

Titel: BREV TIL: Francis James Whitfield FRA: Eli Fischer-Jørgensen (1969-07-03)

Citation: "BREV TIL: Francis James Whitfield FRA: Eli Fischer-Jørgensen (1969-07-03)", 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_0090/facsimile.pdf (tilgået 03. 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.

ristik" are green although they are in the middle of the text. also the curved and the vertical lines on 184a (which are all additions). -

186 there are three oblique red lines referring to correction on p. 185 a.

--- & I have looked up p. 242 in my copy of Forelesninger, but as a matter of fact I think it is the same copy that you had (it is ~~marked~~ a copy made by Spang-Thomsen~~s~~, which I have borrowed from him). ~~ixix~~ There is nothing after B , and there is ~~y~~ wher e you have it. But I cannot quite see the problem, according to the way Hj. used the greek letters for categories, A is selecting B selected, ~~Y~~ both ~~and~~, and ~~P~~ neither -nor, which is in good agreement with the way the symbols are used here. ta is selected ~~sa~~ if we have ta and tat but not at, --- I 'm sorry, now I see the problem, ~~Y~~ and ~~P~~ should probably be reversed, - I cannot resolve this problem-

-- As for the register, I think the best solution will be the following. The register is ~~xxxx~~ published as you proposed in an earlier letter, as a separate issue under Sabø's name, so that you have no responsibility, and so that Resumé can appear alone. I should have preferred ~~xxxxxxx~~if they had appeared together, but I think it is all right, if it is said in the introduction, that a register containing the ~~xxxxixixix~~ terms and referring also to the occurrence in Hj.s other writings will appear soon . I should suggest that the Resumé is published as a volume in the TGLC, and they might get consecutive numbers or No. XIV a and b.

I do not know whether Høder, at the time he talked with you, intended to pay translation and publication. This is well possible, but now it is impossible. He has very great economic difficulties, because one of Arthur Jensen's daughters claims a large sum of money (~~xxx~~ which her father had refused to give her), and I think the daughters ~~have~~ have a good deal of the capital placed in the publishing house, which has brought him in a difficult situation. Thus , it is necessary to get money for the printing, and I think we can get it from Humanistisk Forskningsråd. ~~xxxxix~~ We can apply in August or September.

--- I have read your introduction again. Of course you based your translation on D, since this was the only ms you had at that time, but since then you have, as your notes show, made very careful comparisons with B ,and as you mention, also with H, and you have made a good deal of changes on the basis of what you have found in these ms, so I think the fact that you started with D, is really a historical fact, which is not essential for the presentation of the ~~xxxxxxxx~~ matter now. ~~xxxx~~ Since the first 85 (in B 87) pages were copied by Hjelmslev himself, and the rest by HWP, it is evident that for the first 85 pages the basis must be the typewritten copy, made by Hj.- (and ~~ixz~~ ~~ssá~~ here the corrections in B must be taken into account, in so far as they are corrections and changes evidently made very soon (~~det forelig ende emne~~), but not the corrections introduced by Uldall. As for the remaining part, it is evident that B must be the basis. I do not think you are right in assuming various other sources for D. It is true that in some places, "J. simply writes "der af. af konnotator" and the like), but Wett Frederiksen told me that in these cases he used the so-called "salmebog" i.e. "Hjelmslev's files of definitions (a small box found in his archives - and of which we might also take a copy for you), but that he had had no other

sources. - ~~ixthinkx~~To base the translation on a non-corrected copy of HWP's would of course be wrong, and in your revised version you have not done this either. so your introduction should be changed on this point so that it is in agreement with what is the right method, and what you have in fact done.

A thorough description of all the manuscripts is of course not necessary, but I think you must ~~w~~ say a few words about B and H ~~(xxxxxxxxxxx)~~ and perhaps D. -- All these are not "related papers" but simply versions of the basic manuscript. - As far as I can see it is only for the last chapter you have a different source.

