

Titel: BREV TIL: Eli Fischer-Jørgensen FRA: Francis James Whitfield (1969-05-15)

Citation: "BREV TIL: Eli Fischer-Jørgensen FRA: Francis James Whitfield (1969-05-15)", i *Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds*, s. 1. Onlineudgave fra Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds: [https://tekster.kb.dk/catalog/lh-texts-kapsel\\_011-shoot-workidacc-2014\\_0144\\_011\\_whitfield\\_0020/facsimile.pdf](https://tekster.kb.dk/catalog/lh-texts-kapsel_011-shoot-workidacc-2014_0144_011_whitfield_0020/facsimile.pdf) (tilgået 30. april 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.

May 15, 1969

Dear Eli -

It should be possible for me to send off to you within a couple of weeks a photocopy of the new, revised typescript that I have had prepared of my edition and translation of Résumé. Work on this and on Grundtrekk accounts at least in part for my long delay in answering your letters about Résumé — and, of course, your letters itself required very careful consideration. I refer especially to your questions and suggestions about a "philological account" of the edition, and I shall treat this matter first in what follows.

The copy from which I worked originally is the one that you lent to me before I left Denmark in 1967. (I understood at the time — and I hope I was right in thinking so — that you intended to let me have it on extended loan, until I had finished my work with it.) It is most likely, as you say, to have been Pöschke's copy; henceforth I shall refer to it as D.

In the summer of 1967, I found among Louis' papers a cardboard folder, stamped "Louis Hjelmslev Blegdamsvej 82 København Ø". According to my notes, this contains 193 pages in all. The first 117 pages are typewritten, but with many changes, additions, and deletions introduced by hand. With page 118 (corresponding to page 116 of D) starts the handwritten portion of the text — extremely messy and full of abbreviations and insertions, but still of inestimable help in making sense out of D. It seems to me most likely that this is what Louis was referring to when he wrote to you from Rugeleje, on August 18, 1958, about "mit eget delvis haandskrevne og af flere forskellere oplyste MS". (I quote from the excerpt from this letter that you copied and gave to Vibeke.)

Now, my study of this manuscript (which I shall call B) makes me quite certain that it was the basis of D, and, as I have already said, there are many places where I was able to use it to make sense out of D or to confirm emendations that I would have in any case made of D on the basis of internal evidence. For example, D (page 104, line 15) has the absurd phrase "som en videnskabelig, og følgende en videnskabelig"; the corresponding place in B confirms that the correct reading of the final phrase is "og følgende en metavidenskabelig".

This is not too bad an example of the time-consuming, space-consuming, and fruitless labor that would be involved if one were to undertake a "philological account" of the readings that I have adopted for my translation. Let us imagine for a moment that Alth. Færeviksen had pointed out this point not quite as obvious an error, but one that might give rise to some doubts (as his "variantes" raised doubts with you and Mads). Then, according to the principles you suggest, it would be necessary not only to give reference to the reading of B but also (I see no way out of it) to point out that the English does not even translate B literally but, in accordance with general principles of making the terminology conform to that of PTh (provided, bien entendu, that only terminology is involved), "metavidenskabelig" has been translated, not as "metascience" but as "meta-academic scientific". Nothing would be achieved by

such a note except quite unnecessary confusion of the reader.

Observe that specific references to B would entail responsibility for a much fuller account of B than would be possible within any reasonable amount of space or desirable. B was not used merely as the basis of D — notes were being added to it long after the appearance of D. For example, the paragraph that appears in D at the bottom of page 53 (beginning "Sædvanen sættes...") is bracketed in B, with the annotation "Ken ikke forklare 2/12 51". Now, if I am to carry out my original — and, I think, quite proper — plan (as indicated clearly on page iv of my introduction), I could not possibly follow all the ramifications to which notes like this would lead. (For one thing, I should have to take a course in recognizing different people's handwriting.)

Your reference to "varietes" raises another question. Actually, according to my notes, I found "Insarientes" in B, but let us suppose that I had not — that B had been completely illegible at this point or that a page had been lost: I still would not hesitate to errand, without comment, to "Insarientes" and to translate accordingly. Why?

1. "Varietes", as you observe, would make no sense.
2. Compare *OSG* 72, 89, and 108, and observe that there is not a single indication to make us suspect a divergence between *Ricams* and *OSG* on this point.
3. In view of the preceding, why speculate (and why distract the reader by speculating), in a footnote, about a possible emendation to "Insarientes" (or, for that matter, to "varietes" — which, although equally nonsensical, would have to be solemnly considered and dismissed in such a philological footnote)?

It is precisely to avoid this sort of thing that I have spent literally hundreds of hours cross-checking both within *Ricams* and with other works (particularly *OSG*).

