a word like "good", what need is there for a word like "bad"? "Ungood" will do just as well – better, because it's an exact opposite, which the other is not. Or again, if you want a stronger version of "good", what sense is there in having a whole string of vague useless words like "excellent" and "splendid" and all the rest of them? "Plusgood" covers the meaning, or "double-plusgood" if you want something stronger still. (...) In the end the whole notion of goodness and badness will be covered by only six words – in reality, only one word. (p. 54)

Orwell, as we know from his biographers, had a poor opinion of Esperanto. Davison (1996: 25), quoting Louis Bannier, writes "He had no respect for the Esperanto movement" (see also the quote from his essay "New Words" above). This might be attributed to Orwell's personal experience with the language in 1928, when he spent some time in Paris in his aunt's house. Ellen Kate Limouzin lived together with her future husband Eugène Lanti (Eugène Adam), an active member of the Esperanto Movement, which was then highly ideologically oriented, and a co-founder of the Sennacieca Asocio Tutmonda (World Association for Non-Nationhood), the leading organization of the Esperanto Workers' Movement. There were heated political arguments between Orwell, a supporter of communism and the Soviet system, and Lanti, who was increasingly questioning the Soviet Union's contribution to the construction of socialism. According to Crick (1992: 190), Orwell's negative views of Esperanto can also be explained by the fact that he originally went to Paris in order to improve his French. The Adams' family language was Esperanto, however, so that he soon had to look for new accommodation.[12]

4. Conclusion

This study has addressed a topic that is located at the intersection of linguistics and literary studies providing significant insight into both these disciplines. It has shown that there are a number of "contact points", or links, between planned languages, initiated to ease communication between people of different mother tongues in the real world, and languages created for imaginary worlds. One of them is the fact that the authors of fictional languages were often influenced by planned language projects and referred to these in their literary works in various ways. This phenomenon was described taking the English-speaking authors J. Swift and G. Orwell and their masterpieces "Gulliver's

---

[12] Crick (1992: 190) writes: "Orwell told a friend in his last years that as a young man he had gone to Paris partly to improve his French, but had to leave his first lodgings because the landlord and his wife only spoke Esperanto – and it was an ideology, not just a language."

Travels" and "1984" as examples, in which language plays such a central role that it seems to be legitimate to call them linguistic novels. Swift and Orwell – and other writers might be added in this context – interpolated their knowledge of planned languages into their own language creations and into the story plot. The authors' participation in debates on the planned language projects of their time shows the relevance of the topic in the past and present. In the same way as interlinguistics with its focus on planned languages is to be regarded as an integral part of linguistics, the comprehensive reception of authors like Swift, Tolkien and Orwell cannot ignore their occupation with this topic. Future research should address some of the other links which could only be mentioned briefly in this paper, such as the impact of linguistic theories on the creation of languages and the potential of both planned languages and fictional languages as a point of departure for teaching linguistics.

Bibliography

Adams, Michael 2011: *From Elvish to Klingon. Exploring Invented Languages.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aitchison, Jean 2001: Misunderstanding about language: A historical overview. In: *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 5/4: 611-619.

Barandovská-Frank, Věra 2011: Spracherfindung und Nationalsprache: das Beispiel El Glheþ Talossan. In: *Interlinguistische Informationen*. Beiheft 18. Berlin: GIL, 33-49. Spracherfindung und Nationalsprache: das Beispiel El Glheþ Talossan.

Barandovská-Frank, Věra 2012: Konferenzbericht über Conlangs. In: *Interlinguistische Informationen*. Beiheft 19. Berlin: GIL, 149-154.

Barandovská-Frank, Věra 2019: De nouveaux défis pour l'interlinguistique. In: *Cahiers de l'ILSL* 61, 7-24.

Blanke, Detlev 1985: *Internationale Plansprachen. Eine Einführung.* Berlin: Akademieverlag.

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

Blanke, Detlev 1998: Pri la aktuala stato de interlingvistiko. In: Carlevaro, Tazio (ed.): *Domaine de la recherche en linguistique appliquée.* Bellinzona: Hans Dubois, 6-88.

Blanke, Detlev 2006: *Interlinguistische Beiträge. Zum Wesen und zur Funktion internationaler Plansprachen* (herausgegeben von Sabine Fiedler). Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang.

Blanke, Detlev 2018: *International Planned Languages. Essays on Interlinguistics and Esperantology* (edited by Sabine Fiedler and Humphrey Tonkin). New York: Mondial.

