

**John Buchanan Masterclass**  
**on**  
**Esperanto language, literature, and culture**

**University of Liverpool**  
**26–28 March, 2014**

Note: original text made available for publication on  
[esperantoresearch.org.uk](http://esperantoresearch.org.uk) > esperantology.

**Language from literature**

**Wim Jansen**



AMSTERDAM CENTER  
FOR LANGUAGE AND  
COMMUNICATION



## **Contents**

<b>1. Constituent order</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. Some complicated affixes</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>3. The rise and fall of affixes</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>3.1. Lexicalization</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>3.2. Missing suffixes?</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>4. Participle constructions</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Annex 1 Semantic categories in Esperanto</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Annex 2 Explanation of terms</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Literature</b>	<b>34</b>

# 1. Constituent order

References:

Speech at the first Universal Congress: 30–33.<sup>1</sup>

Word order, or rather constituent<sup>2</sup> order, is not addressed in the *Esperanto Mini-Grammar* (here: EMG). This should not be a great surprise to us: most text books consider the order in which constituents are placed free, and tacitly copy patterns from the instruction language into Esperanto. Marček (2007) is no exception to this rule.<sup>3</sup> Without any explanation, Marček applies certain orders which we will define as statistical default patterns or basic orders in Section 1.1–1.5 below. Occasionally, he deviates from them, again without giving reasons. On p. 20 we find in one and the same exercise the two sentences (1) and (2):

(1) *Ilia domo estas apud via domo.*  
Their house is next to your house.  
'Their house stands next to your house.'<sup>4</sup>

(2) *Apud nia domo estas malgranda ĝardeno.*  
Next to our house is a small garden.  
'Next to our house there is a small garden.'

The attentive reader may wonder whether the inversion of the constituents around the central verb *estas* has anything to do with the difference in definiteness<sup>o</sup> between 'their house' and 'a small garden', or with the so-called presentative nature of (2), or whether one is simply free to choose the order. Similarly, there are the two sentences (3) and (4), immediately following each other on p. 41 of the same book, which read:

(3) *La infanoj lernas en la klaso.*  
The children study in the classroom.  
'The children study in the classroom.'

(4) *Lernejo estas domo, kie lernas infanoj.*  
A school is a building in which study children.  
'A school is a building in which children study.'

---

<sup>1</sup> All page numbers in the References at the beginning of each chapter indicate the relevant sections in Gubbins (ed.) (2012) from which the quotations were extracted.

<sup>2</sup> Terms followed by <sup>o</sup> are explained in Annex 2 'Explanation of terms'.

<sup>3</sup> *Esperanto by direct method*. I refer to the Dutch edition of 2007, which was extensively used in beginners' courses at the University of Amsterdam during the period 2008–2013.

<sup>4</sup> Two levels of translation are provided. The first one contains relevant constituents as 1:1 glosses of the original; the second one, enclosed in single quotes, is in current English, and reflects in most cases the literary translation from *Star in a Night Sky* (Gubbins [ed.], 2012).

Does the right-displacement of the subject *infanoj* ‘children’ in (4) have anything to do with a possible difference between main clause<sup>o</sup> and subclause orders, or is there a compelling reason to focus on the children and put the constituent in an unusual position? Marček doesn’t tell us.

The daily practice of Esperanto shows that many constituent groupings follow certain fixed default patterns. They are indeed easily modifiable — so there is some truth in the statement “the word order in Esperanto is free” —, but only in accordance with certain clear rules which have established themselves over decades of usage. In what follows, we’ll investigate ordering phenomena in clauses containing a subject<sup>o</sup> and an object<sup>o</sup> (1.1), in clauses in which there is only a subject (1.2), and in clauses with a copula<sup>o</sup>-supported predicate<sup>o</sup> (1.3). We’ll also look at negative clauses (1.4) and at noun phrases<sup>o</sup> (1.5). In all cases, we’ll identify default patterns and factors that may cause speakers to deviate from them.

The search for default patterns concentrates usually, though not necessarily, on what happens in information-neutral, non-interrogative, non-negative main clauses, containing a nominal<sup>o</sup> subject S and a nominal direct object O, e.g., a matter-of-factish statement like ‘The teacher holds a book in his hands’. Such investigations centre around the ordering or sequential arrangement of S and O in conjunction with the verbal predicate V under the quoted boundary conditions. If a dominant default pattern can be identified, we’ll call this the basic order. A sample of 1228 languages worldwide was analyzed with this purpose and it was found that the largest number of languages has the SOV pattern (497 languages), followed by SVO (435 languages).<sup>5</sup>

If we go through the contents of Zamenhof’s First Book and the Foundations of Esperanto — and not many clauses comply with the strict limitations I mentioned above — we cannot but conclude that the prescriptive root material of the language looks SVO.<sup>6</sup> Unfortunately, the sample is so small that SOV and VOS are not encountered at all. Therefore, Table 1 should be seen as a trend-setter without, a priori, much statistical value:<sup>7</sup>

*Table 1: Relative frequencies of patterns of S, O and V in the roots of Esperanto.*

OSV	OVS	SOV	SVO	VOS	VSO
8.5%	1.7%	0.0%	88.1%	0.0%	1.7%

In order to find out which patterns we may encounter in contemporary Esperanto, a corpus search was performed based on a statistically relevant sample of texts published in recent collections of the international magazines *Esperanto* and *Monato*. This corpus material shows the distribution given in Table 2:<sup>8</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Dryer (2005).

<sup>6</sup> Zamenhof (2004 [1887]) and (1963 [1905]) respectively.

<sup>7</sup> Jansen (2010: 279).

<sup>8</sup> Jansen (2008: 21).

Table 2: Relative frequencies of patterns of S, O and V in a modern text corpus.

OSV	OVS	SOV	SVO	VOS	VSO
1.1%	6.9%	0.4%	90.1%	1.2%	0.3%

The figures related to SVO and SOV in modern texts show a striking similarity with the root material of Table 1, with considerably more variation between the minority patterns. It seems confirmed that speakers and writers of Esperanto have a clear preference for SVO as the basic word order at sentence level. Thus, Esperanto joins one of the two worldwide largest groups of languages defined by this syntactic classification criterion. Let's now have a look at the text material from the literature course and verify the sentence patterns we find in there (Section 1.1–1.3).

### 1.1. The basic order SVO

Both quotations (5) and (6) are found in Zamenhof's wrapping up of two lengthy paragraphs of rhetoric. There is reason to believe that, given the speaker's communicative intention to sum up facts, the constituent orders we find here will in many cases reflect the default. And indeed, in (5) we notice the basic order SVO:

- (5) *Nis konsciuv bone la tutan gravecon de la hodiaŭa tago...* (SVO)  
 We should realize well the whole importance of today's day.  
 'Let us be fully aware of the significance of this moment...'  
 (Speech at the first Universal Congress, 1905: 31)

But in (6) a deviation occurs, and not only once, but twice:

- (6) *Kaj niaj filoj kaj nepoj ilin vidos, ilin sentos kaj ĝuos.* (SOV, SOV)  
 And our sons and grandsons them will see, them will feel and enjoy.  
 'And our sons and our sons' sons shall see them, sense them, enjoy them.'  
 (Speech at the first Universal Congress, 1905: 30)

The difference between (5) and (6) is that in the former clause we detect a fully-fledged nominal object, requiring all the articulatory energy needed to produce six syllables in the phonetic realization, whereas in (6) we see a light-weight two-syllable pronominal<sup>o</sup> object. Such light-weight items appear to be very mobile and eligible for a forward movement (in this case), if the speaker is of the opinion that such a movement would be functional. In the given case, there clearly is a positive stylistic effect that results from interposing *ilin* between S and V. At the same time the concatenation of the different ways of perceiving, and consequently enjoying, things is given more weight: *vidos-sentos-ĝuos*.

There is a rule, which can be observed cross-linguistically, which states that the information content in a clause is normally structured in such a way that old

information comes first and that new information is only gradually released. The newest piece of information comes at the very end. A consequence of this is that information which was introduced in a clause 1 (step 1) will have acquired the status of known information by the time this clause 1 is completed (step 2). If the speaker continues along the lines set out in clause 1, and formulates a clause 2, s/he often uses the information the hearer was most recently made familiar with as a bridge between clause 1 and 2 (step 3). In other words: the *new* topic that was introduced in clause 1 is pulled forward in clause 2 as the *known* topic, irrespective of the syntactic function it has (subject, object or otherwise). Due to this effect of topicalization, there may then be a shift of constituents away from the basic order. Example (7) illustrates this:

- (7) *La nomo de Schleyer*<sub>s</sub> *okupos*<sub>v</sub> *ĉiam la plej honoran lokon*<sub>o</sub> *en la historio de nia ideo*,...  
 'The name of Schleyer will occupy the most honoured place in the history of this idea,...' (SVO)  
 ... *kaj tiun ĉi nomon*<sub>o</sub> *la mondo*<sub>s</sub> *neniam forgesos*<sub>sv</sub>. (OSV)  
 '... and this name the world will never forget.'  
 (Speech at the first Universal Congress, 1905: 32)

In (7) we notice the upper clause 1 with the basic SVO, which introduces Schleyer, his name and his role as the new topic, followed by the conjunction *kaj* 'and' introducing the lower clause 2, in which 'this name' has been moved out of its habitual extreme right position to the far left, from SVO to OSV. This is a typical topicalization move, through which the constituent *tiun ĉi nomon* builds the bridge between the two clauses.

