

Titel: BREV TIL: Charles Ernest Bazell FRA: unsure (1951-01-07)

Citation: "BREV TIL: Charles Ernest Bazell FRA: unsure (1951-01-07)", 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_0460/facsimile.pdf (tilgået 20. 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.

Dear professor Bazell,

Thank you very much for your letters, which cleared up various points in your articles. - I am sorry that I have not been able to answer until now.

It is very funny that you consider yourself as the only linguist who cannot understand what is meant by "in praesentia". For at the same time you are the only linguist by whom I have found the expression "in praesentia". And I wondered what you meant. Now I see that something like Hjelmslev's "forløb" is intended. -

I really agree with Jakobson in the point that ~~brality~~ is not simply zero as compared with nasality. You seem to assume a neutralization between n and t (manifested as d) and say that it is the whole point of neutralization that a feature is replaced by zero. - But if the manifestation is opposite, what then? and what in the case of Danish b/p neutralised ~~xx~~ finally so that you may use either of them without distinction? Neutralization means the suspension of an opposition, and you may say that there is one distinctive feature less, ~~xxx~~ in final Danish b than in initial b, - but zero distinction does not imply that one member of the opposition must be called zero. You may call it unmarked or extensive, but that is not the same thing. - By the way I have not yet grasped your distinction between syncretism and neutralization. -- It is true that there is a contradiction between what I wrote about syncretism of cases, and what ~~xxx~~ is found in my "Fonetik", but I was not so convinced that my doubts were right then.

In your second letter you say many interesting things about sequence and accent and related phenomena. - I should prefer to return to these questions later in the spring, when I am going to take up my article on the relational definition of phonemes. At the moment I am busy with an article on a quite different question: the possibility of a classification of ~~xxxxxxxx~~ on an auditory basis and the relation of this classification to the physical classification. (In particular I am discussing Roman Jakobson's terminology and his somewhat bold parallelism between physical and auditory phenomena.)

I was glad to have your explanation of "Höle", and I find your comparison between "sit" and "ibus" striking.

We have had a series of very interesting discussions in the autumn in the Linguistic Circle about syntactic relations, where your articles were also mentioned. - We came to the conclusion that Hjelmslev's relations (selection, solidarity, combination) are of a quite different kind from the ordinary syntactic relations (like e.g. subordination). - ~~Njxxxx~~ Selection is a relation between two invariants (one element presupposes always -- at this stage of the analysis - another) Subordination is a relation between variants, it is a relation in a given ~~shxxxx~~ single chain, and it is of no interest to which invariants the variants belong and how the other variants belonging to the same invariants behave. They are only of interest as endpoints of the given relation (in this case of the subordination). - If you take a sentence like "he saw a stone wall", you cannot find any selection between stone or wall, but on the contrary combination (either of them may be left out), - but a stone is subordinate to wall, - because wall is equivalent to the group stone wall; but it is only so because of the meaning (the substance of the content). A similar case in French is "il a lu les philosophes grecs." -- The glossematic analysis is above all interested in classifying the elements.

18-118

possibilities of relation. - The traditional syntactic analysis considers the relations as such, but ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ generally relations which have no ~~xxxxxxxx~~ fixed expression, but are found on the basis of the meaning. ~~xxxxxxxx~~ Subordination, predication, object-relation etc. may be found in many different languages because they are logical rather than linguistic relations. But they may of course in some languages be linguistic, ~~xxxxxxxx~~ that is, generally they are variants of particular morphemes; e.g. case-morphemes. - Diderichsen tried to reduce the syntactic relations in Danish to relations between certain verbal and nominal morphemes. These relations do not coincide absolutely with the traditional relations, but have something in common with them. - We discussed if word order may constitute the expression of such a relation. e.g. Danish direct and indirect object (but it seems never to be fixed) - in that case word order would be the expression of a morpheme "but somehow this is ~~xxxxxxxx~~ absurd." - The immediate constituents of the American also seem to be found on the basis of a substantial analysis. -

We are going to continue the discussion ~~xxxxxxxx~~ in the new year. ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ stop here, for the present. Form a very brief with the article (and I am going to give a lecture on this topic in Oslo at the end of the month) and I am afraid that I shall not be able to get it ready in time, because ~~xx~~ I cannot work very hard at the moment.

Yours sincerely,

It is confusing that the "content" of case morphemes seems to be lost relations. - This too makes the commutation between ~~xxxxxxxx~~ dubious thing.

I was glad to have your explanation of "right" and "left" commutation between "right" and "left".

We have had some interesting discussions in the seminar in the linguistic circle about syntactic relations, when your article was mentioned. - We seem to be concerned with Hjelmslev's relation (subject-verb), (verb-object), (verb-object), (verb-object), (verb-object) - like a syntactic relation between two morphemes (like a syntactic relation between two morphemes) - and as this page of the article, it is a relation in a very narrow sense, and it is of an interest to which Hjelmslev has referred and has in other various passages to the same phenomena. They are only in interest as examples of the "right" and "left" commutation of the verbal relation. - If you see a sentence like "the cat sat on the mat" you can find any relation between "sat" and "mat", but on the contrary, you cannot find any relation between "sat" and "cat". - This is important to note, because you will find in the group of the commutation of the verbal relation in these cases "it is a syntactic relation".

It seems this is interesting and important in our linguistic circle.