

<p>LI SPLITTRE E LI TRAVE (Schematisme e naturalitá in lingues international)</p>	<p>THE MOTE AND THE BEAM (Schematism and naturalism in international languages)</p>
<p>Sub li titul "LE SCHEMATISMO IN AGONIA" Sr. A. Schild ha publicat in nr. 2 (februar 1957) del revúe CURRERO DEL MUNDO un articul tre interessant in quel il oposi li naturalisme de ILa al schematisme de ILe. It cúlmina in li constatacion que in realitá, si li Occidental de De Wahl es plu natural quam li Esperanto de Zamenhof, anc De Wahl ne ha successat liberar se completmen de ti specie de schematisme quel es li pecca cardinal del sistemas non-naturalistic. Nam si, il argumenta, li regules de derivation de De Wahl ne producte formes tam natural quam ili existe in ILa, tande ili ha fallit lor scope. Un parol quam <i>electibilitá</i>, il di, ne es plu bon quam <i>elektebleco</i> e si noi admisse li unesim quam just, on deve anc justificar mult altri esperantismes.</p>	<p>Under the title "LE SCHEMATISMO IN AGONIA" (Schematism in Agony) Mr. A. Schild published a most interesting article in the second issue (February 1957) of CURRERO DEL MUNDO in which he opposes the naturalism of Interlingua against the schematism of Occidental. It culminates with the claim that in reality, while De Wahl's Occidental is more natural than Zamenhof's Esperanto, De Wahl was still unable to free himself from this type of schematism which is the cardinal sin of non-naturalistic systems. Because if, he argues, De Wahl's rules of derivation do not produce forms as natural as the ones found in Interlingua, then he has failed in his goal. A word like the Occidental <i>electibilitá</i>, he says, is no better than the Esperanto <i>elektebleco</i> and if we admit the word <i>electibilitá</i> as correct then we have no choice but to justify a lot of other Esperantistic forms as well.</p>
<p>"Wenn man's so hört, möcht's leidlich scheinen Steht aber doch immer schief darum." di Goethe in su Faust. To es li citation quel veni me in mente, ponderante li argumentes de Sr. Schild. Yo ha nequande contestat que ILa es capabil seducter homes con humanistic cultura e yo anc concede que it es etimologicmen plu vicin al comun fonte de nor civilisation hellenic-latin quam li lingue de De Wahl. Ma de to ancor ne seque que ti-ci deve, pro ti motive, necessimen esser minu natural quam li lingue de IALA.</p>	<p>"Hearing it that way it doesn't seem so bad, But there's still something inside it that doesn't fit." says Gothe in Faust. That is the quote that comes to mind when I read the arguments by Mr. Schild. I have never contested that Interlingua is capable of seducing people of humanistic culture and I also concede that it is etymologically closer to the common source of our Greco-Roman civilization than De Wahl's language. But it still does not follow that it should, because of this, necessarily be less natural than IALA's Interlingua.</p>
<p>Li citation de isolat exemples posse ilustrar precisi punctus de problemas stant in discussion, ma ili prova nequó. Li discussion</p>	<p>Citing isolated examples can illustrate certain points in issues that are in discussion, but they prove nothing. The discussion only becomes a fertile one when we example the examples in</p>

<p>deveni fertil solmen quande noi exámina ti exemples in li cadre del general conceptiones quel forma li base de singul sistema.</p>	<p>the framework of the general concepts that form the basis of each system.</p>
<p>Noi va dunc posir nos li question: "Quo es schematisme"? Aplicat al scientie linguistic, it realmen ne sembla dir plu mult quam "crear paroles o frases per formar les secun prefixat modelles e regules". Noi deve aconosser que Zamenhof ha cultivat ti metode in su forme max pur. A it noi debi perles quam <i>onigilo, alakvigi, homidino, malamigi, senkiale, ulego</i> e mult altres. Ili es, quam di tre justmen Sr. Schild "jocas de combination". Or, anc ILe forma su paroles per li combination de radicas con afixes. Malgré to, li formes resultant es, in contrast a tis de Espo, ínmediatmen comprensibil. Pro quo? Pro que in ILe ne solmen li radicas, ma anc li afixes es natural, nam ili es extraet del lingues vivent. E ti resultate ha esset atinget malgré li "schematisme" quel presidet al creation del derivates.</p>	<p>We will therefore ask ourselves the question: "What is schematism?" Applied to the science of linguistics, in reality it doesn't seem to mean anything more than "creating words or phrases by forming them according to set models and rules". We must acknowledge that Zamenhof has cultivated this method in its purest form, and it is to this that we owe forms like <i>onigilo, alakvigi, homidino, malamigi, senkiale, and ulego</i> amongst others. They are, as Mr. Schild rightly stated, "joining games". Now, Occidental also forms its words by the combination of roots with affixes, but despite this, the resulting forms are, in contrast to those of Esperanto, immediately understood. Why? Because in Occidental not only the roots are natural, but also the affixes, because they are taken from the living languages. And this result has been obtained despite the "schematism" that presided in the creation of derived words.</p>