## 1.2. The basic order SV

In (8) below, we encounter S only followed by a lexical verb V but without an object O. The quotation is from the closing sentence of a paragraph, in which Zamenhof summarizes his conclusions. We are, therefore, dealing with the statement of a fact (no matter what we may think of spirits flying through the air), and it nicely follows the basic order SV(O):

- (8) *La fantomoj*<sub>s</sub> *flugos*<sub>v</sub> *en la mondon*... (SV)  
 The spirits will fly into the world...  
 'These spirits are flying into our world...'  
 (Speech at the first Universal Congress, 1905: 30)

Now look at (9). Having characterized, earlier in his speech, the modesty of this first large-scale gathering of Esperanto speakers as private individuals fostering an ideal, Zamenhof now builds a sharp contrast with the glitter of political summit meetings:

- (9) *Ne kunvenis<sub>v</sub> regnestroj<sub>s</sub>, nek ministroj<sub>s</sub>,...* (VS)  
 Did not meet heads of state, nor ministers,...  
 'No heads of state, no ministers, meet here...'  
 (Speech at the first Universal Congress, 1905: 30)

Quotation (9) is the first of a series of three in which S is consistently moved backward out of its habitual clause-initial position, thereby attracting the attention of the hearer, who now focuses on the contrast. What facilitates the mobility in this particular case is the heavy weight of the seven-syllable *S regnestroj nek ministroj*. In other words, we are facing the joint influence of the pragmatic function 'emphasis' or 'contrast' and the structural weight of S, which together render it very susceptible to a backward movement out of its expected position.

### 1.3. The copula-supported predicate in SCopA

- (10) *Ĉia interkompreniĝado<sub>s</sub> inter ili estas<sub>cop</sub> ... ne ebla<sub>A</sub>.* (SCopA)  
 Any understanding between them was ... not possible.  
 'Any kind of mutual understanding was ... out of the question.'  
 (Speech at the first Universal Congress, 1905: 30)
- (11) *Tie la reciproka kompreniĝado<sub>s</sub> estas<sub>cop</sub> atingebla<sub>A</sub>...* (SCopA)  
 There the reciprocal understanding is achieved...  
 'There, reciprocal understanding is achieved...'  
 (Speech at the first Universal Congress, 1905: 30)

In (10) and (11) above, we recognize two matter-of-factish statements and the CopA order in them is the same we encounter in English. It is embedded in an overall SV type sequence, considering that Cop behaves like V. Now, when looking at (12) and (13) below, we notice a clear change: the expected CopA order is inverted and has become ACop. In addition, this inverted subset is now embedded in an inverted VS type sequence. Both (12) and (13) are perfect mirror images with respect to what we expected based on (10) and (11):

- (12) *Sankta<sub>A</sub> estas<sub>cop</sub> por ni la hodiaŭa tago<sub>s</sub>.* (ACopS)  
 Sacred is for us the day of today.  
 'This day, for us, is sacred.'  
 (Speech at the first Universal Congress, 1905: 30)
- (13) *Modesta<sub>A</sub> estas<sub>cop</sub> nia kunveno<sub>s</sub>.* (ACopS)  
 Modest is our meeting.  
 'Our meeting is modest.'  
 (Speech at the first Universal Congress, 1905: 30)

Both short statements (12) and (13) come at the beginning of Zamenhof's address, almost in the form of an outcry, two slogans joined into one, emphasizing the sacred character of the day and the low profile of the event. 'Emphasis', as we have seen, is easily expressed in the Esperanto syntax by a constituent inversion, which, in turn, is the result of the deliberate movement of a constituent out of its habitual position. In (12) and (13) we see the combined action of a forward movement of A, followed by a forward movement of the entire ACop complex. The result is that the uncommon ACop now occupies an uncommon clause position, which is the reason why it strongly attracts the hearer's attention. And this is precisely what Zamenhof wanted to achieve. Just listen to yourself as you pronounce the statements *La hodiaŭa tago estas sankta por ni* and *Nia kunveno estas modesta*, and you will agree that these are flat messages without any appeal when compared with (12) and (13).

The quotations (5)–(13) contain illustrations of what is formulated elsewhere<sup>9</sup> as a practical rule concerning the ordering of constituents in a clause: the basic order is SVO, which is freely modifiable under the pressure of pragmatic considerations (focussing and topicalization) or structural weight. A basic order was not prescribed in early Esperanto, nor was it described in any detail. Nevertheless, its presence is an observable fact, and it is susceptible to influence factors which are known cross-linguistically. Their occurrence in Esperanto supports the thesis that the language's syntax develops spontaneously and in a natural way.

#### 1.4. The basic negation order NegV

Marček (2007: 11) introduces negation by giving examples of answers to yes-no questions, but does not formulate a rule. EMG: 42 states that "*ne* means 'not', and negates the following word or phrase". In reality, the situation is a little more complex. Let's first of all distinguish between clausal negation (the whole sentence or linguistic expression is negated), and constituent negation (only part of the expression is negated, i.e. a constituent or, in the extreme case, one word only). Even though this distinction is important, it can be shown that negative clauses in Zamenhof's First Book and Foundations have *ne* consistently in the immediate pre-verbal position as long as there is no explicit contrast in the expression (a prescriptive rule is absent).<sup>10</sup> In the literary text under review we see this illustrated by (14) and (15):

- (14) *La vortoj ... ne flugos<sub>v</sub> telegrafe al ĉiuj urboj kaj urbetoj de la mondo.* (NegV)  
 The words ... not fly by telegraph to all cities and towns of the world.  
 'The words ... fly not by telegraph to all the towns and cities of the world.'  
 (Speech at the first Universal Congress, 1905: 30)

---

<sup>9</sup> Jansen (2008: 35).

<sup>10</sup> Jansen (2008: 23, table III).



Above, it is the linguistic expression in its entirety which is negated. In the days of this first congress there would have been no alternative to a ‘flight by telegraph’, so that, no matter how hard we try, there is no way to interpret the expression as the negation of the ‘telegraph’ only, in favour of some hidden alternative. The picture in (15) is the opposite: there is no question about *ili* (the pioneers remembered by Zamenhof) being deceased; they are physically dead, but not so in our memories, which is the constituent negated. Perhaps some of us expected (15) to be VNeg: *Sed ili mortis ne en nia memoro*, but NegV turns out to be very stable:

- (15) *Sed ili ne mortis<sub>v</sub> en nia memoro.* (NegV)  
 But they not died in our memory.  
 ‘They live on in our memories.’  
 (Speech at the first Universal Congress, 1905: 33)

What is shown in (15) is in line with the didactic root material from which we started, and also with the treatment of contrastless constituent negation in the earlier mentioned corpus research. In (16) below, we see what happens when an explicit contrast is added (in this case *sed kiel fratoj* ‘but as brothers’, left out here because it wouldn’t fit in nicely). The negation particle *ne* appears moved to the right, far beyond the verb, so as to form a kind of ‘not X but Y’ construction, *ne kiel fremduloj, sed kiel fratoj*), an expression of immediate contrast without any disturbing discontinuities. In the modern text corpus, almost 70% of the relevant clauses follow this model.<sup>11</sup>

- (16) *Ni membroj ... staras<sub>v</sub> unu apud la alia ne kiel fremduloj,...* (VNeg)  
 We members ... stand one next to the other not as foreigners, ...  
 ‘We, members ... stand side by side not as foreigners, ...’  
 (Speech at the first Universal Congress, 1905: 31)

The quotations (14)–(16) illustrate what could be termed a refinement of the EMG rule. In clausal negations and contrastless constituent negations the particle *ne* comes before the verb. When, in the case of a constituent negation, an explicit contrast or alternative is mentioned, *ne* tends to move to the right building a continuous ‘not X but Y’ construction. The sequence NegV is the basic order and appears to be very stable.

## 1.5. The basic order AN

Marček (2007: 15) introduces adjectives A by giving examples of answers to questions built on *kia* ‘what kind of’, but does not formulate a rule. Both attributive<sup>o</sup> and predicative<sup>o</sup> adjectives are shown. EMG: 3 states that “adjectives tend to denote

---

<sup>11</sup> Jansen (2008: 24, table IV).

characteristics, and are used to describe nouns”. EMG further notes that adjectives may go before or after the noun N, but it relates this distinction to attributive and predicative adjectives respectively. The mobility of an attributive adjective around its head<sup>o</sup> noun is not addressed: so, is it either AN, or NA, or both?

