

Titel: BREV TIL: Francis James Whitfield FRA: Eli Fischer-Jørgensen (1969-06-09)

Citation: "BREV TIL: Francis James Whitfield FRA: Eli Fischer-Jørgensen (1969-06-09)", 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_0040/facsimile.pdf (tilgået 29. 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.

Dear Frank,

Thank you for your long letter from May 15, and excuse me for not having answered until now. I have not even thanked you for the translation of Grundtræk (but as Niels has written about it, you know at least that it arrived all right). - This has been the worst term in my life, although ~~xxxxx~~ I am sure it has not been as bad as yours. Our students make trouble, but they do not throw bombs. - I have had lectures that demanded very much preparation, committees, and a festschrift paper, and the Hjelmslev-papers. I have not had a single Sunday free, and I have worked 12-14 hours a day. Therefore I have postponed writing until to night - the night before my departure on holidays - (more or less - ~~xxx~~ must take the other letters along, and I am going to spend a fortnight in a summerhouse, cooking etc. with my mother who is getting rather senile).

- First about the Résumé.

I understand from your letter that you are very tired and that you are getting more or less fed up with the whole thing. And I understand this perfectly well. You must have had a very bad time, with illness and students' riots together with the normal work. It is admirable that you have been able to work with these things at all. And of course you do not want to start over again comparing texts. -

But I think it is possible to find a way out. - In a way it is much less complicated than I supposed ~~xxxxx~~ when I wrote my letter in October 1968 about these questions. I did not know then that you had found Hjelmslev's original manuscript, and it does not appear from your Introduction, where you only speak of "related papers". When the original is there, it has of course no sense to discuss different interpretations of mistakes in Wett Frede riksen's typewritten version. These mistakes are devoid of interest. ("variant" etc.). And as for the handwritten additions in D, it is evident that only the additions made by WF (because he had forgotten something) should be included, whereas Diderichsens notes should be excluded (all this without comment). You write that you must have a course in people's handwriting. But this does not seem to be necessary. - I have gone through all the handwritten additions and compared with your translation, and it turns out that you have in fact been able to distinguish between WF and PD, and that you have included WF and left out PD. WF additions are pp: 47, 91, 93, 96, 97, 102, 103, 104, 105, 107, 109, 114, 121, 123, 125, 143, 145, 154, 152, 154, 155, 157, 160, 177. PD has added cross references, references to Forelesninger, explanations of symbols and the like (pp. 10, 11, 18, 29, 30, 33, 46, 48, 50, 52, 62, 66, 81, 85, 95, 72, 79, 126, 134, 140, 137, 138, 141, 143, 144, 145, 150, 156, 172, 179, 183, 185).

There are no additions by Hj, except perhaps in the introduction "er udsendt", - ~~Ex~~ and there are only very few points of doubt. - On page 56. The text has "Funktion mellem to konstanter" (and so also B), PD has corrected to "flere", and you have simply written "between constants" which is certainly a good solution (but as B has two - it should be mentioned, see below). -

p. 80 "solidarisk med den Relation der etablerer komplekse enheder. ~~xxx~~ ---dl. The handwriting is PD's: dl if. (i.e. according to (ifølge)) L.Hj. 19/7 42. This is enigmatic, since the ms. is from 1943. In B it has been added, and deleted again. Probably 19/7-42 refers to a letter from L.Hj. to PD giving a definition of konnektiv. Anyhow it should be left out, as you done.

p. 84. for funktioner der etablerer summer (dl? in the margin with PD's handwriting). This is found (as an addition) in B, but you have left it out. I think this should not be left out.

p. 100. blockletters, so I cannot see who has made the addition, anyhow it should be included, since it is found in B. ¹⁰⁷ If WF has added sprog to videnskab. As you have semiotic I suppose you have translated -sprog. - This is not found in B, but Hjelmslev must have asked WF to add this. - (Should be noted).

p. 136 n'a seems to be PD's handwriting. You have included it, although it is not found in B. - I do not know the symbols, so I cannot judge about it.

p. 165. 336 337, B has centrifugal in both def. §. PD has changed the first to centripetal, and you have the same, but in B it is the opposite - fugal petal. What is correct? If it is a mistake in B according to the system of definitions, it should be mentioned.

