

AUTONOMY AND REGULARITY IN THE INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE

ALPHONSE MATEJKA, 1948

Originally written in Occidental in the magazine Cosmoglotta A, issue  
136 (1948)

## Translator's note

One of the justified criticisms of the Occidental movement (and the international language movement as a whole) during the first few decades is that it spent just as much time assailing other languages as it did on putting together a movement of speakers and making it into a living language. The result of this is that now in 2020 a lot of the content in *Cosmoglotta* is less valuable than it could be, where instead of a translated piece of poetry, literature or news with permanent value one finds far too often yet another tired tirade against Esperanto or Ido.

In spite of this, I have found one piece written by Alphonse Matejka in 1948 that is valuable in 2020 as well, because it speaks against a misconception of Occidental that continues to this day: that Occidental is simply a method of reproducing existing Romance words and a language that slavishly follows them without being able to produce its own vocabulary or add any extra nuance or richness to these words it use its own system of derivation to generate autonomous words when it wishes. Or in short, that it only offers analysis and imitation, but no synthesis or originality.

Matejka does bring up Esperanto throughout, but does also mention Latino sine Flexione and the IALA's project (later Interlingua) as an example of two languages that veer too far towards simply registering and using international words without focusing enough on how to generate this vocabulary themselves. He had also originally intended to include Ido but ran out of space, and so Esperanto remained the only language brought up to compare to Occidental with any detail.

One final note to add is that the author to whom he is responding, the Esperantist W.J.A. Manders, wrote a book called *Vijf Kunsttalen* that floored Matejka with its objectivity and the author's understanding of the makeup of Occidental. In 1947 he wrote that: "I do not hesitate to declare that this new word constitutes one of the most valuable contributions to literature on world languages...Now, the truth is that the work by Mr. Manders surpasses my most optimistic hopes and I cannot help but express my great and sincere admiration here that I profess for the rare, most rare spirit of scientific objectivity that one sees in his work. It shines not only through its astonishingly rich documentation, but also for an impeccable exposition of the facts..."<sup>1</sup> among other compliments.

After this, he noted that there were still some points where he thought Mr. Manders had misunderstood Occidental and began a response, which took place in this issue in 1948. But this response was not at all based on personal animosity as A. Matejka was most grateful to Mr. Manders for his book and only took issue with a few key points that served as the basis for this special issue of *Cosmoglotta*.

- *David MacLeod, 2020*

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://anno.onb.ac.at/cgi-content/anno-plus?aid=e0g&datum=1947&page=19&size=45>

# COSMOCILOTA

OFICIAL MENSUAL ORGANE DEL OCCIDENTAL-UNION

ALF. MATEJKA:  
**AUTONOMIE e REGULARITÀ**  
IN LI LINGUE-INTERNATIONAL

Numero  
special

Redaction  
• Administration:  
INSTITUTE  
OCCIDENTAL  
Chapelle (Vd)  
Svizzera



Nr 136  
Serie A  
MARTE  
1948



<b>Autonomie e Regularitá in li Lingue International</b>	<b>Autonomy and Regularity in the International Language</b>
In nró 134 de COSMOGLOTTA (ed. A pag. 19) yo atraet li attention del letores a un nov ovre interlinguistic, "VIJF KUNSTTALEN", scrit de un esperantist nederlandesi, Sr. W.A. J. Manders de Venlo.	In issue 134 of Cosmoglotta (edition A., page 19) I mentioned to the readers a new book called Vijf Kunsttalen (Dutch: Five Constructed Languages), written by Mr. W.A.J. Manders, a Dutch Esperantist from Venlo.
Pos har substrecat, quam it convene, li scientific objectivité quel manifesta se in ti ovre, yo anunciat mi intention discusser in quelc articules ulteriori li fundamental objectiones de Sr. Manders contra Occidental. Li unesim de ti articules esset publicat in COSMOGLOTTA B nr. 94 sub li titul "Autonomie e Naturalitá in li L.I.". Yo ocupat me in it pri li misinterpretation del conceptiones fundamental de E. de Wahl pri li scope del mundlingue e yo exposit li vis-punctu occidentalistic pri li ortografic problema. Li sequent articules va esser consacrat al question del derivation. It semblat me util profitar ti ocasion por far un specie de resumate de omni argumentes queles milita in favore de nor tese. Noi constata in facte que li importantie del problema "autonomie o naturalitá" sembla crescer con li progresses del modern interlinguistica. Sr. H. Jacob consacrat a it un númere apreciabil de págines in su du libres "On the choice of a common language" e "A planned auxiliary language" e anc li linguistic stab de IALA esset confrontat con li sam problema.	After emphasizing the scientific objectivity of the book, I said that I would discuss the fundamental objections that Mr. Manders has against Occidental in upcoming issues. The first of these was published in issue 94 of Cosmoglotta B under the title "Autonomie e Naturalitá in li L.I." (Autonomy and Naturality in the International Language). There I focused on misunderstandings of Edgar de Wahl's fundamental concepts and demonstrated the Occidentalist point of view on the issue of spelling. The next articles will be about the issue of derivation. It seemed a good idea to take the opportunity to put a sort of overview together of the arguments in our favour. We see in fact that the importance of the issue of "autonomy or naturality" seems to be on the increase along with the progress made in modern interlinguistics. Mr. H. Jacob devoted a fairly large number of pages to it in his two books "On the choice of a common language" and "A planned auxiliary language" and the linguistic staff of the IALA is also confronted with the same problem.
Pro practic motives noi presenta li materiale in un sol caderne, vice disperser li exposite in pluri articules.	For practical reasons, we present the material in a single issue instead of dividing it into multiple articles.

<b>LI OBJECCIONES DE SR. MANDERS.</b>	<b>THE OBJECTIONS OF MR. MANDERS.</b>
Por bon situar li problema, yo deve comensar per citar quelc selectet passages ex li libre de Sr. Manders queles ilustra li punctus in discussion:	To put the issue into context, I will have to begin by citing a few selected passages from Mr. Manders' book that illustrate the points in discussion:
<i>(pag. 198): ... Ci on deve támen posir se li question: "Esque li conception de De Wahl responde a rational criteries? ... Su tot sistema presuposi li conossentie de adminim un lingue romanic. Ti qui vole expresser se in Occidental ne posse usar li existent affixes secun su propri</i>	<i>(page 198) ... Here, however, one has to ask the question: "Does De Wahl's conception meet rational criteria? ... His whole system presupposes knowing at least one Romance language. He who wants to express himself in Occidental cannot use the existing affixes the way he wants: he has to</i>

<p><i>arbitrie: il deve usar li precis afixe quel permisse formar un internationalmen conosset parol o quel ducte a un derivate con romanic aspecte. ... It es totvez ver que Occidental oferta solmen rar possibilitás de individual parolformation. Si on departe del vispunctu que li lingue international va, plu tost o tard, far li aprension de foren lingues superflui por mult persones - e to es anc il conception de De Wahl - tande to significa que in future multes va dever aprender li vocabularium de Occidental con omni su composites e derivates presc in li sam maniere in quel ili deve nu aprender li derivates francesi e hispan. It es ver que mem in ti casu Occidental vell maner ancor mult plu facil quam li vivent lingues, mersi al relativ regularitá del derivationes e al facil grammatica, ma por tis queles ne posse apoyar se sur li lingues romanic, li sistema de derivation de Occidental va esser inferiori in facilitá a ti de Esperanto e Ido; concernent su possibilitás de aplicacion it es mem inferiori a Volapük.</i></p>	<p><i>use the exact affix that allows the formation of an internationally-known word, or which leads to a derivation that looks Romance. ... It is nevertheless true that Occidental only rarely offers the chance at individual word formation. If you start from the point of view that the international language will, sooner or later, make learning other languages superfluous – and that is also what De Wahl envisages – then that means that many in the future will have to learn Occidental’s vocabulary with all its composites and derivations almost in the same way that they now have to learn derivations in French and Spanish. It es true that even in this case Occidental will remain much easier than natural languages, thanks to the relative regularity of its derivations and its easy grammar, but for those that do not have the help of a Romance language, Occidental’s system of derivation will be inferior to that of Esperanto and Ido, and for its possibilities of application it is even inferior to Volapük.</i></p>
<p><i>(pág. 80): Occidental have quam cardinal characteristicum que it ne tende, quam li altri lingues international, vers absolut regularitá. To vale tam por li grammatica quam por li derivation. Ti ultim es adplu caracterisat per li existentie de un grand númere de afixes de queles pluri have plu quam un function, durante que li sam function es sovente expresset per pluri afixes. Plutost quam etablisser un ver sistema de derivation, De Wahl provat trovar regules queles vell permisser reciver derivates internationalmen conosset quam regularimen format Occidental-paroles. "Electricitá, salvation, executor, expedition, action, tolerantie, serpentine, Argentina, fripon, spion, patron" es ne solmen regulari derivationes occidentalistic, ma adplu paroles queles es incontrabil sub li sam formes in lingues national. E to es por De Wahl lu essential.</i></p>	<p><i>(page 80): Occidental is characteristic in that it does not, as the others do, aim for absolute regularity. That applies to the grammar just as much as the derivation. And this derivation is characterized by the existence of a large number of affixes of which many have more than one function, while the same function is often expressed by multiple affixes. Rather than establish a true system of derivation, De Wahl attempted to find rules that would permit internationally recognized derivations as regularly formed words in Occidental. "Electricitá, salvation, executor, expedition, action, tolerantie, serpentine, Argentina, fripon, spion, patron" are not just regular Occidental derivations, but also words that can be found in the same forms in national languages. And that, for De Wahl, is essential.</i></p>
<p><i>(pág. 351) On ne posse ne admirar li sistema de De Wahl quel resuma in quelc relativmen simplic regules li tre complicat mecanisme de derivation del lingues romanic. Ma quantcunc ingeniosi es ti sistema, it have poc practic valore. Durante que in Esperanto e Ido on posse self formar li derivates per li unic auxilie del rason o del leges del analogie, ti sam possibilitá es excludet in</i></p>	<p><i>(page 351) It is impossible not to admire De Wahl’s system that sums up the most complicated mechanism of derivation of Romance languages in a few relatively simple rules. But however ingenious it may be, it has little practical value. While in Esperanto or Ido one is able to form the derivations oneself through reason or the rules of analogy alone, this same possibility is</i></p>