Zamenhof’s First Book and Foundations give for all occurrences of noun phrases 88% AN and 12% NA.<sup>12</sup> The modern text corpus gives an even more skewed distribution with 96.4% AN and 3.6% NA.<sup>13</sup> It is clear from the corpus that AN is almost automatically applied in an information-neutral context. This is the case in example (17) below, which is the continuation of (9) where heads of state and ministers were introduced, so that there can’t be any discussion about the kind of maps that are meant here. There is no alternative to the qualification *politikan* ‘political’, which therefore requires no stress or emphasis:

- (17) *Por ŝanĝi la politikan<sub>A</sub> karton<sub>N</sub> de la mondo...* (AN)  
 To change the political map of the world...  
 ‘To change the political map of the world...’  
 (Speech at the first Universal Congress, 1905: 30)

Instead, in (18) below, Zamenhof’s intention was clearly to emphasize not the presence of souls in the audience but the requirement they be sensitive, if they want to pick up the “strange and faintest of sounds” that he describes in this introduction:

- (18) *Senteblej por ĉiu animo<sub>N</sub> sentema<sub>A</sub>:...* (NA)  
 Sensible to every soul sensitive:...  
 ‘And yet sensible to every sensitive soul:...’  
 (Speech at the first Universal Congress, 1905: 30)

Another reason for abandoning the basic order AN is structural weight (compare a similar effect in [9] above). This can be caused by one single, multi-syllable adjective or by a combination of adjectives which are all equally important in their qualifying roles. Of this latter condition we find a nice example in the text under review. The complex qualification *nenatura-ofenda-maljusta* is too heavy for placement before the head noun *vojo* and is consequently moved to the right:

- (19) *Per vojo<sub>N</sub> nenatura<sub>A</sub>, ofenda<sub>A</sub> kaj maljusta<sub>A</sub>,...* (NAAA)  
 By (a) way unnatural, offensive and unjust...  
 ‘By means that are unnatural, offensive and unjust,...’  
 (Speech at the first Universal Congress, 1905: 30)

---

<sup>12</sup> Jansen (2008: 25, table V).

<sup>13</sup> Jansen (2008: 25, table VI).

The examples (17)–(19) illustrate the rule that governs the placement of attributive adjectives before or after the head noun: the basic order is AN, and inversions to NA are facilitated by pragmatic conditions (focussing) and structural weight.

Exercise: use the prose on page 184–185<sup>14</sup> (*Tena: A Home in Central Europe* [extract], 1996) and on page 314–315 (*Been There, Done That* [extract], 1989) to identify one basic and one deviating order for each of the groupings addressed in Section 1.1 through 1.5. Try to find a justification for each deviation from the standard.

---

<sup>14</sup> Page numbers in the Exercises refer to Gubbins (ed.) (2012).

## 2. Some complicated affixes

References:

From the “Green Bible”, 1935: 64–65.

Away with neutrality! [extract], 1922: 76.

As Water of the River [extract], 1963: 135.

Children at a Window Display, 1931: 195.

The Infant Race [extracts: chapters I and II], 1956: 228–229.

Richness, 1953: 246.

Autumn Leaves, date unknown: 275.

In order to understand how the word building system in Esperanto works it is important to know which semantic categories are relevant in the language. For this special topic, reference is made to Annex 1. Table 4 in this Annex gives an overview of the semantic categories and designations by lexemes<sup>o</sup> (formally expressed as stems or *radikoj*). Lexemes are the lowest level at which semantic categories are designated. For instance, the category Location, according to Table 4 designated by the lexeme *lok-* ‘place’, also applies to the derivation *lern-ej-* ‘school’, the compound *futbal-kamp-* ‘football field’, the prepositional phrase *en la ĉambro* ‘in the room’ and others. What concerns us here is the level of derived lexemes or affixed stems. In particular, we’ll treat derivations by the suffixes *-aĵ*, *-ec* and *-ul*. In this Section we’ll go through them one by one.

Marček (2007: 77) introduces *-aĵ* through examples only, without any explanatory narrative.<sup>15</sup> Some of his examples are: *skrib-aĵ-o* ‘writing, script’, *dolĉ-aĵ-o* ‘(something) sweet’ and *alkohol-aĵ-o* ‘alcoholic drink’. EMG: 4 defines the suffix *-aĵ* as follows: “*-aĵ* forms words for things of a specified type, often physical objects”, and gives the following examples: *nov-aĵ-o* ‘item of news’, *seg-aĵ-o* ‘sawdust’, *trink-aĵ-o* ‘(a) drink’, *arane-aĵ-o* ‘spider’s web’, *glaci-aĵ-o* ‘ice cream’ and *ŝaf-aĵ-o* ‘mutton’.<sup>16</sup> The circumstance that both Marček and EMG build their examples with *-aĵ* on base words which are either adjectives, verbs, or nouns, suggests that *-aĵ* can be applied to stems of different semantic categories. This, in turn, means that the pretty short-hand definition of EMG, despite the great mnemonic merit it has, is insufficient in terms of predicting what the meaning of an *aĵ*-derivation built on a particular stem is to be. The following examples illustrate this:

- (20) *Estu firm-aĵ-o en la lingvo.*<sup>17</sup>  
(There) be something fixed in the language.  
‘Let there be a fixed point in the language.’  
(From the “Green Bible”, 1935: 64)

<sup>15</sup> The spelling of *-aĵ* conceals its link with French *-age* in, e.g., *ouvrage* ‘literary work’ (Esperanto *verkaĵo*) and *témoignage* ‘testimony’ (Esperanto *atestaĵo*).

<sup>16</sup> Both in running text and in numbered quotations, I often include hyphens in the derivations. This is for didactic purposes only. In normal written or printed text, such hyphens are never used.

<sup>17</sup> Note that the poet Nikolao Kurzens uses the term *firmamento* in his more mature Esperanto in *Aŭtuna Elegio*, 1933 (Gubbins [ed.]: 274).

- (21) *La Fundamento kreskigu verd-aĵ-on,...*  
 The Foundation make grow something green, ...  
 'Let the Foundation bring forth greenery...'  
 (From the "Green Bible", 1935: 64)

In (20) and (21), the suffix *-aĵ* creates the Individuals *firm-aĵ-* and *verd-aĵ-* out of the Dependent Properties *firm-* and *verd-*, i.e. it turns these qualities into tangible or visible instantiations without specifying these any further, without adding any semantics to them. That's why the glosses read 'something fixed' and 'something green'. Hence, a *bel-aĵ-o* 'beauty' may refer to such disparate 'things' as a painting, a car, a scientific experiment, or a wedding cake. It is the context that will help us to understand what is meant. We could identify this role of *-aĵ* as *-aĵ<sub>1</sub>*.

The next examples are different. In (22), *-aĵ* is applied to *est-* 'be', and the derived lexeme *est-aĵ-* carries the meaning 'whatever exists' or, more restricted, 'living being'.<sup>18</sup> We might be tempted to view 'whatever exists' as being as indefinite as the 'something fixed' we saw above, but there is a difference: these derivations in *-aĵ* tend to have conventionalized meanings; this is illustrated by 'living being' and other word examples like *kresk-aĵ-o* (not just 'whatever grows', but 'plant') and *brul-aĵ-o* (not just 'anything that burns', but 'fuel'). There is a clear tendency to add a specific semantic charge to each of these derivations. We could identify this more specific role of *-aĵ* as *-aĵ<sub>2</sub>*.

- (22) *La vortaro aperigu vivajn est-aĵ-ojn,...*  
 The dictionary make appear living beings, ...  
 'Let the dictionary bring forth living creatures, ...'  
 (From the "Green Bible", 1935: 65)

In (23) and (24) below, we find confirmation of our plea for a specific *-aĵ<sub>2</sub>* variant of the basic *-aĵ* (now reduced to *-aĵ<sub>1</sub>*). In these cases, the base of the derivation is an Individual and, consequently, a derivation by *-aĵ*, which creates another Individual, *must* add a semantic charge to the one it operates on, otherwise the whole derivation would make no sense. In other words, the earlier mentioned *alkohol-aĵ-o* is not 'something containing alcohol' but an 'alcoholic drink'. *Lum-* being 'light', *lum-aĵ-* > *lum-aĵ-o* must be more than 'light': it is a device or a body that radiates light (even if we continue to call it 'light'). If *ĉifon-* translates as 'rag', *ĉifon-aĵ-* > *ĉifon-aĵ-o* must be a piece of cloth destined to be used as, or looking like, a rag.

- (23) *Estu lum-aĵ-o en la ĉiela firmaĵo,...*  
 (There) be something illuminating in the firmament of heaven, ...  
 'Let there be a light in the firmament of the heaven...'  
 (From the "Green Bible", 1935: 65)

<sup>18</sup> <http://vortaro.net/>: bèta version of PIV on the Internet.

- (24) *El ĉifon-aĵ- kaj stupo...*  
 Out of rag fabric and stuffing...  
 'Of rags and stuffing...'  
 (Children at a Window Display, 1931: 195)

There is an even further specialization of *-aĵ*, which is not attested in our review text, but which is mentioned here for the sake of completion. This concerns the conversion of a countable property into an edible mass property, e.g., *pork*- 'pig' > *pork-aĵ*- > *pork-aĵ-o* 'pork'. This application affects a small number of edible animals and is clearly culturally determined. EMG: 4 quotes *ŝaf-aĵ-o* 'mutton' from *ŝaf*- 'sheep'; similarly, *ĉeval-aĵ-o* is 'horse meat' only, but, according to PIV, *azen-aĵ-o* is 'donkey meat' or 'stupidity'. PIV does not tell us which way *vulp-aĵ-o* may go ('fox meat' and/or 'act of shrewdness' from *vulp*- 'fox?'), and *serpent-aĵ-o* ('snake meat' and/or 'a politician's wriggling' from *serpent*- 'snake?'), once these derivations are introduced by the speech community.