Cilli, Oronzo, Smith, Arden R. & Wynne, Patrick H. 2017: J.R.R. Tolkien the Esperantist. Barletta: Cafagna Editore.

Conley, Tim & Cain, Stephen 2006: *Encyclopedia of Fictional and Fantastic Languages.* Westport, CT/London: Greenwood Press.

Crick, Bernard 1992: *George Orwell. A Life.* London: Penguin.

Davison, Peter H. 1996: *George Orwell: A Literary Life.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dittmann, Jürgen 1984: *Sprachlenkung und Denkverbot – George Orwell als Sprachkritiker.* Hugo Steiner zum 55. Geburtstag. Freiburger Universitätsblätter 83, 31-47.

Eco, Umberto 1995: *The Search for the Perfect Language* (translated by James Fentress). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Fiedler, Sabine 2011: Literarische Spracherfindungen aus interlinguistischer Sicht: die englisch-sprachigen Autoren J. Swift, G. Orwell und J.R.R. Tolkien und ihre fiktionalen Sprachen. In: *Interlinguistische Informationen.* Beiheft 18. Berlin: GIL, 9-32.

Fimi, Dimitra & Higgins, Andrew 2016: *J.R.R. Tolkien. A Secret Vice. Tolkien on Invented Languages.* London: HarperCollins.

Fink, Howard R. 1971: Newspeak: the epitome of parody techniques in Nineteen Eighty-Four. In: *Critical Survey* 5, 155-163.

Garvía, Roberto 2015: *Esperanto and its Rivals. The Struggle for an International Language.* Philadelphia University of Pennsylvania Press.

Gobbo, Federico 2017: David J. Peterson 2015: The Art of Language Invention. From horse-lords to dark elves, the words behind the word-building (Review). In: *Language Problems & Language Planning* 41(3), 304-306.

Hüllen Werner 1984: Bischof John Wilkins und die Fachsprachen unserer Zeit. In: *Fachsprache* 6, 115-122.

Klare, Johannes 2011: Erfundene (fiktionale) Sprachen in einigen älteren französischen belletristischen Texten in der Nachfolge der „Utopia" (1516) von Thomas Morus. In: Brosch, Cyril & Fiedler, Sabine (eds.): *Florilegium Interlinguisticum. Festschrift für Detlev Blanke zum 70. Geburtstag.* Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang, 247-262.

Mannewitz, Cornelia 1997: Zur Rolle von Kunstsprachen in Gesellschaftsutopien". In: *Interlinguistische Informationen.* Beiheft 2. Berlin: GIL, 35-42.

Mannewitz, Cornelia 1999: Anthony Burgess' „A Clockwork Orange": Zur lexikalischen Systematik im Original und in Übersetzungen. In: *Interlinguistische Informationen.* Beiheft 5. Berlin: GIL, 82-88.

Mannewitz, Cornelia 2002: Wer in aller Welt spricht Klingonisch? In: *Interlinguistische Informationen*. Beiheft 8. Berlin: GIL, 107-114.

Mannewitz, Cornelia 2003: Science-Fiction-Sprachen im Internet. In: *Interlinguistische Informationen*. Beiheft 9. Berlin: GIL, 40-53.

Okrent, Arika 2009: *In the Land of Invented Languages.* New York: Spiegel & Grau.

Orwell, George 1949: *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (edition 1992). New York/Toronto: Everyman's Library Alfred A. Knopf.

Orwell, George 1968: *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell* (ed. by Sonia Orwell). New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Пиперски, Александр 2017: *Констуирование языков.* Москва: ПостНаука.

Rai, Alok 1988: *Orwell and the Politics of Despair.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sanders, Nathan 2016: Constructed languages in the classroom. In: *Language* 92(3), e192-e204.

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

Sigmund, Sven 2003: Die Tengwar – ein alternatives Schriftsystem. In: *Interlinguistische Informationen*. Beiheft 9. Berlin: GIL, 102-109.

Smith, Arden R. & Wynne, Patrick 2000: Tolkien and Esperanto. In: *Seven* 17, 27-46.

Stria, Ida 2016: Inventing languages, inventing worlds. Towards a linguistic worldview for artificial languages (Dissertation). Poznan: Wydział Neofilologii UAM w Poznaniu.

Suchowolec, Karolina 2017. *Sprachlenkung – Aspekte einer übergreifenden Theorie*. Berlin: Frank & Timme.

