

Titel: BREV TIL: Charles Ernest Bazell FRA: Eli Fischer-Jørgensen (1956-04-21)

Citation: "BREV TIL: Charles Ernest Bazell FRA: Eli Fischer-Jørgensen (1956-04-21)", i *Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds*, s. 1. Onlineudgave fra Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds: https://tekster.kb.dk/catalog/lh-texts-kapsel_004-shoot-workidacc-2005_0099_004_EFJ-Bazell_0130/facsimile.pdf (tilgået 02. maj 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.

E

Dear professor Rozell,
Thank you very much for your letter from January, and excuse me for not having answered till now. I have spent almost all my time preparing our new Institute for Linguistics and Phonetics which is being installed in an 8-room apartment in St. Kannerstræde 13. Up to now we had two tiny rooms in all for linguistics and phonetics, and the former room was at the same time office for the Linguistic Circle and library and professor's room for all teachers of English, French and General Linguistics (b), whereas the latter was library, auditory, research room etc. This will be a change, but it has taken an enormous time.

I am however very proud that I got Hjelmslev to answer you, and I thought that would be the best thing you could think that you are quite right that Hjelmslev never stressed the trial-and-error stage. He did not even do it orally until round 1951. This phase of the work had never really had his interest, he has always taken for granted that the analyst already knew the language completely.

I also agree with your view on Sierrens and Cohen. - I have also promised to write a review of her book. - Whitfield however was very dissatisfied with it. Of course it does not go very deep into the problems. - In this respect I think that Coserius' article is very good.

When I got your first letter I phoned to Hjelmslev in order to get a good example of the paradigmatic relations, I thought that logically they must be functions between members of a paradigm paralleling the syntagmatic functions. I was astonished that he could not answer my question immediately, but had to think it over. - Then he wrote to you. But of course your objection is evidently right: autonomy does not correspond to combination, if he maintains his definition.

Now, when I asked him about this, he said that unfortunately he had given a wrong definition of autonomy, it should be defined just as combination in syntagmatics (i.e. according to the example of the vowel-consonant relation). But I am sure that this was a mistake. For his example corresponded very well to the definition. I have not thought this through. I think I should have asked him to give me an example of a paradigmatic relation. I think I should have asked him to give me an example of a syntagmatic relation. I think I should have asked him to give me an example of a paradigmatic relation. I think I should have asked him to give me an example of a syntagmatic relation.

I think I should have asked him to give me an example of a paradigmatic relation. I think I should have asked him to give me an example of a syntagmatic relation. I think I should have asked him to give me an example of a paradigmatic relation. I think I should have asked him to give me an example of a syntagmatic relation.