A simple rule like the EMG rule quoted in the introduction to this Section can be very helpful, but the student should always be aware that the linguistic reality is often more complex than that, even in Esperanto. The generic approach 'thing of a specified type' really applies to *aĵ*-derivations of qualifications only (of the *bel-aĵ*-type). From there on we see an increase in specification, specialization or conventionalization, whichever label we wish to use. And there is a certain correlation with the semantics of the stems which are eligible for *aĵ*-derivation, with the highly specialized, but rather inexplicable 'mutton-and-pork' type formations at the end of the scale. The distinction between *aĵ*<sub>1</sub>, *aĵ*<sub>2</sub>, and *aĵ*<sub>3</sub> type derivations is an attempt to model these differences, but should not be interpreted as a mathematical description of a linguistic reality.

Exercise: use the prose on page 184–185 (*Tena: A Home in Central Europe* [extract], 1996) and on page 314–315 (*Been There, Done That* [extract], 1989) to identify instantiations of *-aĵ* in different applications.

Marček (2007: 78) introduces *-ec* through examples, of which the first one could be seen as a short-hand rule: "The property of a good man is goodness".<sup>19</sup> Some of his examples are: *bel-ec-o* 'beauty', *pur-ec-o* 'cleanliness' and *amik-ec-o* 'friendship'. EMG: 17 defines the suffix *-ec* as being "equivalent to '-ness' in English". Two of its examples are *strang-ec-o* 'strangeness' and *infan-ec-a* 'childlike, childish'. Similarly to what was said under *-aĵ*, both Marček and EMG build their examples with *-ec* on base words from different classes, suggesting the applicability of *-ec* to stems of different semantic categories. This, again, means that the references in EMG to '-ness', '-like' and '-ish', may be insufficient in terms of predicting what the meaning of an *ec*-

<sup>19</sup> Not the spelling of *-ec*, but its pronunciation [èts], reveals its origin in the Romance languages, in the first place Italian *-ezza* (*lunghezza* 'length'), to a lesser extent French *-esse* (*jeunesse* 'youth') and Spanish *-eza* (*belleza* 'beauty').

derivation built on a particular stem is to be. The following two sets of examples illustrate this. In (25) and (26) we seem to have two classic instantiations of the ‘-ness’ type (even though there is more variation than just ‘-ness’ in English):

(25) *Tio estas nur banala ĝentil-ec-formulo.*  
 This is just (a) banale politeness-formula.  
 ‘These words were mere politeness.’  
 (As Water of the River [extract], 1963: 135)

(26) *Senfina divers-ec-o de la vivo!*  
 Infinite diversity of life!  
 ‘And all life’s infinite variety...’  
 (Richness, 1953: 246)

Clearly, we are dealing with the qualities *ĝentil-* ‘polite’ and *divers-* ‘diverse’ (both primarily used in adjectival applications), which have become *ĝentil-ec-* and *divers-ec-*. The role of *-ec* is that of preparing a property that is preferentially used as an adjective for application in a noun position. There is no separate semantic charge that comes with this *-ec*, which we might call *-ec<sub>1</sub>*. The application *-ec<sub>1</sub>* always refers to ‘the property of someone/something’.

The situation is different in (27). Semantically, the stem *burĝ-* ‘bourgeois person’ is an Individual, destined to be used in a noun slot. Adding *-ec<sub>1</sub>* to this stem, preparing it for the slot it was anyway destined to occupy, would make no sense if the move wasn’t accompanied by the import of additional semantics. This leads to the identification of the variant *-ec<sub>2</sub>*, which is the complement of *-ec<sub>1</sub>*. The additional semantics imported into the derived stem is the overall set of properties or characteristics which naturally pertain to a bourgeois person. In fact, the translator of (27) refers to them as ‘bourgeois properties’. Similarly, *infan-ec-o* translates as the set of characteristics that come with childhood, e.g., applied to an adult as ‘childishness’.

(27) *Emo pri nomkonigado kaj aliaj burĝ-ec-oj.*  
 Tendency towards status and other bourgeois properties.  
 ‘[tends towards] status and other bourgeois traits.’  
 (Away with neutrality! [extract], 1922: 76)

A number of times, the so-called primary destination of a stem has been invoked, e.g., A *ĝentil-a* < *ĝentil-*, N *burĝ-o* < *burĝ-*. This expression suggests there may be secondary, and perhaps even less frequent, ways of using a stem or derived stem in the syntax. EMG: 17 gives us the example of A *infan-ec-a* ‘childish’, instead of the primary N *infan-ec-o* ‘childishness’. Other examples of this we encounter in (28) and (29) below. In (28) the Property *sol-* ‘sole, one and only’ produced first *sol-ec-* ‘solitude’, which subsequently appears not as the noun *sol-ec-o* ‘solitude’, but as the adjective *sol-ec-a* meaning ‘in solitude, all on its own, lonely’.

- (28) *Sub sol-ec-a seka arbo.*  
Under (a) lonely dry tree.  
'Beneath a lone tree's naked boughs.'  
(Autumn Leaves, date unknown: 275)

In (29) it is the earlier explained noun *burĝ-ec-o* 'set of bourgeois characteristics' (27) which is applied as an adjective, i.e. 'an atmosphere characterized by bourgeois properties':

- (29) *Burĝ-ec-a atmosfero.*  
Bourgeois atmosphere.  
'Bourgeois atmosphere.'  
(Away with neutrality! [extract], 1922: 76)

When comparing (29) with (30) below, we notice the delicate difference between *burĝeca*, meaning 'characterized by bourgeois properties', and *burĝa*, meaning 'of bourgeois persons'.

- (30) *Burĝ-a spirito.*  
(A) bourgeois spirit.  
'A bourgeois spirit.'  
(Away with neutrality! [extract], 1922: 76)

Once again we see that a simple definition like the one quoted in EMG, provided with a set of examples, or even examples only (Marček), can help the student to induce the general rule. On the other hand, the complexity of the linguistic reality may make it difficult to discern some interesting details. In this particular case, the similarity between, e.g., *boneco* and *infaneco* should not lead the learner astray and make him/her infer that these are derivations of the adjectives *bona* and *infana*. Derivation in Esperanto is a process that is dealt with in the lexicon, and not at the morphosyntactic level of words. In reality, we are dealing with two complementary variants of the suffix *-ec*: *-ec<sub>1</sub>*, which prepares the base stem for use in a different environment without an additional semantic import, and *-ec<sub>2</sub>*, which leaves the base stem in its environment, but singles out its properties or characteristics.

Exercise: use the prose on page 184–185 (*Tena: A Home in Central Europe* [extract], 1996) and on page 314–315 (*Been There, Done That* [extract], 1989) to identify instantiations of *-ec* in different applications.



The last suffix we'll discuss here is *-ul*, which is less complicated than *-aĥ* or *-ec*, but added because of its complementarity.<sup>20</sup> EMG: 62 defines it as forming “words for people of a specified type”, and the examples *jun-ul-o* ‘young person’ and *milion-ul-o* ‘millionaire’ have the same explanatory power as *bon-ul-o* ‘good person’ and *riĉ-ul-o* ‘rich person’ in Marček (2007: 78). The following examples (31)–(33) from our literary text material further illustrate the use of *-ul*:

- (31) *Por eterna turmento de la novaj verd-ul-oj.*  
 For eternal torment of the new green persons.  
 ‘For the eternal torment of new green followers.’  
 (From the “Green Bible”, 1935: 65)
- (32) *Praavaj kaj vilaj sovaĝ-ul-oj...*  
 Ancestral and hairy wild men...  
 My hairy savage ancestors...  
 (The Infant Race [extracts: chapters I and II], 1956: 228)
- (33) *Ĉiu almoz-ul-o...*  
 Every beggar...  
 ‘Every beggar.’  
 (The Infant Race [extracts: chapters I and II], 1956: 229)

Remember that after (22) we concluded that it was helpful to distinguish between *-aĥ*<sub>1</sub> (deriving an Individual from a Dependent Property) and *-aĥ*<sub>2</sub> (deriving an Individual from an Individual with additional semantic import). This is not needed here, because *-ul* does not just create an Individual type derived stem, but an *animate* Individual, and this semantic detail is enough to explain the general operation of *-ul* on any base stem. In other words, *sovaĝ-* > *sovaĝ-ul-* > *sovaĝ-ul-o* ‘wild man’ and *almoz-* > *almoz-ul-* > *almoz-ul-o* ‘beggar’ are operations governed by one undifferentiated suffix *-ul*, despite the fact that *sovaĝ-* as a quality is a Dependent Property and *almoz-* an Individual, translated by the adjective ‘wild’ and the noun ‘alms’ respectively.

Exercise: use the prose on page 184–185 (*Tena: A Home in Central Europe* [extract], 1996) and on page 314–315 (*Been There, Done That* [extract], 1989) to identify instantiations of *-ul* in different applications.

<sup>20</sup> The origin of this suffix is unclear. All we can say is that there are isolated occurrences of *-ul* in Latin and Russian with the approximate meaning which Zamenhof reserved for it in his grammar.

### 3. The rise and fall of affixes

#### 3.1. Lexicalization

References:

Away with neutrality! [extract], 1922: 76.

As Water of the River [extract], 1963: 135.

The Infant Race [extracts: chapters I and II], 1956: 228.

Autumn Leaves, date unknown: 275.