Swift, Jonathan 1712: *A Proposal for Correcting, Improving, and Ascertaining the English Tongue* (2nd ed.; printed for Benj. Tooke at the Middle-Temple-Gate, Fleetstreet). London.

Swift, Jonathan 1726/1998: *Gulliver's Travels*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tolkien, John R.R. 1931/1997: A Secret Vice. In: Tolkien, Christopher (ed.): *The Monsters and the Critics*. London: HarperCollins (originally published in London: Allen & Unwin, 1983). 188-223.

Wahlgren, Yens 2004: *Klingon as Linguistic Capital. A Sociolinguistic Study of Nineteen Advanced Klingonists.* BA-Thesis.

Walker, Lewis 1973: A possible source for the linguistic projects in the academy of Lagado. In: *Notes & Queries* 20.11, 413-414.

Wilkins, John 1668: *An Essay Towards a Real Character, And a Philosophical Language* (Printed for SA: GELLIBRAND, and for JOHN MARTIN Printer to the ROYAL SOCIETY). Reproduction: The Scolar Press Limited Menston, England 1968.

Wüster, Eugen 1931: *Internationale Sprachnormung in der Technik. Besonders in der Elektrotechnik.* 3. abermals ergänzte Aufl. 1970. Bonn: Bouvier.

Chap. III.   *Concerning a Real Character.*   415

That which at prefent feems moft convenient to me, is this ;

Tranfcend. (General	Bα	Animals (Exanguious	Zα	Action (Spiritual	Cα
Rel. mixed	Ba	)Fifh	Za	)Corporeal	Ca
(Rel. of Action	Be	)Bird	Ze	)Motion	Ce
Difcourfe	Bi	(Beaft	Zi	(Operation	Ci
God	Dα	Parts (Peculiar	Pα		
World	Da	)General	Pa	Oecon.	Co
Element	De	Quantity (Magnitude	Pe	Poffef.	Cy
Stone	Di	)Space	Pi	Relation Provif.	Sα
Metal	Do	(Meafure	Po	Civil	Sa
Herb confid. accord. to the (Leaf	Gα	Quality ,Power Nat.	Tα	Judicial	Se
)Flower	Ga	)Habit	Ta	Military	Si
(Seed-veffel	Ge	)Manners	Te	Naval	So
Shrub	Gi	)Quality fenfible	Ti	Ecclef.	Sy
Tree	Go	(Difeafe	To		

The *Differences* under each of thefe *Genus*'s, may be expreffed by thefe Confonants ⌠ B, D, G, P, T, C, Z, S, N.
in this order ;⌡ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7. 8 9.

The *Species* may be expreffed by putting one of the feven Vowels after the Confonant, for the Difference ; to which may be added (to make up the number) two of the Dipthongs, according to this order
⌠α, a, e, i, o, ʊ, y, yi, yʊ.
⌡1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9.

For inftance, If (De) fignifie *Element*, then (Deb) muft fignifie the firft difference ; which (according to the Tables) is *Fire* : and (Debα) will denote the firft Species, which is *Flame*. (Det) will be the fifth difference under that Genus, which is, *Appearing Meteor*; (Detα) the firft Species, *viz.* *Rainbow*; (Deta) the fecond, *viz.* *Halo*.
   Thus, if (Ti) fignifie the Genus of *Senfible Quality*, then (Tid) muft denote the fecond difference, which comprehends Colours; and (Tida) muft fignifie the fecond Species under that difference, *viz.* *Rednefs* : (Tide) the third Species, which is *Greennefs*, &c.
   Thus likewife, if (Be) be put for the Genus of *Tranfcendental Relation of Action*, then (Bec) muft denote the fixth difference, which is *Ition*; and (Becʊ) will fignifie the fixth Species, which is *Following*.
   As for thofe Species under Plants and Animals, which do exceed the number of Nine, they may be expreffed by adding the Letters *L*, or *R*, after the firft Confonant, to denote the fecond, or third of fuch Combinations. Thus, if Gαde be *Tulip*, *viz.* the third Species in the firft Nine, then Glαde muft fignifie *Ramfon*, *viz.* the third in the fecond Nine; or the twelfth Species under that Difference. So if Zana be *Salmon*, *viz.* the fecond fpecies in the firft Nine, them Zlana muft fignifie *Gudgeon*, *viz.* the fecond in the fecond Nine ; or the eleventh Species under that Difference.

It

Figure 1: Page 415 of Wilkins' (1668) work