<p>Li veritá es que on ne posse oposir "schematisme" (tal qual Sr. schild sembla conceper it) a "naturalitá". Nam Schematisme lude un rol important mem in li lingues vivent. In quó consiste li labor del grammaticos, si ne in classificar li elementes lingual in categorias de queles chascun forma li modelle por un determinat númere de paroles? Ili comensa por ex. per far li distinction inter verbes regulari e irregulari. Poy ili subdivide li verbes regulari in special classes. Chascun parol inrangeat in li sam classe seque li sam regules de formation. It sufice monstrar li formes conjugativ de un sol verbe por haver li clave por li formation de omni altres del sam classe. Quo to es, si ne "schematisme"? Li infante quel aprende parlar, seque instinctivmen li sam lege. It es conosset,</p>	<p>The truth is that one cannot oppose "schematism" (as Mr. Schild seems to conceive it) against "naturalism". Because schematism plays an important role in the living languages too. Just what is the job of the grammaticians, if not to classify the elements of a language into categories of which each forms the model for a determined number of words? They begin, for example, by making the distinction between regular and irregular verbs. Then they subdivide the regular verbs into special classes. Each word set in the same class follows the same rules of formation. It is enough to show the conjugated forms of a single verb to have the key to the formation of all verbs of the same class. What is that, then, if not "schematism"? The child who learns to talk follows the same rules instinctively. It is known, on the other hand, that all newly formed verbs are conjugated, without exception, according to the models of the regular verbs. Schematism is stronger than tradition and it would be outright absurd to condemn it as "unnatural".</p>

<p>de altri látere, que omni verbes novimen format es conjugat, sin exception, secun li modelle del verbes regulari. Li schematisme es plu fort quam li tradition e it vell esser proprimen absurd condemnar it quam "innatural".</p>	
<p>Sr. Schild erra, si il crede que li autores de lingues constructet ha fallit in lor prova, crear lingues "natural" unicmen pro que ili "ne successat desembarassar se del schematisme". In contrari, ili ha recurret al schematisme in plen conscientie del facte que it es li sol medie quel li leges del lingue oferta les por realisar li postulate del *facilitá* quel es, e malgré omnicos resta, un del pilares fundamental in li construction de un lingue auxiliari.</p> <p>Támen, si li schematisme, per su natura self, es un procede de construction perfectmen natural, su application irreflectet posse, quam monstra li exemple de Espo, provocar conflictos con li postulate del naturalitá. It vell esser absurd pretender de De Wahl successat eliminar sin exception omni casus de friction existent. Il esset un genie, ma ne un magico. Ma il successat trovar li max bon solution possibil in su eforties, conciliar li postulate de regularitá (quel es ci sinónim a schematisme) con ti de naturalitá. It es ni just, ni logic, mesurar li valore del resultate atinget per li litt númere de casus irreductibil, i.e. tis queles resistet a su metode de derivation, e silentiar modestmen pri li aplastant majorité (adnim 90%) del casus queles il successat soluer in maniere til nu ínegalat. Por convicter nos pri to, it suffice tornar nor attention al resultates queles IALA obtenet per su metodes, pretendentmen plu scientific e sol natural.</p>	<p>Mr. Schild is wrong if he believes that the authors of constructed languages have failed in their attempts to create "natural" languages just because they "were not able to avoid reverting to schematism". On the contrary, they have opted for schematism while fully aware of the fact that it is the only method that the laws of the language offer them to meet the demand for a language that is <i>easy</i>, which is, and despite all to the contrary, remains one of the fundamental pillars in the construction of an auxiliary language.