Lexicalization<sup>o</sup> cannot be described as a single productive process, which could be captured by one generalized rule. Many forms of linguistic material (if not all, in theory) are candidates for lexicalization. Examples in Esperanto are the imperative *vivu!* ‘long live!’ promoted to the verb *vivu-i* ‘to cheer’, or the more complex clause *ne forgesu min* ‘don’t forget me’ promoted to the flower name *neforgesumin-o* ‘myosotis’. The most frequently occurring lexicalization in Esperanto is that which concerns the promotion of affixes to stems or words.<sup>21</sup> An example in English is the autonomous use of the word *ism* meaning ‘some undefined ideology’, which was created out of the suffix *-ism*. An example of a prefix in English is *ex-*, meaning ‘former’. Promoted to word status, the meaning of *ex* is restricted to ‘former husband or wife’. Both exist in Esperanto in basically the same form: the noun *ism-o* meaning again ‘some undefined ideology’, and the adjective *eks-a* meaning ‘former, past’. Both affixes can be found in EMG: 18, 26. They are not treated in Marček (2007). The number of affixes prone to lexicalization shows that the phenomenon has spread with time through almost the entire inventory, increasing from 28% to 80% (from 10 out of 36 affixes in 1888 to 33 out of 41 in 2005).<sup>22</sup>

Example (34) shows us a familiar case to start with: the lexicalization of the instrument suffix *-il* (EMG: 24; Marček 2007: 61), here as the noun *il-o* (Jansen 2013: 46–47). Whereas the specification of the suffix *-il* could read: “*-il* derives a complex lexeme which expresses a tool or instrument associated with what is expressed by the lexeme it operates on”, it is clear that in the process of lexicalization, *il* has lost its operator function and its (specific) operand. What is left can only be the (generic) meaning of a tool or instrument, without specifying its detailed function, thus designating the semantic category Instrument, or Individual — the latter one reflecting the designation as an object without any reference to its function. Both designations justify the noun as the primary choice in the syntax:

- (34) *Ĝi estas por ni bezona il-o...*  
It is for us (a) needed tool...  
‘For us it is the essential tool...’  
(Away with neutrality! [extract], 1922: 76)

---

<sup>21</sup> Norde (2009: 10–11).

<sup>22</sup> In 1888 the affixes *mis-*, *pra-*, *-aĉ*, *-end* and *-ism* did not exist yet.

Example (35) refers to the suffix *-ebl* (EMG: 17; Marček 2007: 81), here shown as the adjective *ebl-a* (Jansen 2013: 65–66). A more expanded specification than the one offered by EMG reads: “*-ebl* derives a complex lexeme which expresses the *doability* or *feasibility* of what is expressed by the lexeme it operates on”. By virtue of this definition, candidate lexemes for derivation by *-ebl* are associated with transitive verbs, and the result is primarily an adjective: *manĝ-* ‘eat’ > *manĝ-ebl-* > *manĝ-ebl-a* ‘edible’. What is left after lexicalization of *ebl* and the loss of its operand (*manĝ-* in the case above) is ‘potentiality’ as a Dependent Property, in practice rendered by the adjective *ebl-a* ‘possible’:

- (35) *Neniu dubo plu ebl-a!*  
 No doubt any longer possible!  
 ‘There can be no doubt!’  
 (As Water of the River [extract], 1963: 135)

Example (36) concerns the suffix *-er* (EMG: 19; not covered by Marček 2007), here shown as the plural noun *er-oj*. A more expanded specification than the one offered by EMG reads: “*-er* derives a complex lexeme which expresses the *individual component* of what is expressed by the lexeme it operates on”. By virtue of this definition, candidate lexemes for derivation by *-er* are associated with ‘things’ or Individuals: *riz-* ‘rice’ > *riz-er-* > *riz-er-o* ‘grain of rice’. What is left after lexicalization of *er* and the loss of its operand (*riz-* in the case above) is ‘individual component’, in practice rendered by the noun *er-o* ‘part, component, smallest indivisible component preserving the characteristics of the whole thing’. In (36) below, the author views himself as being the sum of many ancestral components:

- (36) *La sumo de miaj avaj er-oj...*  
 The sum of my grandfather’s components...  
 ‘The sum of all these channels of ancestry...’  
 (The Infant Race [extracts: chapters I and II], 1956: 228)

In example (37) we notice not a suffix, but the lexicalized prefix *pra-* (EMG: 52; not discussed in Marček 2007), here shown as the adjective *pra-a*. A more expanded specification than the one offered by EMG reads: “*pra-* derives a complex lexeme with the qualification *ancient, primitive* or *next higher or lower degree of kinship* added to the meaning of the lexeme it operates on”. By virtue of this definition, candidate lexemes for derivation by *pra-* are associated with Entities: *histori-* ‘history’ > *pra-histori-* > *pra-histori-o* ‘prehistory’; *av-* ‘grandfather’ > *pra-av-* > *pra-av-o* ‘great-grandfather’. What is left after lexicalization of *pra* and the loss of its operand (*histori-* or *av-* in the cases above) is the qualification ‘ancient, primitive’, in practice rendered by the adjective *pra-a* ‘ancient, primitive, ancestral’:

- (37) *Avino mia*                      *pra-a,...*  
 Grandmother of mine    ancestral, ...  
 'Great-grandmother of mine, ...'  
 (The Infant Race [extracts: chapters I and II], 1956: 228)

In example (38) we return to an affix which is covered relatively early in Marček (2007: 61–62), i.e. the prefix *ek-* (EMG: 18). A more expanded specification than the one offered by EMG reads: “*ek-* derives a complex lexeme with the qualification *starting* or *sudden* added to the meaning of the lexeme it operates on”. By virtue of this definition, candidate lexemes for derivation by *ek-* are associated with State-of-Affair Entities or verbs: *ir-* ‘go’ > *ek-ir-* > *ek-ir-i* ‘to start going, leave’. The novelty with respect to (34)–(37) is that in (38) *ek-* has not been promoted to the level of a (lexical) stem, but to that of the grammatical preposition *ek* ‘on’. Elsewhere, *ek* is translatable by the exhortative interjection ‘come on!’ or something similar (Jansen 2013: 47–48). Because of its definition, *ek* is not easily linked to a semantic category and, less than *pra*, offers itself as the stem of a content word (even though the intransitive verb *ek-i* ‘to begin’ is used occasionally). This explains the unusual preference for the grammatical preposition or interjection:

- (38) *Poste supren, ek pro blovo,...*  
 Afterwards up, on by (the) wind, ...  
 ‘Then up and on, as new winds blow, ...’  
 (Autumn Leaves, date unknown: 275)

Exercise: use the prose on page 184–185 (*Tena: A Home in Central Europe* [extract], 1996) and on page 314–315 (*Been There, Done That* [extract], 1989) to identify instantiations of affix lexicalization.

### 3.2 Missing suffixes?

References:

Children at a Window Display, 1931: 196.  
 The Infant Race [extracts: chapters I and II], 1956: 228–229.

It has been said many times before: lexical items (stems) pertaining to a specific semantic category have a preferred ‘encoding’ in the syntax. All kinds of Entities, Locations, etc., appear first of all as nouns: *hom-o* ‘man’, *kat-o* ‘cat’, *tabl-o* ‘table’, *pluv-o* ‘rain’, *koncept-o* ‘concept’, *kamp-o* ‘field’, etc. Dependent Properties have a clear preference for becoming adjectives or manner adverbs: *bon-a* ‘good’, *rapid-e* ‘quickly’, etc. Others become preferentially verbs: *kur-i* ‘to run’, *leg-i* ‘to read’, *don-i* ‘to give’, etc. It appears, however, that these preferences inhibit in no way the occurrence of, e.g., *hom-a*, *pluv-i*, *kamp-e*, *don-o*, and many others. The theoretical background of this is not uncontroversial, but two things are certain:

1. Given that *hom-o* is a noun and *hom-a* an adjective, calling *hom-* a noun stem would be a *contradictio in terminis* for *hom-a*.
2. The endings *-o* and *-a* being noun and adjective markers, they are elements of the syntax and have nothing to do with the semantics, so that it would be wrong to consider *hom-a* a derivation of *hom-o*.

From the translations of *hom-o* ‘man’ and *hom-a* ‘human’ it becomes clear that the part-of-speech systems of Esperanto and English (and Dutch and many other languages) are different on principle: for Esperanto we can hypothesize that it has flexible items at the semantic level with compulsory syntactic marking; English is known to have specialized items with little or no marking. The question now is, how do we know what *hom-a* should mean, if we only have translations for *hom-o* (‘man’, *homme*, *Mensch*, *mens*, etc.), and are not sure that all learners of Esperanto interpret the differences between their native part-of-speech systems and that of Esperanto the same way. This sounds more alarming than what appears from the day-by-day usage of the language, but is of great importance should the language be introduced for official purposes at a truly large scale.