<p><i>Occidental. In ti lingue un derivate es corect solmen si it coincide in su aspecte exteriori con un forme romanic. Li scope es dunc sempre crear un parol quel on ja conosse per su forme. Ti qui vell basar se unicmen sur li sense del radicas e del afixes, vell ínmancabilmen crear paroles quam "militariatu, afabilerie, esperore, povrificar, capitalario, liberie, mortantie, comensation", formes queles es omnes teoricismen corect, ma malgré to fals. Qui ne conosse romanic lingues es fortiat aprender omni derivates quam si ili vell esser radicas, benque in veritá li regulari formation facilisa considerabilmen li aprension. Por li activ usation del lingue ti total dependentie del romanic lingues forma un seriosi obstacul. De altri látere it es just aconosser que to considerabilmen facilisa li comprension por tis queles conosse ti lingues. Un intelectuale totmen ne besona conosser Occidental por posse comprender ínmediatmen alquel textu in Occidental. On posse dir lu sam ni pri Esperanto ni pri Ido.</i></p>	<p><i>excluded in Occidental. In this language a derived word is correct only if it coincides in its external aspect with a Romance form. The goal is thus to always create a word that one already knows the form of. One who relies only on the meaning of the roots and affixes would inevitably create words like "militariatu, afabilerie, esperore, povrificar, capitalario, mortantie, comensation", forms that are all theoretically correct, but nevertheless false. One who does not know any Romance languages is forced to learn all derived words as if they were separate roots themselves, though in reality the regular formation does make learning considerably easier. This total dependence on the Romance languages forms a serious obstacle for the active use of this language. On the other hand, it is good to recognize that this makes understanding considerably easier for those that do know these languages. An intellectual does not need to know Occidental to be able to immediately understand a text written in it. One cannot say the same about Esperanto, nor Ido.</i></p>
<p>In li oculos de Sr. Manders, li situation sembla dunc esser li sequent: de un látere un sistema (Esperanto) quel es ni tam natural ni tam international quam Occidental, ma quel oferta li avantage esser extremmen simplic e regulari in su parolformation; de altri látere un sistema (Occidental) quel es absolut international, ma u ti internationalitá es obtenet ye li detriment del regularitá e facilitá de application del regules de derivation. Li facilitá de Esperanto es obtenet per li clarmen definit e univoc sense del elementes derivatori: li sense de un notion composit (parol derivat) resulta sempre logicmen ex li senses combinat del elementes isolat. Li sfere de application del afixes es practicmen ínlimitat. In revanche, li desfacilitá de Occidental es debit al multisensitá del afixes: un parol derivat es corect solmen si it es conform al internationalitá, e solmen li romanic popules save electer ex li quantitá de afixes disponibil tis queles efectivmen producte li internationalitá del forme derivat. It manca dunc al sistema de derivation de Occidental li autonomie quel caracteriza li metodes de parolformation in Esperanto e Ido.</p>	<p>In the eyes of Mr. Manders, the situation thus seems to be as follows: on one hand is a system (Esperanto) which is neither as natural nor as international as Occidental, but which offers the advantage of being extremely simple and regular in its word formation; on the other hand is a system (Occidental) that is absolutely international, but where this internationality is obtained at the detriment of regularity and ease of application of the rules of derivation. The ease of Esperanto is obtained by the clearly defined and univocal meaning of its derivational elements: the meaning of a composite notion (derived word) always results logically from the combined meanings of its isolated elements. The sphere of application of the affixes is practically unlimited. In contrast, the difficulty of Occidental is due to the multiple meanings of the affixes: one derived word is correct only if it conforms to internationality, and only the Romance peoples know how to choose from within the quantity of affixes available those that produce the internationality of the derived form. Occidental's system of derivation thus lacks the autonomy</p>

	that characterizes the methods of word formation in Esperanto and Ido.
--	--

<b>ANC OCCIDENTAL ES AUTONOM.</b>	<b>OCCIDENTAL IS ALSO AUTONOMOUS.</b>
<p>Nu, it es certmen un exaggeration afirmar que li sistema de derivation de Occidental es caracterisat per un total manca de autonomie. Noi posse mem posir quam principie que un parol corectmen format secun li regules de derivation docet in nor grammaticas deve esser considerat quam just mem si it ne coresponde al forme international sub quel on customa trovar it in li lexicos. Yo ne vide, por ex., in li nómine de quel principie on vell posser condemnar li paroles "militariatu, povrificar, comensation" queles Sr. Manders cita quam încorect.* In céteri ti possibilitás de misformation es minu frequent quam on vell posser suposir a prim visu. Por exemple: qui va formar li parol "capitalario" quande noi have un derivate "capitalist" de quel li internationalitá include omni lingues de Portugal til Russia? Poy noi save que in Occidental on distinte inter afixes productiv e ínproductiv. Li sufixes ínproductiv es tre poc (-est, -il, -id, escer, icar) e on generalmen aprende li derivates "tot fat" vice formar les self, quam on anc aprende in Esperanto sin derivar les (pro que on ne posse) paroles finient in -mento, -enco, -anco, -oro, -uro, -ara, -ara etc. etc.) durant que ili forma in Occidental regulari derivates.</p> <p>*) Per un ironie del fate, Sr. Manders sembla har haustet su exemples ex li critica de Occidental quel yo self publicat ca. 15 annus ante nu in mi articul "IDO E LA LOGIKO" (Progreso X 93). Ma desde 1933 yo ha evoluet quam anc Sr. Manders va inevitabilmen evoluer e to probabilmen in minu mult témpore quam yo.</p>	<p>Now, it certainly is an exaggeration to claim that the system of derivation of Occidental is characterized by a complete lack of autonomy. We can even lay down the principle that a word correctly formed according to the rules of derivation in the grammar should be considered correct even if it doesn't correspond to the international form that one is used to finding in the dictionary. I don't see, for example, by what principle one should condemn the words "militariatu, povrificar, comensation" that Mr. Manders cites as incorrect.* Plus, these possibilities for misinformation are less frequent that one would first suppose. For example: who would form the word "capitalario" when we have the derived word "capitalist" that has an internationality that extends across all languages from Portugal to Russia? Plus we know that in Occidental there is a distinction between productive and unproductive affixes. The unproductive suffixes are very few in number (-est, -il, -id, -escer, -icar) and one generally learns these derived words "as is" instead of forming them oneself, just as one also learns in Esperanto, without deriving them (because you can't), words ending in -mento, -enco, -anco, -oro, -uro, -ara, etc. etc., while these form regular derived words in Occidental.</p> <p>*) By fateful irony, Mr. Manders seems to have found his examples among the criticism of Occidental that I myself published about 15 years ago in my article "IDO E LA LOGIKO" (Progreso X 93). But since 1933 I have evolved just as Mr. Manders will inevitably evolve and probably in less time than it took me to do so.</p>
<p>Li afixes productiv have in Occidental practicmen li sam possibilitás de ínlimitat application quam in Esperanto. Nequó impedi nos dir equita-t-osi, malgré que F have "équitable" E H "equitativo". Noi forma sin hesitar "ludette, plorada, substantival, pruntation, credaci, perdibil, leonello, musicastro, plumallia, tassade, sucrage,</p>	<p>The productive affixes have practically the same possibilities of unlimited application as those in Esperanto. Nothing is stopping us from saying equita-t-osi, even though French uses équitable and Spanish uses equitativo. We do not hesitate to form words like "ludette, plorada, substantival, pruntation, credaci, perdibil, leonello, musicastro,</p>