</p> <p>Now, while schematism by its very nature is a perfectly natural method of construction, applying it haphazardly can, as the example of Esperanto shows, provoke conflicts with the demands of naturalism. It would be absurd to pretend that De Wahl managed to eliminate without exception all existing causes for friction here. He was a genius, not a wizard. But he managed to find the best possible solution in his efforts to reconcile the demands of regularity (which here is synonymous with schematism) with those of naturalism. It is neither just nor logical to measure the value of the result attained by the small number of cases that resisted against his method of derivation, and to stay silent on the overwhelming majority (at least 90%) of the cases that he managed to solve in a manner unequalled up to now. It will suffice to turn our attention to the results that the IALA obtained with its methods, supposedly more scientific and outright natural, to convince ourselves of this fact.</p>
<p>Lass nos reprendre li exemple del parol <i>electibilitá</i> citat de Sr. Schild in su articul. In</p>	<p>Let us once again take up the example of the word <i>electibilitá</i> cited by Mr. Schild in his article. This word is indeed, while perfectly</p>

<p>efecte, ti parol, si it es perfectmen comprensibil, ne es international. Li forme international es <i>eligibilitá</i> quam in ILa. Ma lass nos nu examinar un poc li vertús del metode de IALA in su practic application. In un lingue auxiliari quam ILa, dotat de un complet sistema de derivation, li diligent aprensor va desirar profitar del resurses queles oferta le ti sistema e il ne vole esser fortiat consultar li léxico chascun vez quande il deve formar un nov parol. Li exemples <i>visibile</i>, <i>perceptibile</i>, <i>digestibile</i>, <i>compressibile</i> etc. monstra le que li sufixe <i>-ibile</i> es adjuntet al duesim radica (li radica supinal). Ma poy il incontra just li parol <i>eligibilitate</i> quel ne es conform a ti modelle, nam it vell logicmen dever esser <i>electibilitate</i>. Por trovar li clave del enigma, il consulta li grammatica e trova ta que li sufixe <i>-ibile</i> adjunte se al duesim radica solmen quande li unesim radica fini in un del consonantes -s, -pt, -t, o -x. Su curiositá natural ducte le a leer li complet capitul quel tracta pri li leges del formation del "double stem verbs" e il trova tis-ci tre ingeniosi. Tam ingeniosi que yo, in mi torn, va permisser me resumar les in infra.</p>	<p>understandable, not international. The international form is <i>eligibilitá</i> as in Interlingua. But let's examiner the virtues of the method of IALA a little in its practical application. In an auxiliary language like Interlingua, endowed with a complete system of derivation, the diligent learner will want to take advantage of all the resources that this system offers him and will not want to be forced to consult the dictionary every time he needs to form a new word. The examples <i>visibile</i>, <i>perceptibile</i>, <i>digestibile</i>, <i>compressibile</i> etc. show him that the suffix <i>-ibile</i> is added to the second root (the supine root). But then he encounters this word <i>eligibilitate</i> which does not conform to this model, because it logically should be <i>electibilitate</i>. To find the key to this enigma, he consults the grammar and finds there that the suffix <i>-ibile</i> is added when the first root ends in one of the consonants -s, -pt, -t, or -x. His natural curiosity leads him to read the entire chapter on the laws of formation of the "double stem verbs" and he finds them most ingenious. So ingenious that I, for my part, will permit myself to sum them up here.</p>
<p>Li exposition in li grammatica comensa per indicar li verbes irregulari queles</p> <p>a) fini in li infinitive per -ar b) fini in li infinitive per -ir.</p> <p>Poy seque 7 regules queles monstra qualmen es modificat li unesim radica por obtener li radica supinal servient al derivationes, a saver</p> <p>1) Modification del radica pos li consonantes c, l, n, p, r, u, x. 2) Modification del radica pos li digramma sc.</p>	<p>The overview in the grammar begins by indicating the irregular verbs which</p> <p>a) end in the infinitive -ar. b) end in the infinitive -ir.</p> <p>Following this are 7 rules that show how the first root is modified to obtain the supine root that serves for derivations, namely:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Modifying the root after the consonants c, l, n, p, r, u, x. 2) Modifying the root after the digraph sc. 3) Modifying the root after the consonants b, g, h, m, qu, v. 4) Special rule concerning the consonant r, modifying Rule 1. 5) Modifying the root after the consonants d, t. 6) Exceptional deviations from Rules 1 and 3.