The approach that is taken here is founded on the insight that linguistic expressions are built on combinations of two types of phrases: referential phrases, which refer to Entities, and predicate phrases, which ascribe Properties or establish relations between the referential phrases. In both phrases there are two key positions (slots), one indispensable and one optional. These slots are occupied in the syntax by words pertaining to the four classic classes of nouns, adjectives, verbs and manner adverbs. What is specific to Esperanto is that these words are not built on semantic material that is specialized to occupy these, and no other positions. Material designating any semantic category may indeed go into each of the four word classes (we have briefly discussed the case of *hom-o* and *hom-a*, but flipping through the pages of the literary texts of this course you will encounter many many more instantiations). The four key slots can be described as follows:

1. The head of a referential phrase is occupied by a noun. By means of this noun we refer to something/someone, e.g., *tabl-o*, *hom-o*, *kat-o*, etc.
2. A referential phrase contains an optional modifier (in **bold** print), which occupies the adjective position. This modifier defines a subset of all possible heads of the type mentioned above: *intelligent-a hom-o*, *nigr-a kat-o*, etc.
3. The head of a predicate phrase is occupied by a verb (in **bold** print). By means of this verb we ascribe a Property (in most cases to one or more arguments): *mi kur-as* (the act of running is ascribed to me); *mi leg-as libron* (the act of reading is ascribed to me and to the book, which undergoes it); *mi instru-as lecionon al vi* (the act of teaching is ascribed to me, to the lesson which undergoes it and to the audience which receives it). Esperanto has copied the use of a copula (linking verb, in **bold** print) from English and other languages

in cases like *mi est-as instruisto* (ascribing ‘teacherhood’ to me) and *vi est-as inteligenta* (ascribing ‘intelligence’ to you).

4. A predicate phrase contains an optional modifier (in **bold print**), which occupies the manner adverb position, briefly: *mi kuras **long-e**; mi legas **laŭt-e**; mi instruas **plezur-e***.

The picture above is pretty straight-forward, because we’ve used primary words in the four slots, but it appears applicable at a very large scale with many stems used in non-primary application. There is one combination which may be problematic and which, indeed, has caused discussion in the speech community since the early years of the language: the use of Entities as verbs (see 39–42 below). Other combinations may cause some discussion, e.g., the use of Dependent Properties (adjectival candidates) as verbs. Others have not yet attracted much attention (the use of Entities in adjective positions). The following set of examples is just a taster of what we may face when we use or read non-primary words in the above slots. The exercise could be expanded over many more pages, but is limited here to a few examples of what can happen in the head position 3.

In (39) we notice the verbal form *larm-as* built on the Individual *larm-*, for which the noun solution *larm-o* ‘tear’ would be more natural (primary). *Larm-* in the head position 3 means ascribing ‘tear-hood’ to the subject *ŝi* ‘she’ of the clause, or, using the equivalent copula construction \**ŝi estas larmo(j)* \*‘she is tear(s)’, marked by an asterisk because this isn’t only not what’s meant, it’s even ungrammatical. What is meant is ‘she is shedding tears’, an expression which goes beyond the ascription of a Property and imports additional semantic information, which is not accounted for materially, i.e. there is no derivational affix to take care of this semantic aspect. We’ll come back to this after (43).

- (39) *Pli kaj pli larm-as,...*  
 More and more tear-PRS...  
 ‘Her sobs increase,...’  
 (Children at a Window Display, 1931: 196)

In (40) we encounter the verbal form *pirat-is* built on the Individual *pirat-*, for which the noun solution *pirat-o* ‘pirate’ would be more natural. In the head position 3, *pirat-* means ascribing ‘piratehood’ to the subject *Ruben* of the clause, or, using the equivalent copula construction *Ruben estis pirato* ‘Ruben was a pirate’, and this is indeed what the author intends.

- (40) *Kiu ... sur la mar’ pirat-is.*  
 Who ... on the sea pirate-PST.  
 ‘Who ... pirated at sea.’  
 (The Infant Race [extracts: chapters I and II], 1956: 228)

In (41) we find a repetition of what we saw in (40). The verbal form *patr-is* is built on the Individual *patr-*, for which the noun solution *patr-o* ‘father’ would be primary. In the head position 3, *patr-* means ascribing ‘fatherhood’ to the subject *kiu* ‘who’ of the clause, or, using the equivalent copula construction *kiu estis patro* ‘who was (the) father’, and this is indeed what the author intends. Personal names (and professions, social positions, etc., like ‘writer’, ‘president’, ‘director’, etc.) are all applicable in such copulaless constructions, in full conformity with the approach we have taken.

- (41) *Kaj [kiu] dek bastardojn patr-is.*  
 And [who] ten bastards father-PST.  
 ‘Who ... fathered ten bastards.’  
 (The Infant Race [extracts: chapters I and II], 1956: 228)

Example (42) destroys this nice regularity. The verbal form *vir-is* built on the Individual *vir-*, for which the noun solution *vir-o* ‘man, adult male person’ would be more natural. In the head position 3, *vir-* does not render the idea of the subject just ‘being a man’, but, repeating the author’s own account, ‘displaying his virility by fathering thousands of children’. So, even though *vir-* refers to a person, the narrow definition of ascribing ‘manhood’ to a subject is insufficient here and a fair amount of additional semantics is imported into the verb without any support by a derivational affix.

- (42) *Kaj tie vaste vir-is.*  
 And there vastly man-PST.  
 ‘The thousandfold outpouring of his body...’  
 (The Infant Race [extracts: chapters I and II], 1956: 228)

What happened to the inanimate Individual *larm-* ‘tear’ in (39) and the animate *vir-* ‘man’ in (42), returns in (43), affecting the abstract Entity *koncept-* ‘concept’. It appears cumbersome to interpret the verbal form *koncept-i* as ‘being a concept’, and a translation like ‘developing a concept, forming an idea of something’ seems more in order:

- (43) *La menso svene rifuzas eĉ koncept-i individuajn erojn...*  
 The mind faintly even concept-INF individual components...  
 ‘My spinning head cannot conceive of single links...’  
 (The Infant Race [extracts: chapters I and II], 1956: 229)

The approach we have described in the introductory part of this Section is based on the verified assumption that lexemes (stems) are flexible, i.e. not predestined to occupy one slot exclusively. The meaning of the syntactic word is then completed by the definition of the function of the slot the stem is assigned to. This produces a closed set of rules, which the majority of stems adheres to. There are, however,

exceptions: see (39), (42) and (43). They represent a growing minority of non-primary words which do not follow a rule-based formation principle, but develop new meanings based on intuition and plausibility. Following our examples, the verbs *larm-i* ‘to shed tears’, *vir-i* ‘to display one’s virility’ and *koncept-i* ‘to conceive’ would be justified by claiming that these are the most ‘natural’ actions one can think of when transforming nouns such as a tear, a man or a concept into a verb. If this is the way the speech community as a whole feels about the issue, we may indeed view this as a natural process that is taking place in Esperanto. It should be remembered, however, that such a process would destroy the rule-based usage of stems for word formation (starting with verb formation) and undermine the very *raison d’être* of stems. *Larmo* should then be learned as the noun translating ‘tear’ and *larmi* as the verb translating ‘to shed tears’. Whether ‘tear’ as the thing that is produced by shedding tears should then be derived as *larmaĵo* (applying *-aĵo* of Section 2), colliding with the existing *larmo*, is another story.

There is an alternative to the process sketched above: Esperanto features a multi-purpose or wildcard suffix for all those cases where there is a relation between the base and the derivation, which in its details may vary from word to word. This is the suffix *-um* (EMG: 62; Marček [2007: 93]).<sup>23</sup> The EMG example *foli-o* ‘leaf’ > *foli-um-i* ‘to leaf through, to browse’ may show us the way and provide us with the justification to make a plea for *larm-um-i*, *vir-um-i* and *koncept-um-i*.

Exercise: use the prose on page 184–185 (*Tena: A Home in Central Europe* [extract], 1996) and on page 314–315 (*Been There, Done That* [extract], 1989) to identify instantiations of suffixless word forms.

---

<sup>23</sup> The variety in relations is potentially so large that it would be impossible even to think of a new range of suffixes that could do the whole job.



## 4. Participle constructions

References:

Away with neutrality! [extract], 1922: 76.

As Water of the River [extract], 1963: 135.

Children at a Window Display, 1931: 195.

Autumn Elegy, 1933: 274.

Been There, Done That [extract], 1989: 315.

In its compound tenses, English uses one auxiliary<sup>o</sup>, ‘to have’, in the active voice<sup>o</sup> and one, ‘to be’, in the passive voice<sup>o</sup>, and has two participles, one present and one past. Esperanto uses one single auxiliary, *esti*, for both voices, and has three participles for the active voice, and three for the passive. It should be clear from this comparison that it may be difficult to search for a 1:1 translation from English into Esperanto of a table of compound tenses. It is proposed to approach the issue by looking first at participles in their attributive, adjectival role.<sup>24</sup>

In the discussion around (35) in Section 3.1 we met the suffix *-ebl*. Following its specification, we know that, starting from *leg-* ‘read’, *leg-ebl-a* means ‘readable’, ‘what can be read’. Participles, which are known to share the characteristics of verbs and adjectives, display in Esperanto exactly the same structure as ordinary adjectives. Combining the stem *leg-* with the participle ending *-ant* (EMG: 6), we get *leg-ant-a* ‘reading’, ‘who is in the process of reading’. Compare:

*Leg-ebl-a* readable, what can be read, e.g., *legebla libro* a readable book.

*Leg-ant-a* reading, who is reading, e.g., *leganta studento* a reading student.

As a book can be readable (or not) at any time in the past, present or future, one can also be reading at any such time:

*La libro estas/is/os legebla.* The book is/was/will be readable.

*La studento estas/is/os leganta.* The student is/was/will be reading.