<p>glotton, stridore, hesitatori, successosi, flexura" etc. etc. sin questionar nos esque ti paroles es international o ne. Ma mem quando ili efectivmen ne es international, ili malgré omnicos nequando have ti aspecte artificial quel caracteriza li pluparte del derivates in Esperanto e Ido. Ili sempre representa formes queles anc li vivent lingues vell har posset producter per lor propri medies. E in facte un grand quantité de derivates in Occidental, quam por ex. toleration, transportation, mordaci, malessere, ricevment, queles vell posser semblar innatural por un francese, have lor exact equivalente sive in anglési, sive in italian o hispan e es pro to considerat quam perfectmen natural del concernet popules.</p>	<p>plumallia, tassade, sucrage, glotton, stridore, hesitatori, successosi, flexura" etc. etc. without asking ourselves whether these words are international or not. Even when they are in fact not international, they nevertheless never have the artificial appearance that characterizes most of the derived words in Esperanto and Ido. They always represent forms that living languages would have been able to produce using their own means. And in fact a large quantity of derived words in Occidental, such as toleration, transportation, mordaci, malessere, ricevment, which could seem unnatural for a French person, have an exact equivalent either in English, Italian or Spanish, and because of that are considered to be perfectly natural to those peoples concerned.</p>
--	--

<b>ESQUE VERMEN ESPERANTO ES PLU FACIL?</b>	<b>IS ESPERANTO TRULY EASIER?</b>
<p>Noi vole tamen francmen aconosser que monoglottes parlant un lingue ne-romanic posse efectivmen in cert casus esser seductet a formar derivates queles, benque teoricismen possibil, tamen ne corresponde al formes queles li internationalita imposi quam directiv in li usation del lingue. Si noi reduce li critica de Sr. Manders a ti precisi casus, noi deve aconosser que it es rect. Ma... e nu veni li grand question: ESQUE REALMEN LI SAM DESFACILITA NE ANC EXISTE IN ESPERANTO? Esque vermen Esperanto es un lingue autonom in ti sense que chascun notion posse esser expresset por talmen dir automaticmen e sin erra possibil mersi al unic auxilie de bon selectet afixes con clarmen definit sense? Esque li logic analise quel li usator de Esperanto deve far por trovar in chascun casu li exact combination de radicas e afixes queles coresponde al ide a expresser es realmen accessibil anc al "hom del strade", i.e. a ti specie de clientes a quel Esperanto pretende just dedicar su particulari cuidas?</p>	<p>We however do recognize that monoglots that speak a non-Romance language can sometimes be driven to form derived words that, albeit theoretically possible, do not correspond to the forms that internationality dictates in the use of the language. If we reduce the criticism of Mr. Manders to these precise cases, we must recognize that it is right. But... and here comes the great question: DOESN'T THE SAME DIFFICULTY EXIST IN ESPERANTO AS WELL? Is Esperanto truly an autonomous language in the sense that all notions can be expressed automatically and without the possibility of being wrong just through the help of well-selected affixes with a clearly defined meaning? Is the logical analysis that the user of Esperanto must use to find in each case the exact combination of roots and affixes that correspond to the idea being expressed truly accessible to the "average Joe", in other words, to this sort of clientele that Esperanto claims to dedicate itself to?</p>
<p>Pri to noi es ja del comensa assaltat de un seriosi dubite. Si li afirmationes de nor adversarios concernent li excellentie de lor sistema de derivation vell esser ver, quel beson vell ili tande haver por editer spess vocabulariums, quam ili</p>	<p>We are in serious doubt about that right from the beginning. If what our adversaries claim about the excellence of their derivational system were to be true, then what need would they have to put together thick dictionaries that one sees with</p>



<p>existe in Esperanto e Ido? Un bon grammatica e un simplic radicularium vell dever suficer por omni besones. Quel beson on vell haver por indicar in li lexicos anc omni derivates, si tis-ci posse esser tam facilmen format ex li radicas mersí al însuperabil principie de "autonomie" quel presidet al elaboration del regules de "vortfarado" in Esperanto? Ho vé, ti tant laudat facilitá del sistema de derivation aparentmen ne existe, nam li max complet grammatica de Esperanto, a saver li "Plena Gramatiko" de Kalocsay e Waringhien (ca. 500 págines!) es ancor ne sat complet por explicar omni misteries del esperanta "vortfarado" e ancor minu por far superflui li spess lexicos. In contrari! In su recension del duesim edition del aludet grammatica, li excellent esperantist Lanti plendi amarimen (Sennacieca Revuo 10.5.1939) que li esperantistes possede nu "tro plenan gramatikon, dum mankas sufiçe plena vortaro!"</p>	<p>Esperanto and Ido? A good grammar and a simple root word lexicon should be enough for all needs. What need is there to indicate all derived words in these dictionaries, if they can be so easily formed from the roots hanks to the insuperable principle of "autonomy" that took place in the elaboration of the rules for "vortfarado" (word creation) in Esperanto? But oh dear: this lauded ease in the system of derivation doesn't seem to actually exist, because the most detailed Esperanto grammar, the "Plena Gramatiko" by Kalocsay and Waringhien (around 500 pages!) is still not complete enough to explain all the mysteries of Esperanto's "vortfarado" and is even less capable of making the thick dictionaries superfluous. On the contrary! In his review of the second edition of this grammar, the renowned Esperantist Lanti complained bitterly (<i>Sennacieca Revuo</i>, 10.5.1939) that the Esperantists now had "tro plenan gramatikon, dum mankas sufiçe plena vortaro" (too many grammars, but not a complete dictionary)!</p>
<p>In veritá li sam "desfacilitás" queles li esperantistes critica in Occidental existe in mem plu alt gradu anc in Esperanto. Ili es solmen de un altri specie. Noi va demonstrar to per un metodic exposition del factes.</p>	<p>In truth, the same "difficulties" that the Esperantists criticize in Occidental are there in a much worse state in Esperanto as well. They are only of a different type. We will demonstrate this with a methodic demonstration of the facts.</p>

<b>LI MULTISENSITÁ DEL AFIXES IN ESPERANTO.</b>	<b>MULTIPLE MEANINGS IN ESPERANTO AFFIXES.</b>
<p>On reprocha a Occidental que it manca a su afixes ti unisensitá quel caracteriza li sistema de derivation in Esperanto e quel es assertetmen li cardinal factor por li facil aprensibilitá de ti lingue. Or li veritá fortia nos constatar que ti sam multisensitá existe anc che li afixes de Esperanto. Vi quelc exemples:</p>	<p>Occidental is criticized for not having a sole meaning in its affixes that is characteristic in the derivational system in Esperanto, and which it asserts as being the main factor that makes it easy to learn. However, the reality of the situation forces us to admit that Esperanto affixes have the same multiple meanings. Here are a few examples:</p>
<p>-ADO:1. action (skribado), 2. durada (irado), 3. repetition (pafado).</p>	<p>-ADO: 1. Action (skribado, writing), 2. Duration (irado, voyage), 3. Repetition (pafado, shooting, fusillade)</p>
<p>-AJO: 1. alquó concret (skribaĵo), 2. concret resultate de un action (konstruaĵo), 3. materiale</p>	<p>-AJO: 1. Something concrete (skribaĵo, writing), 2. Concrete result of an action (konstruaĵo, construction), 3. Material (lignaĵo, wood), 4.</p>

(lignaĵo), 4. cose comestibil (porkaĵo), 5. maniere de acter (azenaĵo).	Something edible (porkaĵo, pork), 5. Way of acting (azenaĵo, acting like an ass).
-IDO: 1. filio de ... (reĝido), 2. yun nascete (ĉevalido), 3. descendentes (levidoj), 4. indigeno (Kanaanido), 5. epigone (Homeridoj).	-IDO: 1. Son of... (reĝido, prince), 2. Newly born young (ĉevalido, foal), 3. Descendents (levidoj, Levites), 4. Indigenous people (Kanaanido, Canaanites), 5. Followers (Homeridoj, Homerites).
-ISMO: 1. doctrine (budhismo), 2. movement (vegetarismo), 3. maniere de acter (kanibalismo), 4. sistema (ĵurnalismo), 5. maladv tendentias (alkoholismo), 6. idiotismes (latinismo).	-ISMO: 1. Doctrine (budhismo, Buddhism), 2. Movement (vegetarismo, vegetarianism), 3. Way of acting (kanibalismo, cannibalism), 3. System (ĵurnalismo, journalism), 5. Negative habits (alkoholismo, alcoholism), 6. Idioms (latinismo, latinism).
-ANO: 1. membre (komitatano), 2. logiante (urbano), 3. adepte (Lutherano), 4. apartenent a ... (familiano).	-ANO: 1. Member (komitatano, committee member), 2. Resident (urbano, urbanite), 3. Adept (Lutherano, Lutheran), 4. Belonging to... (familiano, family member).
-EMA: 1. inclinat a ... (dormema), 2. posent (eksplodema), 3. sub li dangere de ... (mortema).	-EMA: 1. Inclined to... (dormema, sleepy), 2. Able to (eksplodema, explosive), 3. Under danger of... (mortema, deadly).
EK-: 1. comensa de un action (ekiri), 2. subit action momentan (ekbati).	EK-: 1. Beginning of an action (ekiri, start going), 2. Sudden momentary action (ekbati, start beating).
RE-: 1. retro (reveni), 2. denov (revidi).	RE-: 1. Back (reveni, return), 2. Again (revidi, see again)
EL-: 1. movement ad éxter (eliri), 2. selection (eltrovi), 3. aquisiter alquó desirat (elflati monon de iu), 4. manifestar per alquó (elparoli), 5. crear per (elpensi), 6. extender in li sense del longore (eglatigi), 7. plen, exhaustiv (elkreski), 8. posser far til li fine (elporti = occ. suportar). 9. til ínusabilitá, desaparition (eluzi).	EL-: 1. Movement to outside (eliri, to go out), 2. Selection (eltrovi, discover), 3. Obtain something desired (elflati, cajole money from someone), 4. Manifest with something (elparoli, to pronounce), 5. Create with (elpensi, invent), 6. Extend in the sense of length (eglatigi, to flatten out), 7. Full, exhaustive (elkreski, to grow up), 8. Be able to go to the end (elporti, carry away, put up with), 9. Until it disappears (eluzi, use up).
Yo pensa que ti exemples (haustet ex li Plena Gramatiko de Esperanto de Kalocay-Waringhien) suffice por monstrar li ver caractere del monosemie aplicat in Esperanto. It va esser desfacil afirmar que li diferentias de sense es minu grand in Esperanto quam in Occidental.	I think that these examples (taken from the Plena Gramatiko de Esperanto by Kalocay-Waringhien) should suffice to show the true character of monosemy (monosemy: having only one meaning) in Esperanto. It would be difficult to claim that the differences in meaning are fewer in Esperanto than in Occidental.