<p>3) Modification del radica pos li consonantes b, g, h, m, qu, v.</p> <p>4) Regul special concernent li consonante r, modificante li regul 1.</p> <p>5) Modification del radica pos li consonantes d, t.</p> <p>6) Deviationes exceptional del regules 1 e 3.</p> <p>7) Exceptiones suplementari afectant alquel del categories ja citat.</p> <p>E por finir, seque un liste de verbes totalmen irregulari, i.e. classificabil in nequel del categories ja citat.</p> <p>Li total quantité de omni verbes citat es 130. Ma li real númere del verbes irregulari es plu grand.</p>	<p>7) Supplementary exceptions affecting some of the categories already mentioned.</p> <p>To finish this, we see a list of verbs that are completely irregular, i.e. not able to be classified in any of the categories already mentioned.</p> <p>The total quantity of cited verbs in 130. But the real number of irregular verbs is greater than this.</p>
<p>Yo ne vole ci extender me sur li extrem complication de ti regulation e li quasi impossibilitá aplicar it in practica, ma yo desira posir al adherentes de ILa du precisi questiones:</p> <p>Si vu qualifica li regul De Wahl, por li exposition de quel suffice exactmen 4 lineas (vide mi manuale) quam "schematisme", quo noi deve alor pensar pri li derivation in ILa quel pussa li manie, voler capter li formation del radicas supinal in regules, til crear ne minu quam 9 categories? Esque to ne es schematisme potentiat?</p> <p>Qualmen vu posse condemnar li regul De Wahl quam vestigie de "schematisme" si vu fa exactmen lu sam, con li sol resultate, que vor regules es complicat li impracticabilitá e que, malgré lor superabundantie, ili lassa ancor plu mult casus ínsoluet quam in Occidental?</p>	<p>I do not wish to get into the extreme complication of these rules and the near impossibility of applying them in practice, but I would like to ask two precise questions to the followers of Interlingua:</p> <p>If you qualify De Wahl's rule, for which 4 lines suffice to explain it (see my manual) as "schematism", then what should we make of the derivation in Interlingua which goes to the insane lengths of trying to capture the rules of formation of supinal roots to the point that it creates no fewer than 9 categories? Is that not schematism incarnate?</p> <p>How can you condemn De Wahl's rule as a vestige of "schematism" if you do exactly the same thing, with the only result that your rules are complicated to impracticability and which, despite their large number, still leave more unsolved cases than in Occidental?</p>
<p>Ma hay ancor un altri aspecte del problema quel merite esser mentionat.</p>	<p>But there is another part of the problem that deserves to be mentioned.</p>

<p>ILa complica su sistema de derivation til far it practicmen ínaplicabil, unicmen por posser evitar "monstruosítas" quam *electibilitá, fractibil, consumpter* etc. malgré que ti formes es perfectmen comprensibil. Naturalitá ante omnicos. Ma esque realmen Sr. Gode crede que por li popules romaníc li formes supra indicat es plu hideosi e minu natural quam li formes conjugativ <i>nos paga, vos audi, illes pote</i> etc.?</p> <p>Pro quel motive misteriosi il admesse li schematisme in li formes conjugativ (tam frequent que sin ili on ne posse formar un sol frase) e in contrari vela se li facie quande, in virtú del sam principie, noi di <i>electibilitá</i> vice <i>eligibilitá</i>? Li simplic veritá es que De Wahl, hante un vez adoptet un principie, aplicat it sistematicmen e acceptat su ínevitable consequentias quam un cose natural e perfectmen logic. Li remarca de Dr. Gode que li occidentalistes "crede se obligate de admirar tal ingeniositates, durante que ille ipse habe vergonia de haber rendite se culpabile de illes" monstra un strangi misrepresentation del real statu de cosas. Nam si Sr. Gode crede dever hontar pro har schematisat li formas conjugativ in ILa, quo impedi le "renaturalisar" les secun li exemple de NEOLATIN de Schild? Si, in contrari, il trova que li conjugation deve esser regulari, benque alor li formas resultant es exactmen tam innatural quam li derivates criticat in ILe, quel motive have il por hontar?</p>	<p>Interlingua complicates its system of derivation to the point of making it practically impossible to apply, just to avoid "monstrosities" like <i>electibilitá, fractibil, consumpter</i> etc. despite that these forms are perfectly understandable. Naturalism before everything. But does Mr. Gode really believe that for the Romance speakers the forms indicated above are more hideous and less natural than the conjugated forms <i>nos paga, vos audi, illes pote</i> and so on?