

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

Citation: "notes on EFJ, [whitfield] 011-0050", i *Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds*, s. 3.
Onlineudgave fra Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds: https://tekster.kb.dk/catalog/lh-texts-kapsel_011-shoot-wacc-2014_0144_011_whitfield_0050_p3_bP2_TB00050/facsimile.pdf
(tilgået 05. 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.

Notes on FFJ 9-1-19 - Page 3

I caught after making the copy that you have.

- (7) Page 2, P₃ B was — in part — prepared at a time when Louis was using *videndelst* and *metaendendelst* whereas, in OS6, he finally decided that he should use *videndelst* and *metaendendelst* (OS6, page 106, footnote 2: "At vi ikke simpelt hen siger *videndelst* ligesom i et vis mere riges med den mulighed at vi endelig ikke er oppe i vis forståelse som syntaktisk.") As you will discover, this usage is well attested in B (see, for example, D, page 15 — I don't have the page reference to B), which is simply inconsistent on this point. There is a case where it is certainly proper to make the text read consistently and where footnotes could clarify up the text to no purpose. I think that my Introduction covers this kind of situation adequately, but if, after seeing the whole state of affairs in B, you think that these items should be specifically referred to on page iv of the Introduction, I suppose that could be done.
- (8) Page 2, P₄ I omitted 'n's in the revised version.
- (9) Page 2, P₅ B's reading is correct and is what I have rendered in the revised version.
- (10) Page 2, P₆ Since you do not yet have the corrected, final version of my text, I can understand your mistaken belief that I corrected B only where D was not clear. Actually, I believe I have quite good records of B — whose readings I added to D in clearly distinguishable red ink using a fine-point pen — out of what you refer to as the main copy of the typeset version. I enclose — to give you an idea of my collection — the kind of readings of B that I noted for the first hundred pages of D. (Naturally, I did the entire text of B quite carefully, but I think this should be sufficient to give you an idea of what kind of collecting I had done.) Of course, many of these readings obviously result from changes that Louis made after WF had prepared the text.
- As I said, the copy of my version that you now have does not include all the changes I have made in my original version (which were made before I had seen B) on the basis of B. Thus, I realize that your copy — in the next-to-last paragraph of P₆ — still reads "where the same interdependence is the relating white". In the revised version, the correct ending "... related white" will be found. Similarly, the revised version reads "On the basis of" in the passage to which you refer on page 185 of D.
- (11) Page 3, line 5 I truly and strongly believe that this is sufficiently determined by the statement on page iv of my Introduction, and that there should not be an appendix encompassing such material. But perhaps you do not mean this, since you only write "should be restored".
- (12) Page 3, line 11-12 In my Introduction I have spoken of "minor details, such as the substitution of 'extension' for 'extension' (conforming to the terminology of the *Philosophie*)". It seems to me that this covers quite adequately the kind of case you refer to here, but I suppose, again, that I could add, as another example, "and the rendering of *dehøjere* by 'higher' and of *oppe* by 'higher'". I do hope you would consider that sufficient since the whole thing is a matter of terminology only, and I follow the choice approved by Louis for *ITL*. Footnotes to each case would certainly help to show the text to which you refer.