<b>UN EXEMPLE INSTRUCTIV.</b>	<b>AN INSTRUCTIVE EXAMPLE.</b>
-------------------------------	--------------------------------

<p>A ti unesim obstacul adjunte se ancor altres. It va esser max bon far preceder lor exposition de un exemple ilustrativ:</p>	<p>Other obstacles are added to this first one. It will be best to first start out with an illustrative example before getting to them.</p>
<p>Lass nos suposir que yo ha aprendet li radica BRUL- in Esperanto e que yo prova derivar de ti radica li tot familie de paroles. Armat per li regules de derivation yo comensa per formar corectmen li sequent serie de paroles:</p> <p>bruli (brular), bruliĝi (arder), ekbruli (accender), ekbruliĝi (inflammar se), malbruli (extinter), malbruliĝi (extinter se).</p>	<p>Let us suppose that I have learned the root BRUL- (burn) in Esperanto and that I am trying to derive the whole family of words from this root. Armed with the rules of derivation, I begin by correctly forming the following series of words:</p> <p>bruli (to make burn), bruliĝi (to burn), ekbruli (to start something on fire), ekbruliĝi (to light on fire), malbruli (to put out), malbruliĝi (to get put out / stop burning).</p>
<p>Ma per hasarde yo incontra ti sam radica in li lexico e constata que durant que yo tractat li verbe quam transitiv, it in realitá have un sense íntransitiv. Ti decovriton totalmen destructe mi bell serie de derivates e yo hasta corecter it. Quam nov rezultate yo recive li sequent serie:</p> <p>bruli (arder), bruligi (brular), ekbruligi (accender), ekbruli (inflammar se), malbruli (extinter se), malbruligi (extinter).</p>	<p>But by chance I find this root in the dictionary and notice that, while I had treated it as a transitive verb, it actually has an intransitive meaning. This discovery completely destroys my beautiful series of derived words and I rush to correct it. The new result is the series as follows:</p> <p>bruli (to burn), bruligi (to make burn), ekbruligi (to light on fire), ekbruli (to catch fire), malbruli (to go out), malbruligi (to put out).</p>
<p>To sembla corect, ma ho vé, mi tribulationes ancor ne es finit. It monstra se que on ne di malbruligi in Esperanto. On have por ti notion un special radica, a saver estingi. Li corect serie es dunc:</p> <p>bruli, bruligi, ekbruligi, ekbruli, estingi, estingiĝi.</p>	<p>That seems correct, but oh dear: my tribulations are not yet over. It turns out that malbruligi is not used in Esperanto. For that meaning there is a special root, namely estingi. The correct series is thus:</p> <p>bruli (to burn), bruligi (to make burn), ekbruligi (to light on fire), ekbruli (to catch fire), estingi (to go out), estingiĝi (to put out).</p>
<p>Ma li possibilitás de autonom parolformation per to ancor ne es exhaustet. Si li situation vell har esset invers, i.e. si yo vell in prim har aprendet li radica esting e ignorat li radica brul, yo vell tot naturalmen har comensat li serie de derivates per:</p> <p>estingi, estingiĝi, malestingi, malestingiĝi, ekmalestingi, ekmalestingiĝi, si yo vell har considerat li verbe estingi quam transitiv, e per estingi, estingigi, malestingi, malestingigi, ekmalestingi, ekmalestingigi, si yo vell har considerat it falsmen quam íntransitiv.</p>	<p>But the possibilities of autonomous word formation from that are not yet at their end. If the situation had been reversed – let us say that I had learned the root esting- and did not know the root brul-, I would naturally have started the series of derived words with estingi, estingiĝi, malestingi, malestingiĝi, ekmalestingi, ekmalestingiĝi - if I had considered the verb estingi as transitive - and with estingi, estingigi, malestingi, malestingigi, ekmalestingi, ekmalestingigi, if I had wrongly considered it as intransitive.</p>

<p>In resuma, li regules de derivation in Esperanto permesse teoricien li sequent serie de paroles:</p> <p>bruli, bruligi, ekbruligi, ekbruli, estingi, estingiĝi, bruliĝi, ekbruliĝi, malbruli, malbruligi, malbruliĝi, estingigi, malestingigi, malestingiĝi, ekmalestingi, ekmalestingiĝi, ekmalestingiĝi.</p> <p>Ex ti 17 teoricien possibil derivates, solmen li 6 unesimes es correct; li 10 altres es falsmen format.</p>	<p>In summary, the rules of derivation in Esperanto theoretically allow the following series of words:</p> <p>bruli, bruligi, ekbruligi, ekbruli, estingi, estingiĝi, bruliĝi, ekbruliĝi, malbruli, malbruligi, malbruliĝi, estingigi, malestingigi, malestingiĝi, ekmalestingi, ekmalestingiĝi, ekmalestingiĝi.</p> <p>Out of these 17 theoretically possible derived words, only the first 6 are correct; the others are falsely formed.</p>
<p>On tro facilmen oblivia que li "vortfarado" in Esperanto totalmen ne es tam simplic e automatic quam on vale far nos creder. Por que un Esperanto-derivate mey esser correct, pluri preconditiones deve esser plenat queles yo va enumerar e curtmen comentar in li sequent lineas.</p>	<p>One tends to forget too easily that the "vortfarado" in Esperanto is in no way as simple and automatic as one would have us believe. For an Esperanto derived word to be correct, multiple preconditions have to be fulfilled that I will enumerate and make a few comments on in the lines to follow.</p>

<b>LI INTRICACITÁS DEL "VORTFARADO" IN ESPERANTO.</b>	<b>THE INTRICACIES OF ESPERANTO "VORTFARADO".</b>
<p>1. Li conossentie del radica ne suffice in Esperanto por posser formar correctmen li derivates. It es necessari saver es que ti radica es substantival, adjectival o verbal. In Occidental, noi deriva ex li du substantives "brosse" e "péctine" li verbes brossar e pectinar e li afere es liquidat. Anc in Esperanto noi forma li derivates brosi, brozado ex li substantive "broso". Ma por posser far to noi deve saver <i>in prim</i> que brosi- in Esperanto have un sense substantival. E to ne es tam self-evident, nam ti sam Zamenhof quel dat un sense substantival al radica brosi-, tracta in revancha li radica komb- (péctin-) quam verbal. On dunc ne posse dir secun li exemple de "bros-": kombo (péctine), kombi (pectinar), kombado (pectination), ma on deve derivar: kombi (pectinar), kombo (pectination), kombilo (péctine). Un altri exemple: Si on ne save <i>in antey</i> que li radica "varb-" have <i>in se self</i> un sense verbal o substantival, li resultates del derivation va esser totalmen diferent. In li unesim casu noi vell reciver: varbi (recrutar), varbo (recrutation), varbito (recrute); in li duesim casu li serie vell</p>	<p>1. Knowing a word root is not enough to correctly form derived words in Esperanto. One must know whether the root is a noun, adjective or verb root. In Occidental, we take the two nouns brosse (brush) and péctine (comb) to derive the verbs brossar (to brush) and pectinar (to comb) and call it a day. In Esperanto we also form the derived words brosi (to brush) and brozado (brushing) from the noun broso (a brush). But to do that, we have to know <i>ahead of time</i> that brosi- has the meaning of a noun in Esperanto. And it is not that obvious, because the same Zamenhof who made brosi- into a noun, made the root word komb- (comb) a verb. One thus cannot follow the example of brosi- to form kombo (comb), kombi (to comb), kombado (combing), but must derive with kombi (to comb), kombo (combing), kombilo (comb). Another example: if one does not <i>already know</i> that the word root varb- (recruit) <i>itself</i> has a verbal or noun meaning, the results of the derivation will be completely different. In the first case we would get: varbi (to recruit), varbo (recruiting), varbito (a recruit); in the second case</p>