</p> <p>For what mysterious reason does he let in schematism in the conjugated forms (so frequent that one cannot form a sole phrase without them) and on the contrary turns his face away when, under the same principle, we say <i>electibilitá</i> instead of <i>eligibilitá</i>? The simple truth is that De Wahl, having adopted a principle, applied it systematically and accepted its inevitable consequences as a natural and perfectly logical thing. The remark by Dr. Gode that the Occidentalists "believe themselves obligated to admire such ingenuities while he himself is ashamed to have been guilty of making them" shows a strange misrepresentation of the real state of things. For if Mr. Gode believes one should be ashamed of having schematized the conjugated forms in Interlingua, what stops him from "renaturalizing" them in the same way as Schild has done with his language called Neolatin? But if, on the contrary, he believes that conjugation should be regular, then why not be proud of the resulting forms that are just as unnatural as the derivations criticized in Occidental?</p>
<p>Ma it ne mem es ver que si ILa accepta li innaturalitá in li formas conjugativ, it ha in cambie eliminat les radicalmen in li derivates. Si noi regarda li derivates <i>execution, preemption, selection, collection, detector, sanction,</i></p>	<p>But it is not even true that Interlingua, having accepted unnatural forms in its conjugation, has radically eliminated them in the derived words either. If we look at the derived words <i>execution, preemption, selection, collection, detector, sanction, convulsion</i>, to cite just a few examples, we see that they are marvellously</p>

<p><i>convulsion</i>, por citar solmen quelc exemples, noi trova que ili es marvelousimen natural e perfectmen irreprochabil. Ma queles es li verbes? Ili es <i>exequer, emer, seliger, colliger, deteger, sancir, conveller</i>. Admirabil resultate!</p> <p>Durant que in ILe perfectmen natural infinitives verbal producte in quelc relativmen rar casus derivates ne sempre realmen international, ma tamen perfectmen comprensibil, noi vide que in ILa perfectmen international derivates es in cambie derivat ex verbes queles es in sam ttempor ne-international e incomprensibil. Alor ú es li diferentie? Certmen hay anc in ILe quelc tre poc infinitives queles pecca contra li internationalitá, por ex. *fisser*, ma esque forsan li forme ILa *finder* es plu bon?</p>	<p>natural and impossible to criticize. But what are the verbs they come from? They are: <i>exequer, emer, seliger, colliger, deteger, sancir, conveller</i>. Quite the result! While in Occidental perfectly natural infinitives very rarely produce derivatives that are not always truly international, yet still perfectly understandable, we see that in Interlingua perfectly international derivatives are instead derived from verbs which are simultaneously not international and incomprehensible. So where is the difference? Certainly there are a very few infinitives also in Occidental that sin against internationality, such as <i>fisser</i>, but then is the Interlingua form <i>finder</i> a better one?</p>
<p>Existe ancor altri cosas passabilmen strangi. In li unesim alinea del capitul quel, in su INTERLINGUA GRAMMAR, tracta li question del "Double stem verbs", il declara que derivates "regularimen" format quam *<i>scribitura, corruptive, incidition</i>* vice li natural *<i>scriptura, corruptive, incision</i>* ne besona esser considerat quam fals, ma posse esser usat ucunc ili sembla stilisticmen possibil o preferibil. Per ti afirmation il justifica per un sol colpe omni derivates in ILe, nam vermen si on considera quam admissibil un derivate ne solmen ne-international, ma perfectmen incomprensibil quam <i>incidition</i>, qualmen on posse ancor jocar pri nor <i>electibilitá</i>?</p>	<p>There are some other strange things as well. In the first paragraph of the chapter which deals with the question of "Double stem verbs" in his Interlingua Grammar, he declares that derivatives "regularly" formed like <i>scribitura, corruptive, incidition</i> instead of the natural forms <i>scriptura, corruptive, incision</i> need not be considered as false, but can be used wherever they seem stylistically possible or preferable. By this affirmation he justifies in one fell swoop all the derived words in Occidental, because if one considers derived words like <i>incidition</i> (not only not international but also impossible to understand) to be admissible, then how can one continue to joke around with the point about our word <i>electibilitá</i>?</p>
