

Titel: BREV TIL: Stephen Anderson FRA: Eli Fischer-Jørgensen (1983-10-31)

Citation: "BREV TIL: Stephen Anderson FRA: Eli Fischer-Jørgensen (1983-10-31)", i *Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds*, s. 1. Onlineudgave fra Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds: https://tekster.kb.dk/catalog/lh-texts-kapsel_001-shoot-wacc-2005_0099_001_EFJ-ANDERSONS_0040_p1_bPO_TB00008/facsimile.pdf (tilgået 27. april 2024)

Anvendt udgave: Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds

Ophavsret: Materialet kan være ophavsretligt beskyttet, og så må du kun bruge det til personlig brug. Hvis ophavsmanden er død for mere end 70 år siden, er værket fri af ophavsret (public domain), og så kan du bruge værket frit. Hvis der er flere ophavsmænd, gælder den længstlevendes dødsår. Husk altid at kreditere ophavsmanden.

31/10 83

Dear Steve,

Thank you very much for sending me various chapters of your book and recently the chapter on glossematics, and excuse me for not having reacted to it. The reason is that I have been terribly busy for the last two years. I have, in fact, never been so busy in my life. When I retired I thought that I would have plenty of time, and I accepted all invitations to contribute to festschrift-volumes, symposia etc. with the result that I have hardly had a minute free. - This summer was particularly hard, but I finally decided to go on holiday for a month at the end of September. I got your chapter on glossematics the day before leaving, so I put it into the suitcase, but I had to look various things up, so I was not able to answer until now.

I think you have done a very good job. It is very difficult to write about glossematics, but your account is very clear, and your criticisms convincing. I have only a few remarks. - (There is a number of misprints, but I think you have found them yourself).

As for the first more historical part on the development of glossematics I can only agree. As far as I can see you have based it partly on my obituaries etc. - There is only one point where I disagree completely - p. 217, l. 10 from below, you mention me together with Jonas Rask, Verner Holger-Jensen and Jespersen. I really do not belong in that company! I have not made any contributions to linguistics at all. I have written some critical papers on phonology, which are rather clear, but not original, and I have contributed to the history of phonology, that is all. - You could mention lots of Danish linguists who have given much more important contributions: Sandfeld, Brandal, Diderichsen, Fogeby, Bech, Jerod, Wischhal. So please, leave me out! (But it was nice of you).

By the way Hjelmslev's books have been translated into various languages in Southern Europe during the latter years, (French, Italian, Spanish, Albanian etc.), so there is, in fact, an interest in his theories, somewhat more than appears from what you say on p. 216.

p. 219 I am more inclined to agree with Diderichsen. Of course Rask knew that language changes, but he did not distinguish clearly between typological and genetic relationship.

p. 230 If you use the term realization, where Hjelmslev said manifestation, I think you should stick to manifestation. Hjelmslev very carefully avoided the term realization in this connection.

p. 224 Did you say that Uldall had a succession of positions in London, Argentine etc. I am not sure that he had any position in London. I think he only stayed there for a short time. I can ask Betty.

p. 239 beginning of last paragraph. I do not think this is quite correct. According to the Resumé taxemes are the last units you arrive at in the particular analysis. But you say they continue making an universal analysis, dissolving the taxemes into prime factors, called glossemes (which are designated by the Greek letter α etc.). Expression glossemes are called