

Titel: notes on EFJ, [whitfield] 011-0050

Citation: "notes on EFJ, [whitfield] 011-0050", i *Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds*, s. 2.  
Onlineudgave fra Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds: [https://tekster.kb.dk/catalog/lh-texts-kapsel\\_011-shoot-wacc-2014\\_0144\\_011\\_whitfield\\_0050\\_p2\\_bP1\\_TB00048/facsimile.pdf](https://tekster.kb.dk/catalog/lh-texts-kapsel_011-shoot-wacc-2014_0144_011_whitfield_0050_p2_bP1_TB00048/facsimile.pdf)  
(tilgået 02. august 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.

Notes on FJ 9-1-39 - Page 2

reducing the number of footnotes to a minimum.

- ② Page 1, P. 4 (ed D, page 56 "Funktion mellem to Konstante") In my revised version, I decided to put "Funktion mellem to Konstante" (and, correspondingly, in Df 127, "Funktion mellem to Variable"). This is the form in which the definition appears both in OS6 and PTh, as there is every reason to believe that Louis was satisfied with it.
- ④ Page 1, P. 5 In my revised version, I leave in "the Relation Establishing" and have permitted myself the following footnote:  
 "This definition (which also appears in OS6, page 65) was later changed (as in PTh, page 72, 137) by deletion of "the Relation Establishing". Note that a corresponding change would have to be made in Pg 54. (F.J.W.)"
- ⑤ Page 2, P. 1 In my revised version, I leave in "functions that establish". The difficulty here and in the parallel case above, of course, from the various definitions that Louis had set out for "establishment". I believe that the following solution, which I have used in my revised version, is the best. Before the definition of "establishment", I insert, in brackets, the following definition and footnote:  
 "Df 98. A FUNCTIONAL FIELD is: Function with all its possible Functions."  
 In<sup>7</sup> This definition is not found in the original version. It is required for the altered definition of ESTABLISHMENT that is given in the following footnote. (F.J.W.)  
 Then comes the definition of "establishment" and another footnote:  
 "Df 99. An ESTABLISHMENT is a Relation that exists between a Sum and a Function Entering into the sum, and that the function Contracts as Constant."  
 In<sup>8</sup> This definition (of OS6, page 76; in PTh it was modified by deletion of the final clause) was later replaced by the following: An ESTABLISHMENT is a Relation that exists between a Paradigm of Sums and a Functional Field Entering into one or more of the sums, and that the paradigm of sums Contracts as Constant.  
 Still later, the following strategy of definition was adopted:  
 FUNCTIONAL FIELD - as above;  
 ESTABLISHMENT - the Relation between a Function and its Functional Field;  
 CELL - Functional Field being Cohesion to a Paradigm of Sums, which (paradigm) Contracts the cohesion as Constant. (Contract Df 215, below.) The cohesion is called a CONSOLIDATION, and the cell is said to CONSOLIDATE the constant. (F.J.W.)"
- ⑥ Page 2, P. 2 "INTERNAL METASOLOGICAL PLAN" is included in the revised version. It was not deliberately omitted in the version that you have - probably a typist's error that