--- As you see, there are very few problems of this kind. On the other hand: as B (Hjelmslev's manuscript) is evidently the source of D (Diderichsens copy of WF's ~~copy~~ typescript) it is quite clear that the translation must be based on B, neglecting the mistakes in D. - ~~It seems to appear from your letter that you have only consulted B, where D was not clear, but that you have not made a systematic comparison between the two. This also appears from e.g. rule 197 where WF has written på tværs af " in stead of "på basis af" (B) and you have "cutting across". - I have now had two copies made of B, one for you and one for me, - and we can send you this copy, if you do not come over. But a comparison is much easier on the basis of the original, because in the copy it is difficult to see the difference between WF's green lines indicating that he had finished copying the page in question, and H's black lines deleting various passages. As there may be cases where WF's mistakes are not obvious a systematic comparison seems necessary, and Hjelmslev and I shall be glad to do this during the summer, I do not think we shall find much, but I think it must be done. +)~~

On the first 85 pages, there will hardly be anything, since these pages were written by Hjelmslev himself. This appears from the fact that these pages have been written with Hjelmslev's typewriter (recognizable by the e (ø) - it was a French typewriter) - moreover in B WF has written with green ink: "Hertil når maskinkrevet ~~manuskript~~ udleveret til HVF." Finally Ege has asked WF, and he has confirmed that he has never borrowed Hjelmslev's typewriter, and that Hjelmslev had written these pages himself, except for a good deal of the symbols and the cross references which were added by WF. - WF has written the rest 1943-45, i.e. he has not written typed the ms himself but dictated to somebody else, which explains some of the mistakes. -

As for the deviations between your translation and B, we fully agree that the translation should be based on the 1943-45 version. This was Hjelmslev's own intention, as he has said expressly to me. And the later additions from 1951-52 have not been carried through it was only an attempt to reconcile Hjelmslev's and Eldall's version and they did not succeed, and Hjelmslev did not really want it. - These additions can be identified by a comparison with Hjelmslev's main copy of the typewritten version, which Ege has. I suppose it is the one I brought back from Edinburgh). In this copy Eldall has introduced a number of corrections with red pencil (e.g. sprog to semiotic etc.) and the corresponding corrections

+) also because Hjelmslev in his letter to me wrote that it was "full of misreadings and mistakes and has to be corrected all through."

have been introduced by HJ. in his own old ms. (generally with indication of the year (1951 or 1952). Probably they have been working together, and HJ. has only had his old ms. since PD had the copy. - We agree that these must be left out, but I think they should be mentioned in an appendix. -

Finally there is the problem of corrections made by you against Hjelmslev's own ms (B). These must be indicated either in footnotes or by putting brackets around additions etc. - I suppose you agree with all of us here that this is absolutely necessary, and I suppose you have a list of these corrections. (Some of them can probably be given once for all, i.e. the translation of sprog by semiotic and the like.) - e.g. your addition p. 161, your change on p. 165 ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ etc. - I do not doubt that your additions are improvements, but nevertheless they are not Hjelmslev's text. I have talked with Toegby and Bjerrum and Mischel about it, they found that this was a simple matter of course.

As I have already told you, -as far as I remember- the Haskersted foundation would only give the normal rate for the translation, e.g. 5.700 cr. This is of course ridiculous, but we should not have asked for money for a translation, but for editorial work, comparing ms. etc. I should suggest that we ask Humanistisk Forskningsråd for a sum for this purpose. This has been an enormous work for you, and why should you have such a ridiculous sum for it? -

As for the register, the money has been given by Humanistisk Forskningsråd. The problem is only to find the right man. I have tried one (Henrik Frebensen), but he had no time. Two other possibilities are Hans Basbell and Jesper Hermann. Basbell would be excellent, but he cannot do it before January. - Now I am not sure that this would delay the publication of the Résumé very much. We have not yet applied for money for the printing, since we wanted to send out Essais II to Hjelmslev's 70th birthday and we could not get the money for both books at the same time. Moreover, we did not expect you to complete this translation so quickly. - But we can apply in the autumn. At that time Essais II should be out, so that they can be included in the register.

