

Titel: BREV TIL: Eli Fischer-Jørgensen FRA: Stephen Anderson (1986-06-30)

Citation: "BREV TIL: Eli Fischer-Jørgensen FRA: Stephen Anderson (1986-06-30)", 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_0050_p1_bPO_TB00008/facsimile.pdf (tilgået 23. juli 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.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

UCLA

BERKELEY · DAVIS · IRVINE · LOS ANGELES · RIVERSIDE · SAN DIEGO · SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA · SANTA CRUZ

DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS
LOS ANGELES, CA 90024, USA

2124B Campbell Hall
Phone (213) 825-9646
June 30, 1986

Prof. Eli Fischer-Jørgensen
Kongestien 45
Virum, Denmark

Dear Eli,

I'm extremely embarrassed about the length of time it's taken me to answer your letter of last November, including a draft of your review of *Phonology in the Twentieth Century*. It came while I was teaching a course from the book, and thus thinking (or re-thinking) about the extent to which I'd said what I meant to. What better time to think about a potential review? But somehow, I didn't get the letter written right away, and that meant it went further and further down in my pile of things to do right way ...

Naturally, I am very pleased with your generous assessment of the book as a whole. You are quite right, of course, that it is aimed at an American audience which is by and large illiterate where the history of the field is concerned: I'm afraid that for most of the relevant specialists in this country, the facts rehearsed are not at all well-known. I hope the book will also be of use for European and other readers: if so, that will come from treating the facts that are familiar to them in terms of a different range of interpretive options.

On points of detail: you're quite right that, grossly, I mean "representation" and "rule" to stand for the description of units and relations, respectively. I realize that there's a certain amount of equivocation involved in using the same words for the views of so many people, but I don't think it's pernicious. Your point about my misleading ascription to Trubetzkoy of a view on representations based on a passage referring to *Lautvorstellungen* illustrates this, I think. My translation is admittedly an exaggeration: it comes from the fact that I translated from Cantineau's French rather than from Trubetzkoy's German, and Cantineau translates *Lautvorstellung* as *représentation phonique*. Still, though, the passage in question is fundamentally about the characterization of utterances in terms of a particular kind of image, and even though that's not the same as a particular transcription, it's still a matter of characterizing the units that make up an utterance rather than the relations among utterances. The level at which I intend REPRESENTATION to function as a technical term is considerably more abstract than just the matter of an explicit transcription system.

With respect to particular figures, a few comments. For Boas, it is of course particularly hard to pin down many theoretical issues, since his "theory" is almost entirely implicit. What I found most interesting was the number of tantalizing remarks that seem to imply a system of rules defined over the set of surface forms — to the virtual exclusion of any sort of more abstract representation. Since he was quite explicitly concerned with a system of transcription, there's no question that matters of representation figured heavily — but the underlying theory of where the regularities of a language reside, he seems to have felt that it's the relations between surface forms, not an underlying and more abstract reality that counts.

As for Hjelmslev, I tried to stress a dissonance I find in his writing between a belief that language is a system