<p>esser: varbo (recrute), varbigi (recrutar), varbigo (recrutation).</p>	<p>the series would be: varbo (a recruit), varbigi (to recruit), varbigo (recruiting).</p>
<p>2. It ne es desfacil divinar que "brul-" have in se self un sense verbal e pro to li desfacilitá mentionat in supra ne existe por ti radica. In revancha, li caractere verbal del radica in question fortia li usator distinter inter sense transitiv e íntransitiv, nam de ti distintion depende li corect o íncorect formation del derivates. Or, Sr. Manders self aconosse francmen que ti necessitá constantmen distinter inter verbes transitiv e íntransitiv, junt con li desfacilitá saver precisimen de omni verbes esque ili es in facte transitiv o íntransitiv, constitue un del max grand obstacules por li corect usa del lingue. It existe, secun Sr. Manders, poc persones queles save usar li sufixes -ig e -iĝ corectmen. Mem expert esperantistes usa les sovente in fals maniere. E li cúlmine del malchance es que ti du sufixes, queles conditiona li just formation del derivates secun li sense (transitiv o íntransitiv) del radicas, es just inter li max important e max frequentmen usat.</p>	<p>2. It is not difficult to guess that "brul-" itself has a verbal meaning, and because of that the difficulty mentioned above does not exist for this root. On the other hand, the verbal character of the root in question forces the user to distinguish between transitive or intransitive meaning, because the correct or incorrect formation of the derived words depends on it. Now, Mr. Manders himself outright recognizes that needing to constantly distinguish between transitive and intransitive verbs, along with the difficulty of knowing precisely whether each verb is one or the other, forms one of the greatest obstacles for the correct usage of the language. According to Mr. Manders, there are few people who are able to use the -ig and -iĝ suffixes correctly. Even expert Esperantists often use them wrongly. And the culmination of misfortune here is that these two suffixes, which set the conditions for the right formation of derived words according to the meaning (transitive or intransitive) of the roots, are two of the most important and frequently used.</p>
<p>3. Noi have in Esperanto un comod medie por indicar li contrarie, a saver li prefixe mal- (granda-malgranda, fermi-malfermi, nova-malnova etc.). On vell pensar que nequó es plu facil quam aplicar un prefixe con un tam clar e ínequivoc sense. Regretabilmen it es tal solmen sur li papere, nam it ne suffice conosser ti prefixe: quam monstra li exemple de "malbruli", on deve ancor saver in quel precisi casus on posse usar it e in queles ne. In facte, it existe in Esperanto un grand serie de antonimes queles ne es format per li prefixe mal-, ma es expresset per special radicas: kuraĵa-time; tiri-puŝi; komenci-fini; morti-vivi; preni-doni; perdi-trovi; ridi-plori; konfesi-nei; amuzi-enui; konverĝa-diverĝa; konkava-konvekso etc. etc. Si li aprensor ne have li certitá que un afixe con un tam clarmen definit sense posse esser usat sin restriction, a quo servi alor ti bell "autonomie" in li "vortfarado" de Esperanto?</p>	<p>3. We have a convenient way of indicating the opposite, namely the prefix mal- (granda-malgranda, fermi-malfermi, nova-malnova etc.). One would think that nothing could be easier than applying a prefix with such a clear and unequivocal meaning. Regrettably it is only so on paper, because just knowing it is not enough. As the "malbruli" example shows, one must also know in which precise cases to use it and in which cases not. In fact, Esperanto has a large series of antonyms that are not formed by the prefix mal- but by special roots: kuraĵa-time; tiri-puŝi; komenci-fini; morti-vivi; preni-doni; perdi-trovi; ridi-plori; konfesi-nei; amuzi-enui; konverĝa-diverĝa; konkava-konvekso etc. etc. If the learner is not certain that an affix with such a clearly defined meaning can be used without restriction, then what is the point of this lovely "autonomy" in Esperanto's "vortfarado"?</p>
<p>Ti incertitá pri li corectitá del Esperanto-derivates extende se anc a formes queles es grammaticalmen ínreprochabil. Li reproche quel on fa a Occidental retorna se contra Esperanto,</p>	<p>This uncertainty about what is correct in Esperanto's derived words even extends to forms that are grammatically unreproachable. The criticism that people make towards Occidental</p>

<p>nam anc in Esperanto on posse formar derivates queles, benque teoricien corect, támen ne coresponde a tis queles li usa ha consecrat quam genuin Esperanto-paroles.</p>	<p>hits Esperanto too, because in Esperanto as well one can form derived words that are, while theoretically correct, not the words that match those seen as Esperanto words as consecrated through usage.</p>
<p>Pro quo, por exemple, ne dir ŝraŭbo-turnilo vice ŝraŭbilo, si on anc di "korko-tirilo"? Pro quo ne ŝipejo vice haveno, si on anc posse dir automobilejo vice garaĝo? Si vagonaro sta por tren, eske alor tegularo e foliaro vell esser minu corect quam tegmento e libro? Pro quo ne herbaro vice herbejo, predikejo vice preĝejo, preĝejeto vice kapelo e mortintejo o enterigejo vice tombejo? etc. etc.</p>	<p>For example, why not say ŝraŭbo-turnilo (screw-turner) instead of ŝraŭbilo for screwdriver, if we say "korko-tirilo" (cork-turner) for corkscrew? Why not ŝipejo (ship-place) instead of haveno for harbour, since one can also say automobilejo (automobile-place) instead of garaĝo for garage? If vagonaro (wagon-many) stands for crain, then would tegularo (tile-many) and foliaro (page-many) be less correct than tegmento for roof and libro for book? Why not herbaro (herb-many) instead of herbejo (herb place) for garden, predikejo (preach-place) instead of preĝejo (pray place) for church, preĝejeto (pray-place-little) instead of kapelo for chapel and mortintejo (dead-person-place) or enterigejo (burying place) instead of tombejo (tomb place) for tomb? And so on and so forth.</p>

<p><b>LI "VORTFARADO" E LI "HOM DEL STRADE".</b></p>	<p><b>"VORTFARADO" AND THE "AVERAGE JOE".</b></p>
<p>Por facilisar li aprension del lingue, Esperanto reducte li númere del radicas a un minimum e recurre a su sistema de derivation por expresser un grand númere de notiones por queles omni lingues vivent usa special radicas. Ti sistema de derivation permesse mem expresser cert notiones fundamental per li artificial combination de afixes inter se. Ti possibilitá es unic in Esperanto e on posse considerar it con bon jure quam li triumf del principie del autonomie in li dominia del derivation. Ma just ta monstra se li congenital ínaptitá de ti principie quam factor de facilitá in li practic aplicacion del lingue. Yo professe un cert admiration por li ingeniositá del autores esperantistic queles excelle in li creation de nov paroles, unicmen basat sur li presc ínlimitat possibilitás quel oferta li sistema de derivation de Zamenhof. Ma ti admiration ne successa dupar me pri li practic valore del metodes usat. Yo defia quicunc prubar que ínstructet persones (queles Esperanto ya just considera quam li max</p>	<p>To make the language easy to learn, Esperanto reduces the number of root words to a minimum and resorts to its derivational system to express a large number of ideas for which all living languages use their own root words. This system of derivation even allows the expression of certain fundamental ideas by the artificial combination of affixes with themselves. This possibility is unique to Esperanto and can be considered with good reason the triumph of the principle of autonomy when it comes to derivation. But that is exactly where one sees the congenital inaptitude of this principle as a factor in making the language easy in its practical application. I profess a certain admiration for the ingenuity of Esperanto's authors who excel in creating new words that are only based on the almost unlimited possibilities that Zamenhof's derivational system offers. But this admiration still does not fool me about the practical value of the methods used. I challenge anyone to prove</p>