The participle ending is not tense-related, but is a distinction of aspect<sup>o</sup>, expressing the state of development or completion of an act in a given time frame. In (44), the qualification *prem-ant-a* ‘pressing, oppressive’, applied to the atmosphere, was so-to-speak ‘actual’ in the time frame set by *est-is*. A more expanded version of the EMG: 6 definition of *-ant* could state that *-ant* specifies the *active progressive* aspect (ACT.PROGR), i.e., the ongoing, unfinished action:

- (44) *La atmosfero estis prem-ant-a.*  
The atmosphere was press-ACT.PROGR-A.  
‘The atmosphere was oppressive.’

---

<sup>24</sup> Reference is made to Jansen (2013: 72–78) supporting Marček (2007: 85–92).

(As Water of the River [extract], 1963: 135)

In the active voice we also have a form which specifies the *resultative* aspect (here: ACT.RES), the state described by the completion of a preceding action. Such participles are formed by the suffix *-int* (EMG: 25). Thus, in (45) below, the act of running downstairs was completed at the reference point in time defined by *est-is*. In terms of compound tenses, we would call this the pluperfect in English:

- (45) *Kiu estis malsupren-kur-int-a...*  
Who had downstairs-run-ACT.RES-A ...  
'Who had run downstairs.'  
(As Water of the River [extract], 1963: 135)

The suffixes *-ant* and *-int*, like all other suffixes, operate on lexemes and not on words, as we know, so that the word form in (46) should not surprise us. *Viŝ-ant-e* 'while wiping' is the adverbial form of *viŝ-ant-*, known in Esperanto as the gerund:

- (46) *Viŝ-ant-e* *siajn larmojn per la bluzo.*  
Wipe-ACT.PROGR-ADV her tears with the blouse.  
'And with its blouse she wipes her tears away.'  
(Children at a Window Display, 1931: 196)

Complementary to the active progressive participle formed by *-ant* (comparable to the present participle formed by '-ing' in English) and the active resultative participle ending in *-int* (comparable to the past participle in '-ed' in English), Esperanto has a passive pair ending in *-at* and *-it* respectively. The passive progressive participle *-at* (PASS.PROGR) is shown in (47) and may also correspond to the past participle in '-ed' in English, or to the expression 'being -ed'. The example in (47) is that of a passive progressive participle used as an attributive adjective in *plano studata* 'a plan being studied'.

- (47) *Laŭ plano funde* *stud-at-a...*  
According to (a) plan carefully study-PASS.PROGR-A ...  
'To a plan carefully put together...'  
(Away with neutrality! [extract], 1922: 76)

Example (48) shows us the passive equivalent *-it* (PASS.RES) of the active *-int*. Once again, the translation in English uses the past participle in '-ed', this time 'approved':

- (48) *Ke la decido de Pierre povas esti nur aprob-it-a.*  
That the decision by Pierre can be only approve-PASS.RES-A.  
'Pierre's decision could only meet with approval.'  
(As Water of the River [extract], 1963: 135)

This tells us how important it is to realize what we mean by saying that ‘the decision was approved’. Was it ‘being approved’, ‘in the process of going through an approval cycle’ without having actually reached approval status, then *esti aprob-at-a* would be the right solution. If, however, we wish to state that the process was completed and approval was reached, then *esti aprob-it-a* is the correct choice. This is why it is recommended not to refer to the participles by their English names, but by their back-translated names in Esperanto, and reserve the term ‘progressive’ for the participles in *-a(n)t*, and ‘resultative’ for those in *-i(n)t*. The terms ‘present’ and ‘past’ are too biased toward ‘time’ and ‘tense’, and, in addition, depending on the circumstances, *-int*, *-at* and *-it* can all be rendered by a ‘past participle’ in English.

The difference with English is further emphasized by the use in Esperanto of two participles which simple don’t exist in English. These are formed by the suffixes *-ont* and *-ot* (EMG: 48). Once again, this is a complementary pair, of which *-ont* generates the active *prospective* participle (ACT.PROSP), and *-ot* its passive counterpart (PASS.PROSP). They identify actions which are contemplated, but have not yet been initiated. These participles are not used very frequently, and not easily found in the literary texts under review, so that two construed cases inspired by EMG are presented in (49) and (50) below:

(49) Mi estas konstru-ont-a domon.  
I am build-ACT.PROSP-A house.  
‘I am about to build a house.’

(50) La domo estas konstru-ot-a.  
The house is build-PASS.PROSP-A.  
‘The house is about to be built.’

There is one instantiation of the use of *-ot* in our literary text, which is reproduced in (51) below:

(51) Dio ... protektos ... ankaŭ la aliajn senkapig-ot-o-j-n.  
God ... will protect ... also the other behead-PASS.PROSP-N-PL-ACC.  
‘God ... protect ... all the other people you’ve lined up to lose their heads.’  
(Been There, Done That [extract], 1989: 315)

In all cases we’ve discussed so far we noticed participles in typical participle applications (let’s say as predicative adjectives), or as an attributive adjective in (47), or as an adverb in (46). What is of interest in (51) is the nominalized use of a participle. Conventionally, nominalized forms denote persons, not things. That’s why the nominative, singular *senkapigot-o* in (51) is to be understood as *senkapigot-a persono*.

This convention seems to be infringed in (52) and (53), in which appear the nominalized *pas-int-o* 'what has passed, gone by', i.e. 'the past' and *est-ont-o* 'what is about to be', i.e. 'the future', in both cases not as persons.

(52) *Ja de l' pas-int-o restas nur memor'!*  
As of the past remains only (a) memory!  
'As of the past remains only a memory!'  
(Autumn Elegy, 1933: 274)

(53) *Ja por l' est-ont-o havas mi nenion!*  
As for the future have I nothing!  
'As for the future have I nothing!'  
(Autumn Elegy, 1933: 274)

Exercise: compare the examples (52) and (53) with the poem *Richness*, 1953, on page 246 and identify a difference of interpretation in the participle forms. What happened in (52) and (53)?

A summary table of participle constructions is given on the next page, including plausible illustrative translations in English.

Table 3: Participle constructions.

Active voice		Passive voice	
Present tense (auxiliary <i>estas</i> )			
Mi estas iranta. <sup>(1)</sup>	I am going.	-	-
Mi estas leganta.	I am reading.	Ĝi estas legata.	It is being read.
Mi estas irinta.	I have gone, I am gone.	-	-
Mi estas leginta.	I have read.	Ĝi estas legita.	It has been read.
Mi estas ironta.	I am about to go.	-	-
Mi estas legonta.	I am about to read.	Ĝi estas legota.	It is going to be read.
Past tense (auxiliary <i>estis</i> )			
Mi estis iranta. <sup>(2)</sup>	I was going.	-	-
Mi estis leganta.	I was reading.	Ĝi estis legata.	It was being read. <sup>(4)</sup>
Mi estis irinta.	I had gone, I was gone.	-	-
Mi estis leginta.	I had read.	Ĝi estis legita.	It had been/was read. <sup>(5)</sup>
Mi estis ironta.	I would go. <sup>(6)</sup>	-	-
Mi estis legonta.	I would read. <sup>(6)</sup>	Ĝi estis legota.	It would be read. <sup>(6)</sup>
Future tense (auxiliary <i>estos</i> )			
Mi estos iranta. <sup>(3)</sup>	I will be going.	-	-
Mi estos leganta.	I will be reading.	Ĝi estos legata.	It will be read.
Mi estos irinta.	I will have/be gone.	-	-
Mi estos leginta.	I will have read.	Ĝi estos legita.	It will be/have been read. <sup>(5)</sup>
Mi estos ironta.	I will be getting ready to go [at some time in the future]. (!)	-	-
Mi estos legonta.	I will be going to read [at some time in the future]. (!)	Ĝi estos legota.	It will be ready to be read [at some time in the future]. (!)

(1) The simple present *mi iras* is preferred unless aspect needs to be emphasized.

(2) The simple past *mi iris* is preferred unless aspect needs to be emphasized.

(3) The simple future *mi iros* is preferred unless aspect needs to be emphasized.

(4) *Estis -ata* necessarily means: unfinished, lasting, or repetitive.

(5) *Estis -ita* necessarily means: finished, achieved.

(6) This is not the 'would' of the conditional mood!

(!) Theoretically possible but hardly ever applied.

## Annex 1: Semantic categories in Esperanto

Esperanto has eight basic question words to refer to partly distinct, partly overlapping semantic classes: *kio* 'what', *kiu* 'who', *kia* 'what (kind of)', *kie* 'where', *kiam* 'when', *kiel* 'how', *kiom* 'how much' and *kial* 'why'. Each of these question words can receive four answers: a demonstrative beginning with *t* (*tio* 'that', etc.), a collective with *ĉ* (*ĉio* 'everything', etc.), a negative with *nen* (*nenio* 'nothing', etc.) and an indefinite without a prefixed element (*io* 'something', etc.), thus constituting a matrix of eight rows and five columns.