I think it must also be said that Hj. himself intended to base ~~xxxxxxxxx~~ the publication on this old version from 1943 (as far as the theory is concerned, he obviously planned some changes in the wording, since he has asked his secretary to copy the ms, ~~xi~~ with a half page blank for ~~x~~ corrections), and that ~~this~~ is ~~x~~ a main reason for not taking the later changes into account. ~~at~~ it should be mentioned that Hjelmslev and Uldall planned a revision in 1950-51, ~~but~~ and started making changes, but that Hj. gave it up again. (it would be interesting to have these changes in an appendix but it is not absolutely necessary).

In the introduction I think you could also say somewhat more about the principles of translation of the terminology, e.g. that you have changed ~~xxxxxxxxx~~ ~~ixxxxxxi~~ the (following) - terms in accordance with PTL, and that you, also in accordance with PTL have changed sprog to semiotic and dagligsprog to sprog (and that Hj. first used semiotiv, then changed it to sprog, but later went back to the first terminology). - and that you have added a relatively great number of cross-references,

As for ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ the differences between B and DH, I think it is essential to distinguish between p.1-85- and the rest. For the first 85 pages the changes in HD (against B) have been made by Hj. himself, and should be kept (~~xxxxxxxx~~ and it is not necessary to ~~say~~ mention the different readings in B). whereas for p. 85 etc, B (+ the file of definitions - ~~ix~~ or simpler the copy of this file in D-H) should be the base, and HWP's mistakes are of course of no interest. -- Of course, as you have,

~~xx~~ changed sprog to semiotic, you must here follow B for p. 1-85, and I think that such things as underlining, small letters or capitals etc. are devoid of interest. i.e. most of the differences you mention in your list are of no real interest, and it does not matter what is written in the translation.

The same is true of most differences after page 85, but where there is a real difference it appears from your list compared with your revised version that you have as a matter of fact followed B. (e.g. §§ 89.5, 11-14. - 97, 14.

As for your own corrections against the ms, Niels and I have gone through your list, and we should make the following suggestions :

- A. In Introduction. - The questions of translation (sprog-semiotic-videnskabsprog fakultativitet) could be stated once for all in the introduction. The addition of cross-references also. - ~~and the~~ ^{probably} addition of glossematic symbols.
- B. No mention, - details of added references, and minor points thus : TB TE, RI, RH Ib --- IU, IW-IX, IZ, IAE. (RI p. 103, B has \mathcal{E}_1 (~~but~~ but the number might be misread ~~ixas2~~)

C. Footnotes (or at any rate bracketing of additions)

1) June 21. - In your not to Def. 98, "later" ans "still later" seem somewhat unprecise. I suppose "later" means "correction in the ms." (both H and D, probably made soon after the copying) and that "still later" means "in later publications (Grundtræk? or where?).

P. 161. Footnotes for bracketing for the additions in 2^o 3^o 6^o 7^o 8^o 9^o 10^o (I suppose you have a copy).

2) June 27.

RA (the note is added by Uldall) ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ from RB, it is not possible yo know ~~what~~ what sort of "uensartethed Hjelmslev thought of, thus it is safer to print it as it is and put Hjelmslev's remark in a footnote/.

RC short footnote

~~RD xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ (the correction inddeling to leddeli is found in H).

RE, RF, RG

IA short note

IAA "

IAB "

IAD "

Thus the principle we have followed is that all content- additions to the manuscript -or changes of the manuscripts (but not commas, underlining, capitalization, references etc) , should be indicated expressly, ~~xxxx~~ I have also talked with Togeby, and H. Chr. Sørensen who are members of the committee taking care of "Hjelmslev's Nachlass, and they had no doubts at all that it must be perfectly clear what ~~is~~ belongs to Hjelmslev's ms, and what is added by the editor.

Of course, this does not in any way imply any doubt about the correctness of your changes. It is only a question of philological principle. - Niels and I are full of admiration for the ~~xxx~~ ^{work} you have done, "one of us would have been able to do anything of the sort. And it must be a certain satisfaction that many of your conjectures have been found afterwards in B or in H. - In the whole H contains quite a number of corrections of mistakes (not corrected in D) ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ ~~xxxx~~ and this is why we think it must be practical for you to have a copy of this too. -

Excuse the misprints. It is 3 o'clock, and there is a wonderful sunrise.

After having seen ~~x~~ the pages of collation B-D you sent, we realize that there is no need for us to make any comparison, but this was not clear from your first letter or from the introduction.

Cordially

Yours