One more example: On page 161 of D we read: "Glossærens redistri-bures paa de simple underarter...", and no typographical error is involved. My version reads now: "The glossærens and glossærens-variantes are redistributed over the simple sub-species..." — simply because that is what is happening and because the attentive reader might be unnecessarily distracted by the absence of the expected phrase "and glossærens-variantes". Would anything be gained by introducing a footnote to point out that, undoubtedly through inadvertence, the phrase does not appear in the original text? I cannot believe so.

I am confident that you and Nils will understand me in this. I shall certainly welcome any queries you may have about the edition, and of course I am not so over-confident as to believe that it is free from errors. It is only that a thorough "philological" investigation and history of the various versions of *Ricams*, partial variants, scattered notes, and other related material would be quite beyond the scope of what I intended to do — to put D in publishable form with the help of B and of whatever other materials that <sup>you</sup> could light on it, and do add to it the translation of "Proceduraklassen II 5", which I have mentioned on page iii of my introduction.

As for the *Polygomeni*, I cannot believe that a lot of footnotes on divergences from *OSG* would have been desirable, as did Louis ever suggest to me any time for such emendations. I really cannot have

much compassion for Nils's American acquaintances who conclude that he has invented the term "discourse procedure" in 1943 because they find it — set off within double quotes — in a revised edition of 1961.

Book de Résumé: "R" already occurs (in two different shapes) as abbreviation for both "relation" and "ravel". It would hardly do to make it the abbreviation of "rule" as well. Even though context would (presumably) clear up the ambiguity in each individual case, why add unnecessary to the reader's psychological burden? Similarly, why use "D" for both "definition" and "casuistic directives"? Abbreviations from the Latin are still by no means uncommon in English (esp. in *ibid.*, v. e.g., ...), and I really cannot see any objection to "R<sub>g</sub>" for "regula". (There will, of course, be a list of commonly used abbreviations — not symbols — at the beginning of the book.) It would be other words of anybody's time to go through the text changing R<sub>g</sub> to R, R<sub>g</sub> to RR, Df to D, Df to DD (and, I suppose, Ex to E, Ex to EE) — and, almost inevitably, some instances would be missed.

I understand the aim of placing the marginal references to definitions and rules in different columns, but it really wouldn't help the reader very much. The best solution would be running heads at the top of the page so that the reader can easily locate a desired definition or rule by flipping through the pages quickly. The new table of contents that I have prepared will also help in this respect.

The suggestion that the *NN* be set in small type is a very good one and will, indeed, make things clearer for the reader.

I'm sorry you weren't able to get support for the great index, to be based on *Welt-Festsatzung's* (which I do not own, but of which I have seen a copy). At the same time, it may be just as well for its preparation to be postponed till after the appearance of *Résumé* and *Essai III*, at least. It certainly would be desirable for it to contain references to both *Essai II* and *Essai III*, since for many people there will be much more convenience than the page references to the original articles. I am sure, beside, that its preparation will take quite a long time, if it is to be done well, and I should not like to see it delay publication of *Résumé*.

"*Calepinus on calepinus*" is slightly emphatic and does mean "one after the other". From Caselli's English-German Dictionary (1959), page 359: "less or less, Verlust auf Verlust, Verlust niter Verlust ein Verlust nach dem andern". Bulo-Bulthoff's English-Polish Dictionary (1959), page 665: "Discretion on Discretion, jedno nieoczekanie po drugim, nieoczekanie za nieoczekaniem". K. Ten Bruggenatze - A. Bröcker, English-Dutch Dictionary (14<sup>th</sup> ed., 1948), page 503: "less or less, 't ene verlies vóór, 't andere na". Miller's English-Russian Dictionary (1919), page 476: "less or less, yedno za yednym". I really should have a memorable list of case to quote, and there is one echoing loudly in my head, but I can't recall it at the moment. Anyway, here is the expression. I'm surprised that Nils was unfamiliar with it.

I reuse my conjecturations and add more (also, also, belated) on your election to the

-4-

"Common Science Foundation." And I still think that you should not underestimate the stimulation that your discussions and correspondence give to Louis.

And now I want to add my warmest thanks to you, to Kato, to H. Ch. Sørensen, and to Torgny for your application to the Poul-Holst Foundation. I could not fail to note how graciously and generously worded it was.

For various reasons, I have postponed till the end my apologies for another long overdue letter. I know that you are at least as busy as I am, so there is really no point in my listing all the causes of my delay. All I can do is pray to whichever saint has survived the recent Vatican purge to give me the grace of greater efficiency.

Celine sends her greetings. She is still not over the hump with her aches and has been having a pretty hard time since her Christmas visit to the hospital. There is, certainly, improvement, but it is slow.

Yours,  
Hjelmslev