<p>important parte de su clientela) es vermen capabil formar self, per li unic auxilie del regules de derivation ti bell serie de "autonom" derivates queles noi incontra tam sovente in li production litterari esperantistic. Yo cita in hasarde: kunulo, almiliti, arigadi, obligi, falkuŝigi, elingigi, pliulo, kontraŭulo, alakvigi, onigilo, alaĵo etc. Yo incontrat in textus esperantistic li expression "ŝtono de falpuŝiĝo". Nequande yo vell har esset capabil constructer self un tal monstru. Solmen per un hasarde yo decovrit que it sta por F "pierre d'achoppement", G "Stein des Anstosses" e ancor hodie yo es incapabil explicar me li processe analisatori quel ha ductet a ti expression.</p>	<p>that uneducated people (those that Esperanto considers to be the most important part of its clientele) are truly able to put together themselves, through nothing more than the help of the rules of derivation, this nice series of "autonomous" derived words that we see so often in Esperanto's literary production. Here are a few that I cite at random: kunulo, almiliti, arigadi, obligi, falkuŝigi, elingigi, pliulo, kontraŭulo, alakvigi, onigilo, alaĵo etc. In some Esperanto texts I came across the expression "ŝtono de falpuŝiĝo". I never would have been able to put together such a monstrosity. Only by chance I found out that it stands for "stumbling block", and even today I am unable to explain to myself the analytical process that led to this expression.</p>
<p>Nequande un francese vell esser capabil formar li parol memstara, nam in su propri lingue ti notion es expresset per special radicas e null logic analise vell ducter le a selecter li radica star- por formar ti parol. Ti-ci ne es altricos quam li litteral traduction del R "samostayatelny" quel noi retrova sub li sam forme in G "selbständig" e Ned. "zelfständig".</p>	<p>A French person would never be able to put together the word "memstara" (independent), because in French this idea is expressed by special roots and no logical analysis would lead him to selecting the root star- to form it. It is nothing more than the literal translation of Russian "samostayatelny" that we see in the same form in German "selbständig" and Dutch "zelfständig".</p>
<p>Resumante lu exposit in supra, yo constata que ti assertet superioritá de Esperanto es ínexistent, nam it ne es possibil formar li derivates corectmen sin constantmen consultar li lexico.</p>	<p>Putting together what is shown above, I have established that the asserted superiority of Esperanto is nonexistent, as it is not able to form derived words correctly without constantly checking the dictionary.</p>
<p>ON DEVE CONSULTAR LI LEXICO por saver</p> <p>a) esque un dat radica es substantival, adjectival o verbal,</p> <p>b) esque un dat verbe es transitiv o íntransitiv,</p> <p>c) esque un dat notion posse efectivmen esser format per derivation o esque it es traductet per un radica autonom.</p>	<p>ONE HAS TO CHECK THE DICTIONARY to know</p> <p>a) whether a given root is a noun, adjectival or verbal root,</p> <p>b) whether a given verb is transitive or intransitive,</p> <p>c) whether a given idea can be effectively formed by derivation or whether it is translated using an autonomous root word.</p>
<p>A to on posse adjunter que</p> <p>d) Mem ta u Esperanto producte li besonat notion per li regules de su sistema de derivation, li aprensor es ancor fortiat consultar li lexico, nam in li majorité del casus queles concerne tipic Esperanto-derivates, li possibilitás de autonom</p>	<p>To that one can add that</p> <p>d) Even where Esperanto produces the needed idea using the rules of its derivational system, the learner is still forced to check the dictionary, because in the majority of cases that concern</p>

<p>formation excede li capabilitás analisatori ne solmen del poc instructet persones, ma mem de un grand parte del intelectuales. Li labor de analise necessari es tam grand que anc por ili li consultation del lexico es li plu curt via.</p>	<p>Esperanto's derived words, the possibilities of autonomous word formation exceed the analytical capabilities of not just the uneducated, but even many intellectuals. The analytical work needed is so great that even for them, checking the dictionary is the easiest way to do it.</p>
<p>A to on va forsan responder que mult esperantistes, mem poc instructet, fini per mastrisar li lingue in maniere tre satisfant pos un plu o minu long periode de practica. To sembla pruvar que li sistema de derivation in Esperanto ne es tro desfacil.</p>	<p>Many will reply to this saying that many Esperantists, even without much education, end up mastering the language quite well after a more or less long period of practice. That seems to prove that the derivational system in Esperanto is not all that hard.</p>
<p>To es just, ma li explication es facil. Li esperantistes totmen ne perdi lor témpor por formar self, con li auxilie del regules grammatical, li derivates queles ili besona. Ili fa exactmen to quo on reproche a Occidental, i.e. ili aprende li derivates <i>tot fat</i>, haustente les sive ex li lexicos, sive ex li letura o li conversation. E TO ES TRE NATURAL, NAM TO ES LI UNIC METODEDE POSSIBIL POR APRENDER UN LINGUE FOREN, NATURAL O ARTIFICIAL. E it es certmen ne Sr. Manders qui va contradir me in ti punctu, nam il aconosse self ti facte tre francmen in su libre, sin advere traer ex it ti conclusiones queles logicmen resulta ex ti state de cosas. Quelc citates va monstrar to:</p>	<p>That is correct, but easy to explain: Esperantists never waste their time using the grammatical rules to form the derived words themselves that they need. They do exactly what Occidental is criticized for, namely they learn the derived words <i>as is</i>, taking them from dictionaries, literature or conversation. AND THAT IS MOST NATURAL, BECAUSE THIS IS THE ONLY POSSIBLE WAY TO LEARN A FOREIGN LANGUAGE, NATURAL OR ARTIFICIAL. And Mr. Manders will certainly not contradict me on this point, because he recognizes this fact quite frankly in his book, though without drawing the conclusions that logically result from this. Some quotes will demonstrate:</p>
<p>(pag. 149): it es anc a remarcar que in li majorité del casus on ne sempre forma li derivates denov; on prunta les ex li lexico o on ha incontrat les durant li letura o li conversation e seque les poy conscientmen o ínconscientmen. Li majorité del esperantistes aprecia ne tam mult li possibilitá formar li derivates autonommen, quam li comoditá per quel ti derivates posse esser analisat e rememorat. In general, on recurre a autonom derivationes solmen quande it existe por to un special necessitá.</p>	<p>(page 149): <i>"Another thing to note is that in the majority of cases the derived words are not formed anew; people take them from the dictionary or have seen them through reading or conversation, and then follow them consciously or unconsciously. Most Esperantists are not as thrilled by the ability to form derived words themselves as they are by the convenience of being able to analyze and remember them. In general, people only resort to deriving their own words when there is a special need to make them."</i></p>
<p>(pag. 191): Nequí studia un vocabularium e certmen ne por aprender li pronunciation; por li max multes li letura constitue li unic o adminim li cardinal medie por familiarisar se con li lingue artificial.</p>	<p>(page 191): <i>"No one studies from the dictionary and certainly not to learn pronunciation; for most of them, reading is the only, or at least the main method to familiarize themselves with the artificial language."</i></p>



<p>(pag. 343): In realitá li derivation in Esperanto es basat precipue sur imitation. Li manuales cita un cert númere de exemples e apoyante se sur tis-ci, on forma self novi derivates. Li facte que analogie lude un plu grand rol quam reflectiones rational es ilustrat per li natura del max frequent erras in li application del lingue. It ne existe un absolut uniformitá in li application del regules de derivation, ne mem che li max bon autores del lingue.</p>	<p>(page 343): <i>“In reality, derivation in Esperanto is based mainly on imitation. The manuals cite a certain number of examples, and people lean on them to form new derived words themselves. The fact that analogy plays a larger role than rational reflection is illustrated by the nature of the most frequent errors in using the language. There is no absolute uniformity in applying the rules of derivation, not even among the best authors of the language.”</i></p>
<p>It es dunc etablisset que li sistema de derivation de Esperanto ne oferta plu mult advantages quam ti de Occidental, nam it ne líbera li aprensor plu mult del necessitá recurrer al lexico, quam to eveni in omni altri lingues. Li sol facilitá quel it oferta es que it furni un comod medie por analizar li derivates queles li aprendentes hauste tot fat ex li letura. Ma ti facilitá existe anc in Occidental e yo audacia asserter que in ti punctu Esperanto es mem íncontestabilmen inferiori a Occidental. Li derivates in Esperanto es in mult casus absolut arbitrari, nam ili ne sempre es li producte de un logic analise de lor sense; ili ha esset creat del prominent scritores esperantistic e ha poy esset colectet in li lexicos. Ma nequó pruva que li formes proposit de ti scritores es li max bon, ni mem li sol possibil. Secun li constation de Sr. Manders self, ti absolut uniformitá in li application del regules de derivation, quel vell teoricienmen dever resultar automaticmen del principie de autonomie, ne existe in Esperanto. Ne mem che li max bon scritores. Quel vell esser li resultate si on vell lassar chascun aprensor líber formar self li besonat derivates?</p>	<p>It is thus established that Esperanto’s system of derivation does not offer any more advantages than Occidental’s, for it does not free the learner of the need to resort to the dictionary, which is the case with all other languages. The only ease that it offers is the convenient method of analyzing the derived words that the learners draw from <i>as is</i> from their reading. But that ease exists in Occidental as well, and I dare say that in this point Esperanto is even incontestably inferior to Occidental. The derived words in Esperanto are in many cases absolutely arbitrary, because they are not always the product of a logical analysis of their meaning; they have been created by prominent Esperantist writers and are later collected into the dictionaries. But nothing proves that the forms proposed by these writers are the best, or even the only possible ones. According to Mr. Manders himself, this absolute uniformity in applying the rules of derivation, which should in theory automatically result from the principle of autonomy, does not exist in Esperanto. Not even among the best authors. What would be the result if one were to let all learners form the needed derived words for themselves?</p>
<p>In Occidental, in contrari, LI PRINCIPIE DEL INTERNATIONALITÁ</p> <p>furni in li majorité del casus un rocc-solid fundament por li selection del just afixes. Null beson rupter se li cap, pro quo on deve dir interpreto, ma kronado (interpretation, coronation); laboratorio, ma dormejo (laboratoria, dormitorio); sakramento, ma movado (sacrament, movement); reĝistaro, ma ornamaĵo (government, ornament), eksklusiva, ma puŝiĝema e instrua (exclusiv, impulsiv,</p>	<p>In Occidental, on the other hand, THE PRINCIPLE OF INTERNATIONALITY</p> <p>for the most part provides a rock-solid base for the selection of the right affixes. No need to rack one’s brains over why one says interpreto but kronado (interpretation, coronation); laboratorio, but dormejo (laboratoria, dormitorio); sakramento, but movado (sacrament, movement); reĝistaro, but ornamaĵo (government, ornament); eksklusiva, but puŝiĝema and instrua (exclusiv, impulsiv,</p>