Now for Essais II. --- I found a girl who was willing to translate the other papers into English. She is American, studying linguistics and married to a Danish linguist, and she had no trouble with the technical terms (she had read PTL) but she did not know enough Danish to catch the meaning of adverbs etc. - However, the causerie is acceptable now after having been corrected thoroughly by Bodelsen and Ege. But the translation of the paper on Vilhelm Thomsen was impossible. As you may have noticed the style is rather bombastic, and in (rather bad) English the effect was dreadful. Now it has been translated into French, ~~xxxx~~ which is much better. -

We are not quite sure that it will be possible to send the book out in time. It has taken some extra time to find people to make the translations, and the printer was horrified when he saw some of the manuscripts - particularly "Grundtræk" and "Accent, Intonation..". It appears that Møder has said that the texts were approximately as in Essais I. -

I am enclosing a copy of your translation of Grundtræk with ~~xxxxxx~~ some changes and additions made by Niels and me. We should, of course have asked for your approval before sending the ms. to the editor, but there was very little time, partly because Basbell kept it rather long, partly because I was extremely busy. Niels and I have discussed the matters very thoroughly with Basbell (who has ~~xxxxxx~~ written his MA thesis about Danish phonemics, ~~xx~~ and who has given a very fine criticism of

Grundtræk) to have a look at it because we wanted to find out whether it would be possible to correct the inconsistencies. But the number was so large, that we realized that this could not be done. So we have only corrected the direct misprints, which could be done by means of a comparison with Hjelmslev's original manuscript, of which I have a copy. This manuscript proves, by the way, that your first assumption about page 18.4 was correct. "og med ' eller med ' . . . " .

In an editorial note we have referred to a paper to be published by Basbell. We found this note necessary, ~~since~~ since this paper is very confusing because of the numerous inconsistencies and the partly impossible rules, - nevertheless it is the best demonstration of the method -- (it is only a pity that the application is so unsatisfactory-- as a matter of fact Hjelmslev has simply taken an old ms and changed something here and there-- I found a ms. from 1935 among his papers, containing most of "Grundtræk") -- We have also found it necessary to add some more indications of the pronunciation, partly in brackets in the text, partly in footnotes, at places where we found the text too difficult. ("no can know, that slagg is pronounced [slɑ?y]?). I suppose you do not object to this. -

?) and you find at the moment

There are, however, also a few changes in the translation I think they appear rather clearly in the text, through the different typewriter. It is now so long ago that I do not really remember details. We have discussed each point and have come to the conclusion that the translation proposed by us comes somewhat closer to the ~~the~~ intention behind Hjelmslev's Danish formulation. So this is, of course, not a criticism of your English style -- it would be ridiculous of us to do that - but it is an attempt to come closer ^{to the Danish text} at some rather difficult points. Of course you are perfectly free to correct it back in the proofs. And perhaps, if you have time to ~~read~~ react to these points now, they may be changed before the paper goes definitely to the printer. I think it is not necessary now to explain each point, - but in all cases where you do not accept the formulation, we will give detailed reasons (~~we~~ probably Hjelmslev can do this better, since I forget everything after a short while).

In the editorial note we have not mentioned your name, because at that time I thought of doing it in the preface, but I think it is better also to give the name of the translator ~~in the preface~~ together with the indication of the original title.

--- Now it is half past two at night, and I have many things to do before I can go to bed, -(and I am leaving tomorrow morning), so I will only add briefly that the faculty has now decided to announce Hjelmslev's chair as a chair in ie. comp. linguistics, and to ask for a chair in general linguistics later. Hjelmslev and I have been on a committee about the chair and the degrees in linguistics. Hjelmslev has also done most of the work in the subcommittee concerning the rules for exams and degrees. According to the plan we have made, it should be possible to ~~start~~ start with an exam (after two years) in general linguistics and then go on to theoretical, applied, comparative, etc. linguistics. --

Please give my greetings to Celina, I hope she is better now.

Best wishes

Yours

Li

Letters to me will be forwarded.

I shall be back 24/6 - leaving L. Iceland 5/7