<p>Yo anc ne vide in quo consiste, por li occidentalistes, li necessitá "dansar sur le corda rigide". It sembla me plutost que ti dansa consiste in pretender, quam fa ILa, perseguer in sam ttempor postulates incompensibil con unaltru. Por ex. abolir li géneres grammatical in li nómine del facilitá (admissente un sol articul) e</p>	<p>I also do not see the necessity for Occidentalists to "walk the tightrope" in this matter. It seems to me that this walk involves aiming, as Interlingua does, for forms that are simultaneously incompatible with one another. For example abolishing grammatical gender in the name of easiness (leaving just one article) and then letting it get back in through the window under the form of final vowels -o and -a in the name of euphony. Or chasing away</p>

<p>poy far revenir les tra li fenestres sub li forme del vocales final -o e -a, in li nómine del eufonie. O chassar li "schematisme" per admitter omni verbes irregulari con lor duplic e triplic radicas e poy far revenir it tra li fenestre per li prova regularisar li formation del radicas supinal per metodes practicmen ínaplicabil.</p>	<p>"schematism" by admitting all irregular verbs with their double ad triple roots, and letting it return through the window by the attempt to regularize the formation of supinal roots by methods that are almost impossible in practice.</p>
<p>Mi amicos de ILa mey pardonar me si yo ha expresset me in ti exposite con un total francore, sin provar masticar mi paroles. Ili save que yo ha, in ti sam revúe, sat sovente anc dit clarmen quant cosas es bon in ILa e quant noi debi al labores de IALA. Ili anc save que yo ha esset e continua esser un partisan convictet del cooperation fructosi inter li du movementes. Ma yo anc pensa que on servi li cose plu bon, si on di apertmen quo on have sur li cordie. Lass nos esser franc; ILa posse, mersí al complexitá de su sistema de derivation deverbal, esser considerat in un cert sense quam plu natural e plu international quam ILe e su finales vocalic rendi li lingue plu eufoniosi (adminu por li sudromanos). Ma in realitá it ha apene fat minu mult concessiones a to quo Sr. Schild nómina "schematisme", e Prof. Sauvageot probabilmene erra mult, si il di que ILa es por non-romanes sam desfacil a aprender quam aquel lingue romanic vivent. Peano ha, in mi opinion, esset plu bon inspirat quande il admisset, in li vocabularium de su LATINO SINE FLEXIONE, quam sol criterie ti del internationalitá e renunciat al elaboration de un sistema de derivation quel solmen vell har complicat li cosas sin aquel beneficie por li aprensor.</p>	<p>I hope my friends in Interlingua will pardon me if I have expressed myself in this exposition with complete frankness, without biting my tongue. They know that I have, in the same magazine, often spoken clearly of how many things in Interlingua are good and how much we owe to the work of the IALA. They also know that I have been and continue to be a convicted partisan of the fruitful cooperation between the two movements. But I also think that we serve the cause better if we openly say what is in our hearts. Let us be frank; Interlingua can, thanks to the complexity of its deverbal derivation, be considered in a certain sense more natural and more international than Occidental and its final vowels make the language more euphonous (at least for South Romance speakers). But in reality it has hardly made fewer concessions to what Mr. Schild calls "schematism", and Prof. Sauvageot is probably not very wrong in saying that Interlingua for non-Romance speakers is just as difficult to learn as any other living Romance language. Peano was, in my opinion, more inspired when he admitted only the criterion of internationality in the vocabulary of his language Latino Sine Flexione, renouncing the elaboration of a system of derivation that only would have complicated things without any sort of benefit for the learner.</p>
<p>Por ne indisposir li patient letor, yo renuncia parlar ancor pri li céteri exemples citat de Sr. Schild in su articul. Noi va esperabilmen haver li ocasion revenir a ili in ulteriori articules.</p>	<p>To avoid indisposing the patient reader, I will avoid speaking more about the other examples cited by Mr. Schild in his article. Hopefully we will have the opportunity to return to them in later articles.</p>

A. Matejka.

A. Matejka.