<p>instructiv); aktoro, ma senatano (actor, senator); instruisto, ma triumfanto (instructor, triumfator); civilizii, ma realigi (civilisar, realisar); poroza, ma dorna (porosi, spinosi) etc. etc.</p> <p>Li international derivates resulta sempre con admirabil regularitá ex li construction del Occidental-paroles. Null beson posir se li question esque in un dat casu Esperanto usa por expresser un cert idé un parol autonom o un constructet combination ex elementes radical e afixal. In facte, qui va decider quo es corect: traduki o alilinvigi? importi o envenigi? konservi o malpereigi? halti o malmoviĝi? polvo o terereto? memori o malforgesi? komitato o anestraro? revolucio o alireĝimigo? reklamo o laŭdavizo? hamako o retolito? etc. In ti constant dilemma: parol international o parol autonommen derivat? li principie del internationalitá surti sempre quam victor ex li combatte. Noi assiste a un crescent invasion de radicas international ye li detriment del autonom Esperanto-paroles: substanco, direktoro, formacio, cirkonstanco, rezignacio, gladiatoro, armaturo, strukturo, solidara, protektorato, prokuroro (sic!), konkurenco, ekvivalento, ekspozicio, amplifikatoro, institucio, minimumo, sentimento, spekulativa etc. It monstra se que li election de paroles vermen international es sentit del esperantistes self quam li max comod via por inrichar li vocabularium. Ili lentmen, ma tenacimen dura substituer se al autonommen format, oficial Esperanto-radicas e derivates.</p>	<p>instructiv); aktoro, but senatano (actor, senator); instruisto, but triumfanto (instructor, triumfator); civilizii, but realigi (civilisar, realisar); poroza, but dorna (porosi, spinosi) etc. etc.</p> <p>One always obtains the international derived words with admirable regularity from the construction of words in Occidental. No need to ask oneself the question whether Esperanto, when expressing a certain idea, is to use an autonomous word or a constructed combination of root and affixed elements. In fact, who decides which is correct: traduki or alilinvigi? importi or envenigi? konservi or malpereigi? halti or malmoviĝi? polvo or terereto? memori or malforgesi? komitato or anestraro? revolucio or alireĝimigo? reklamo or laŭdavizo? hamako or retolito? etc. In this constant dilemma between international words and autonomously derived words, it is the principle of internationality that always emerges the victor. We are seeing a growing invasion of international roots to the detriment of autonomous words in Esperanto: substanco, direktoro, formacio, cirkonstanco, rezignacio, gladiatoro, armaturo, strukturo, solidara, protektorato, prokuroro (sic!), konkurenco, ekvivalento, ekspozicio, amplifikatoro, institucio, minimumo, sentimento, spekulativa etc. One sees that the selection of truly international words is felt by the Esperantists themselves as the best way to enrich the vocabulary. These words slowly but surely are replacing the autonomously formed and official Esperanto roots and derived words.</p>
--	--

<b>KALOCSAY ES RECT!</b>	<b>KALOCSAY IS RIGHT!</b>
Un altri facte tre interessant sublinea ancor li constatationes fat in supra:	Another most interesting fact underlines what has been established above:

<p>Si it existe un dominia in quel li tant trumpetat richesse del vocabularium de Esperanto vell dever posser monstrar su practic usabilitá, it es certmen ti del litteratura. Mersí a su presc ínlimitat possibilitás formar novi paroles per su ingeniosi sistema de afixes, it vell dever esser capabil expresser un infinitá de nuancias queles li vivent lingues ne posse rendir, pro que ili es ligat al leges del tradition in li formation del derivates. In curt, in lingue del tip Esperanto vell teoricismen dever esser superiori a omni lingues vivent in li dominia del litteratura. Ma it monstra se que ti marvelosi possibilitás creatori ne es sentit quam advantages, ma in contrari quam obstacules de tis queles seriosimen prova far servir Esperanto a scopes litterari. Anc pri to li libre de Sr. Manders es nos un preciosi testimon. Discussente li question del adaptabilitá del lingues constructet al exigentias litterari, li autor del libre alude li existentie de un centre litterari esperantistic in Budapest e da nos pri li activitá de su representantes li sequent, tre interessant detallies:</p>	<p>If there is one domain in which the trumpeted richness of the Esperanto vocabulary would need to show its practical usability, it is certainly that of literature. Thanks to its nearly unlimited possibilities of forming new words via its ingenious system of affixes, it should be able to express an infinity of nuances that living languages are unable to, because these other languages are tied to the laws of tradition in forming their derived words. In short, a language such as Esperanto should theoretically be superior to all living languages in the domain of literature. But it turns out that these marvelous creative possibilities are not felt as advantages, but on the contrary as obstacles to those that seriously try to have Esperanto serve literary means. The book by Mr. Manders is a precious witness to that subject as well. Discussing the question of adaptability of constructed languages to the needs of literature, the author mentions that there is a centre of Esperanto literature in Budapest and gives us the following information on those that represent it:</p>
<p>(pag. 142): Noi ja ha dit que Esperanto possede su propri litteratura e que Budapest ha devenit li centre de un cert númer de poetes e scritores, inter queles pluri ha productet remarcabil ovres. K. Kalocsay, li max talentat ex ili, pledat in un studie, intitulat "La evoluo de nia poezia lingvo" ardentmen por li libertá del poetes, inrichar li vocabularium. Precipue por metric traduções li ja existent vocabularium es considerat quam ínsuficient. In facte, li disponibil paroles sovente ne successa reproductet li desirat nuancias. It es necessari evitar quant possibil derivationes e parol-compositiones, pro que ili fa un impression artificial e încolori. Adplu ili es foneticmen desbell e have un plump aspecte, e finalmen ili es sovente tro long por metric traduções. Pro to Kalocsay totmen ne hesita introducer numerosi neologismes, precipue por vicear derivates.</p>	<p>(page 142): <i>"We have already said that Esperanto has its own literature and that Budapest has become the centre of a certain number of poets and writers, some of which have produced remarkable works. K. Kalocsay, the most talented of these, pleaded ardently in a study called "La evoluo de nia poezia lingvo" (the evolution of our poetic language) for the freedom for poets to enrich the vocabulary. The current vocabulary is thought to be insufficient mostly when it comes to metric translations. In fact, the words available are often unable to reproduce the nuances that are desired. They need to avoid derived words and word compositions wherever possible, because they give an impression that is artificial and lacking in colour. On top of this they are phonetically ugly and look plump, and finally are usually too long for metric translations. Because of this, Kalocsay never hesitates to introduce new words in great number, mainly to replace derived words."</i></p>
<p>It es ver que Sr. Manders considera in principie li introduction de neologismes con li scope inrichar li lingue litterari quam ínconciliabil con li scope</p>	<p>It is true that Mr. Manders in as a rule considers the introduction of neologisms to enrich the literary language as irreconcilable with the</p>

<p>fundamental del L.I. Ma ti opinion personal, respectabil in se self, ne posse far desaparir li concret factes queles il cita in su libre. E ti factes monstra clarmen que strax quande expertes esperantistic prova far servir lor lingue a scopes plu seriosi quam a scriir litt historiettes e exchangear ilustrat postcartes, ili senti li defectes inherent al tant laudat sistema de derivation. E por victer li desfacilitás ili recurre justmen al medies queles li teoreticos de Esperanto condemna in Occidental quam ínconciliabil con li principies fundamental del L.I., a saver li internationalitá del vocabularium. Per to ili confirma self que</p> <p>LI INTERNATIONALITÁ ES IN OMNI CASUS LI MAX SECUR E PRACTICMEN LI SOL POSSIBIL GUIDE POR LI EDIFICATION DE UN VOCABULARIUM QUEL SATISFA OMNI EXIGENTIES DE UN LINGUE UNIVERSAL.</p>	<p>fundamental goal of the international language. But that personal opinion, respectable in itself, cannot make the concrete facts that he cites in his book disappear. And these facts show clearly that, as soon as Esperantist experts try to have their language serve goals that are more serious than short stories and the exchange of illustrated postcards, they start to feel the inherent defects in this much lauded system of derivation. And to overcome these difficulties they resort to the very medium that the theoreticians of Esperanto condemn in Occidental as irreconcilable with the fundamental principles of an international language, namely the internationality of the vocabulary. By that they themselves confirm that:</p> <p>INTERNATIONALITY IS IN ALL CASES THE MOST SECURE AND IN PRACTICE THE ONLY POSSIBLE GUIDE FOR THE EDIFICATION OF A VOCABULARY THAT SATISFIES ALL NEEDS OF A UNIVERSAL LANGUAGE.</p>
<p>In facte, si li esperantistes self ne profita li assertet facilitá quel oferta les li mecanicmen rigid sistema de derivation por formar autonommen li besonat paroles, ma prefere li plu curt, plu direct e plu comod via quel consiste in hauster les "tot fat" ex li lexicos e ex li letura, tande li sistema de derivation in Esperanto perdi su unic avantage e conserva solmen li ínnegabil desavantages. Por Occidental li situation es just invers. Ta li sistema de derivation sta in li servicie del internationalitá: li derivates es international sin esser ínregulari, durant que in Esperanto ili es necessimen artificial si ili es regulari e obligatorimen ínregulari si ili es international. Un Occidental-derivate ne es minu facilmen analisabil quam un Esperanto-derivate. Li sol diferentie es que in Occidental ti analise explica li sense de un vivent parol international, durant que in Esperanto li objecte de ti analise es in li max mult casus un artificialmen constructet parol. Quel del du metodes oferta li plu grand cultural valore?</p>	<p>In fact, if Esperantists themselves do not take advantage of the asserted ease that the mechanically rigid system of derivation allows them in the autonomous formation of the words they need, but prefer the shorter, more direct and more convenient path in taking words "as is" from dictionaries and reading, then Esperanto's system of derivation loses its only advantage and keeps only the undeniable disadvantages. For Occidental the situation is the exact opposite. There, the system of derivation works in service to internationality: the derived words are international without being irregular, while in Esperanto they have to be artificial to be regular and irregular to be international. A derived word in Occidental is no less easy to analyze than one in Esperanto. The only difference is that in Occidental this analysis explains the meaning of a living international word, while in Esperanto the object of this analysis is an artificially constructed word most of the time. Which of the two methods offers the greater cultural value?</p>