We'll now review these semantic classes one by one and apply them to lexical items (*radikoj* or 'stems'). A question introduced by *kio* 'what' may be answered by *hom-o* 'man, a human being', *kat-o* 'a cat', *tabl-o* 'a table', etc., identifying the stems *hom-* 'man', *kat-* 'cat' and *tabl-* 'table' with lexemes pertaining to the category of First-order Entities or **Individuals**<sup>25</sup>, which are perceptually constant with time, located in three-dimensional space, publicly observable and referable to, and habitually designated by persons, animals and things (the question word *kiu* 'who' refers to an animate Individual that can be named, and therefore covers part of the same ground). A question by *kio* may also be answered by *pluv-o* 'rain' or *spektakl-o* 'a show' and others, identifying *pluv-* 'rain', *spektakl-* 'show', etc., with lexemes pertaining to the category of Second-order Entities or **States-of-Affairs**, which are located in three-dimensional space and in time and habitually designated by events or processes. Finally, the same question may be answered by, e.g., *ide-o* 'an idea' or *koncept-o* 'a concept', involving the stems *ide-* and *koncept-* which can be identified with lexemes pertaining to the category of Third-order Entities or **Propositional Contents**, which cannot be located in space or time and are not observable. Propositional Contents are mental constructs and can be evaluated as true or false.

In addition to the independent categories there are dependent categories, which are relatable to one of the Entities above or to the overall situation described by the linguistic expression. **Properties** constitute this dependent category. In Esperanto, the question word *kia* 'what (kind of)' inquires about such Properties, as illustrated by *kia libro?* 'what book?' answerable by the quality *bel-* in *bel-a libro* 'a beautiful book', identifying *bel-* 'beautiful' with a lexeme pertaining to the dependent category. Dependent Properties also include the monovalent action *kur-* 'run', which depends on one argument only; the bivalent action *leg-* 'read', which depends on two, an agent and an undergoer; and the trivalent action *don-* 'give', which depends on three, an agent, an undergoer and a locative (recipient).

The question word *kie* 'where' inquires about a **Location**, which may be designated by lexemes like *lok-* 'place' and *kamp-* 'field'.

The question word *kiam* 'when' inquires about **Time**, which may be designated by lexemes like *jar-* 'year' and *moment-* 'while'.

---

<sup>25</sup> Semantic category names are identified by capitalized initials to distinguish them from common nouns.

The question word *kiel* ‘how’ inquires about **Manner**, which may be designated by lexemes like *manier-* ‘manner’ and *procez-* ‘process’. *Kiel* may also suggest an instrumental (*per kio* ‘by means of what’) rather than a manner interpretation, as designated by the lexemes *bros-* ‘brush’, *krajon-* ‘pencil’, *pied-* ‘foot’, *ŝip-* ‘ship’ and many others, alternating with an Individual interpretation according to the context in which they occur. This supports the relevance of a dedicated **Instrument** category.

The question word *kiom* ‘how much (many)’ inquires about **Quantity**, which may be designated by lexemes like *kvant-* ‘quantity’ and *nombr-* ‘number’.

The question word *kial* ‘why’ inquires about **Reason**, which may be designated by lexemes like *motiv-* ‘motive, reason’ and *kaŭz-* ‘cause’.

Table 4: Semantic categories in Esperanto.

Category	Lexical examples
Individual	hom-, kat-, tabl-
State-of-Affairs	pluv-, spektakl-
Propositional content	ide-, koncept-
Dependent Property	bel-, bon-, verd-
Dependent Property	ir-, kur-, sid-
Dependent Property	leg-, bat-, far-
Dependent Property	don-, promes-
Location	lok-, kamp-
Time	jar-, moment-
Manner	manier-, procez-
Instrument	bros-, krajon-, pied-, ŝip-
Quantity	kvant-, nombr-, funt-
Reason	motiv-, kaŭz-

## Annex 2: Explanation of terms

Active voice	Form of a clause with a transitive predicate in which the semantic actor is identified with the syntactic subject, e.g. <i>you write a letter</i> with transitive <i>write</i> and <i>you</i> = actor = subject.
Aspect	The relation between the temporal reference point in a clause and the development of the described state of affairs. Esperanto participles denote the prospective aspect (something is about to happen at the reference point), the progressive aspect (it is happening), or the resultative aspect (it has happened).
Attributive	directly modifying a noun: <i>good wine</i> .
Auxiliary (verb)	Non-lexical verb which is used in combination with participles to form compound tenses.
Clause	Expression which contains a predicate. A main clause needs no support from other clauses (e.g., <i>you are students</i> ); a subclause (in <b>bold</b> print) is dependent on another clause (e.g., <i>I suppose <b>that I am your teacher</b></i> ).
Constituent	Logically coherent group of words, e.g., a noun qualified by an adjective and preceded by an article (e.g., <i>the good students</i> ), or a complex manner adjunct (e.g., <i>very carefully</i> ).
Copula	Non-lexical verb which is needed in many languages to ascribe a Property to the subject. In the following example the qualification <i>intelligent</i> is ascribed to the students: <i>the students are intelligent</i> . In English, the copula <i>to be</i> is required, here in its conjugated form <i>are</i> . In other languages (e.g., Russian) it is sufficient to say <i>The students intelligent</i> .
Definite(ness)	Containing an anteposed element like <i>the, this, that</i> , or a numeral.
Head	Indispensable item in a larger constituent, e.g., 'cat' in 'black cat'.
Lexeme	Fundamental unit of the lexicon of a language. In Esperanto, these are the meaningful units formally represented by stems ( <i>radikoj</i> ).
Lexicalization	Promotion of a non-lexical item of any size or kind to the status of a lexical unit. In Esperanto, this phenomenon is widespread among the affixes of the language, e.g., suffix <i>-in</i> > pseudo-stem <i>in-</i> > noun <i>ino</i> 'female'.
Modifier	Dispensable or optional item in a larger constituent, e.g., 'black' in 'black cat'.
Nominal	Consisting of a full noun like <i>teacher, student</i> , instead of a pronoun like <i>he</i> or <i>she</i> .
Object	Constituent which is secondary to the perspective determined by the subject of the clause. In <i>the teacher explains the lesson</i> the explaining is described as something the teacher does (1), and what he teaches is the lesson (2). In <i>the lesson is explained by the</i>



	<i>teacher</i> , what's being explained is the lesson (1), and who is responsible for this is the teacher (2).
Passive voice	Form of a clause with a transitive predicate in which the semantic undergoer is identified with the syntactic subject, e.g. <i>the letter is written</i> , with transitive <i>write</i> and <i>the letter</i> = undergoer = subject. In the passive voice, auxiliary verbs are needed.
Phrase	A constituent with a head (indispensable) and possibly a modifier (dispensable). <i>Student</i> is a head-only noun phrase; in <i>good student</i> , the modifier <i>good</i> is added to the head <i>student</i> .
Predicate	That part of the clause which establishes a relation between the subject and any objects, or ascribes a Property to the subject. In the following three clauses the predicate is printed <b>bold</b> , and subjects and object are enclosed in square brackets and marked by the subscripts S and O: <i>[The teacher]<sub>s</sub> <b>explains</b> [the lesson]<sub>o</sub>.</i> <i>[The students]<sub>s</sub> <b>sit</b> in the classroom.</i> <i>[The students]<sub>s</sub> are <b>intelligent</b>.</i>
Predicative Subject	Part of the predicate ascribing a Property: <i>the wine is <b>good</b></i> . Constituent which determines the perspective of the clause and often determines the form of the verb in the predicate. In <i>the teacher explains the lesson</i> the explaining is described as something the teacher does (1), and what he teaches is the lesson (2). In <i>the lesson is explained by the teacher</i> , what's being explained is the lesson (1), and who is responsible for this is the teacher (2).
Pronominal	Consisting of a pronoun as a grammatical substitute for a personal name or full noun, or as reference in the text.

## Literature

- Dryer**, Matthew S. 2005. 'Order of Subject, Object and Verb' in Haspelmath, Martin et al. (eds.) *The World Atlas of Language Structures*. 330–333. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- EMG** see *Esperanto Mini-Grammar*.
- Esperanto Mini-Grammar*. 2010. EAB.
- First Book* see Zamenhof (2004 [1887]).
- Foundations of Esperanto* see Zamenhof (1963 [1905]).
- Gubbins**, Paul (ed.). 2012. *Star in a Night Sky*. London: Francis Boutle.
- Jansen**, Wim. 2008. *Naturaj vortordoj en Esperanto*. Rotterdam: UEA.
- Jansen**, Wim. 2010. 'La Fundamenta Esperanto: nekontesteble eŭropa, sed...' in Blanke, Detlev & Ulrich Lins (eds.) *La arto labori kune*. 271–284. Rotterdam: UEA.
- Jansen**, Wim. 2013. *Esperanto*. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam. Faculty of the Humanities: FGW-13-105218022. Grammar guide in Dutch, accompanying Marček (2007).
- Marček**, Stano. 2007. *Esperanto via de directe methode*. Martin, Slovakia: Stano Marček. Text book for Dutch-speaking learners; its English version is entitled *Esperanto by direct method*.
- Norde**, Muriel. 2009. *Degrammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- PIV** see Waringhien (2005).
- Waringhien**, Gaston (ed.). 2005. *Plena ilustrita vortaro de Esperanto*. Paris: SAT. Also accessible at: <http://vortaro.net>.
- Zamenhof**, Lejzer. 1963 [1905]. *Fundamento de Esperanto*. Marmande, France: EFE.
- Zamenhof**, Lejzer. 2004 [1887]. *Meždunarodnyj jazyk*. Moscow: Impeto.