

Re: Esperanto and Interlingua

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2007-03/msg01009.html>

- *From:* "Jens S. Larsen" <jens_s_larsen@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 13 Mar 2007 02:31:16 -0700
-

Ruud Harmsen:

Peter T. Daniels:

Ruud Harmsen:

These possibilities are rarely used, because most users employ the language in ways resembling their own language. But the mechanisms exist in Esperanto, which is what makes it unique.

So there's one of the ways Esperanto differs from any human language.

Yes. That makes it nice and interesting. Don't you think? (;-0

I don't think it's unique at all. There are lots of regional variants in national languages; possibilities that are exploited by some speakers but not others.

I wonder whether Orwell modeled Doublespeak on Esperanto. I wouldn't be surprised; he had a rather jaded view of utopianists.

One objection to Esperanto is that meanings are rather sharply defined, and that as a consequence, word play isn't easy in it.

It's not so difficult as you think. A number of words can be divided in different ways: "sentema" means "sensitive" (sent-ema) or "without a subject" (sen-tema), "kurago" means "courage" or "age of running" (kur-ago) etc. Raymond Schwartz excelled in that sort of thing.

Re: Esperanto and Interlingua

I don't quite remember what Orwell's doublespeak entailed, but it seems unlikely it is anything like Esperanto.

It's been inspired by what Orwell thought about language, including, it seems, Esperanto. If he had known what we know about language today, he probably would have depicted the dystopian language planning activities somewhat differently.

....

One can certainly create such a language on the basis of Esperanto, but as it is, it is nothing like it, as I said, on the contrary, because Esperanto is rather direct and concrete, more so than many natural languages.

It has been claimed that Esperanto is more natural than other languages, which makes sense if you look upon regularity as a natural feature of language. It does not make sense, however, if you look at it scientifically, for as far as naturalness goes, there is only one human language. Otherwise you might as well claim that Indonesian is more natural than Sinhalese.

Jens S. Larsen

.