<b>UN BON SISTEMA DE DERIVATION ES NECESSI!</b>	<b>A GOOD SYSTEM OF DERIVATION IS NEEDED!</b>
<p>Ex lu exposit in supra on vell posser concluder que li intrinsic valore del regules de derivation es questionabil in quelcunc sistema de L.I. Si on in principie sempre prefere aprender li derivates "tot fat" vice formar les autonommen, tande on vell posser contentar se per prender in chascun casu li parol max international e in registrar it in li lexicos sin ocupar se pri ca it vell esser regularimen formabil o ne. To es li via sequet in LsF e in li naturalistic modelle del lingues de IALA. In realitá un bon constructet sistema de derivation va sempre esser necessari pro li simplic motive que it ne existe por chascun notion un parol indiscussibilmen international. Un cert autonomie in li usation del regules de derivation va pro to esser benevenit, nam it permisse plenar eventual lacunes e adplu furni li possibilitá expresser nuancias queles manca in li vivent lingues. In ti punctu Occidental es ancor superior a Esperanto, nam mem paroles ne international conserva malgré omnicos lor omnicos lor natural aspecte, quo es un cose fundamentalmen ínpossibil in Esperanto. Li sistema de derivation in Occidental have li sam creatori capabilitá quam ti de Esperanto e li casus u on posse in bon fide hesitar pri li election del just afixe ne es plu frequent quam in Esperanto: it es solmen li causa del hesitation quel difere.</p>	<p>From what is shown above, one could come to the conclusion that the rules of derivation have questionable intrinsic value in any system for an international language. If people by principle always prefer to learn derived words "as is" instead of forming them themselves, then one could be content with taking the most international word in each case and putting it in the dictionary without worrying about whether it is regularly formed or not. That is the road taken by Latino sine Flexione and in the naturalistic model of the languages of the IALA. In reality, however, a well-constructed system of derivation will always be necessary for the simple reason that there is no indisputably international word for every meaning. A certain amount of autonomy in the rules of derivation will thus be welcome, because it allows filling in areas that lack, and on top of this, allows one to express nuances that are not found in other languages. In this point Occidental is even superior to Esperanto, because even words that are not international still keep a natural appearance, which is fundamentally impossible in Esperanto. The system of derivation in Occidental has the same creative capability as that of Esperanto and the cases where one has good reason to hesitate between the choice of the right word are no more frequent than in Esperanto: it is only the reason for the hesitation that differs.</p>

<b>LI VER DESFACILITÁS.</b>	<b>THE REAL DIFFICULTIES.</b>
<p>Sr. Manders ilustra in su exposite li lingual desfacilitás per un imponente liste de erras queles il trovat in lettres scrit de Esperantistes. Ti facte vell furnir nos un bell ocasion por substrekar li desfacilitás de Esperanto e por monstrar que mem in li "plej facila mundlingvo" li practic resultates ne confirma li bell teories. Ma noi ne va imitar li exemple de cert fanatic esperantistas queles, sin mem posseder contra Occidental li pruvas queles Sr. Manders furni nos contra Esperanto, declara apodicticmen nor lingue quam tro desfacil. Noi es sat rasonabil por aconosser</p>	<p>In his exposé, Mr. Manders shows some lingual difficulties through an imposing list of errors that he found in letters written by Esperantists. This would give us the opportunity to underline the difficulties of Esperanto and to show that even in the "plej facila mundlingvo" (easiest world language) the practical results do not match the pretty theories. But we will not imitate the example of certain fanatic Esperantists who, even without having the proof against Occidental that Mr. Manders provides us against Esperanto, declare with full confidence that our language is</p>

<p>que mem li max incredibil erras queles Sr. Manders cita in su libre es ancor insuficient por condemnar Esperanto. Anc li lettres scrit in Occidental per novicios con poc o null instruction lingual ne es mastre-ovres. In ti concernentie li situation es li sam por omni lingues, national o artificial. Si yo alude ti colection de erras citat de sr. Manders, it es unicmen por substrecar li constatation que <i>li real desfacilitás jace ni in li grammatica, ni in li derivation. Ili jace in li intricacitás del sintaxe e in li idiotismes</i>. Omni monoglottes have un enorm pena por liberar se del influentie perniciosi de lor lingue matrin. Ili ne conosse li diferentias existent inter li manieres de pensation del diversi popules e ili transporta sclavicmen in li lingue international omni particularitás sintactic e semantical de lor propri lingue matrin. Ti obstacul posse esser victet solmen per un long, assidui e atentiv letura de modellic scritores. On posse mem dir que in ti punctu li desfacilitás es tant grand que omni altres pallidija in comparation con ili. Ma just pro to, <i>li criticas directet contra Occidental perdi omni valore, nam li real labor a far es exactimen li sam por omni lingues</i>. E li resultate vell esser li sam, mem si ti criticas vell esser centvez plu justificat quam ili es in realitá. In revancha, li grand advantages queles Occidental oferta mersí al strict application del principie de internationalitá resta definitivmen inscrit al active de nor lingue e confirma su superioritá in relation con omni altri sistemas de L.I.</p>	<p>too difficult. We are reasonable enough to recognize that even the most incredible errors that Mr. Manders cites in his book are still insufficient to condemn Esperanto. The letters written in Occidental by new learners with little or no linguistic instruction are also no masterpieces. In this concern the situation is the same for all languages, national and artificial. If I allude to this collection of errors cited by Mr. Manders, it is only to underline the claim that the <i>real difficulties are not in the grammar, nor in the derivation. They are in the intricacies of syntax and in idioms</i>. All monoglots have enormous trouble liberating themselves from the pernicious influence of their mother tongues. They do not know the differences in modes of thought between diverse peoples and they slavishly bring in all the syntactic and semantic particularities of their mother tongue into the international language. This obstacle can only be overcome through long, assiduous, and attentive reading of model writers. One can even say that the difficulties in this point are so large that the others pale in comparison. But precisely because of this, <i>the criticisms directed against Occidental lose all their value, because the true work to be done is exactly the same in all languages</i>. And the result would be the same, even if these criticisms were to be a hundred times more justified than they truly are. On the contrary, the great advantages that Occidental offers thanks to the strict application of the principle of internationality are definitively inscribed into the assets of our language and confirm its superiority to all other international language systems.</p>
<p>***</p>	<p>***</p>
<p>Yo vell voluntarimen har extendet mi remarcas critical anc a altri lingues international, precipue Ido, vice restricter me a Esperanto. E yo anc havet in comensa li intention consacrar considerabilmen plu mult spacie al critica del sistema de derivation Zamenhofan. Ma ti exposite ha gradualmen tant crescet sub mi plum que yo devet finalmen restricter me al simplic enumeration del fundamental desfacilitás, sin ilustrar les per plu quam tre poc exemples haustet ex li voluminosi materiale quel yo hat colectet por ti scope. Yo espera támen que ili va</p>	<p>I would have liked to have extended my critical remarks to other international languages, mostly Ido, instead of restricting myself to Esperanto. And I originally intended to give much more space to criticism of Zamenhof's system of derivation. But this exposé has grown so large under my pen that I was finally forced to restrict myself to a simple enumeration of the core difficulties, without illustrating them with more than the very few examples taken from the voluminous material that I had collected for this goal. I hope, however, that they will suffice to</p>

suficer por monstrar li ínitenibilitá del tese quel picte li "autonomie" del sistema de derivation, tal qual it es aplicat in Esperanto e Ido, quam factor de facilitá in comparation con li sistemas del naturalistic scole e mem condemna tis-ci quam íncompatibil con li ver scope del lingue international.

A. Matejka

show the untenability of the thesis that paints the "autonomy" of the system of derivation as applied in Esperanto and Ido as the factor making them easy in comparison with the systems of the naturalistic school, and even condemn them as incompatible with the true goal of an international language.

A. Matejka