

Titel: BREV TIL: Louis Hjelmslev FRA: Charles Ernest Bazell

Citation: "BREV TIL: Louis Hjelmslev FRA: Charles Ernest Bazell", i *Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds*, s. 1. Onlineudgave fra Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds:  
[https://tekster.kb.dk/catalog/lh-texts-kapsel\\_021-shoot-workidacc-1992\\_0005\\_021\\_Bazell\\_0180/facsimile.pdf](https://tekster.kb.dk/catalog/lh-texts-kapsel_021-shoot-workidacc-1992_0005_021_Bazell_0180/facsimile.pdf) (tilgået 19. juli 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.

C.E. Bazell, 2

Magdalen College

Oxford

Dear Dr. Hjelmslev,

A renewed  
glance at the case-question in  
English and your own letters  
make me now agree more closely  
with your own view. I should  
now be prepared to admit that  
we have in English some such  
positional scheme:

Woll- <sup>Personae</sup> Subjective <sup>Impersonae</sup> Accusative

Rand- Dative Predicative

but still - no case-category! To  
take a parallel from the phoneme-  
scheme. If we have a language  
allowing only the following

Consonant phonemes: b d g h f,  
it might be legitimate to compare  
these with the acoustically  
corresponding consonants of Latin,  
but not to speak of categories  
of voiceless and voiced consonants  
where voiced and voiceless are  
never opposed in the same archi-  
phoneme (e.g. p:b). In a language  
like Turkish which shows Gen.  
Dat. etc. we have similarly no  
category of case, as the opposition  
is never realized in the same  
archimorpheme — as in Latin, where  
the signifies Gen. Dat. are realized  
in the same signifiants; (archimorphemes)  
Gen-Sing.: Gen-Plur, etc., each with

their reverse formants; just as  
the same ~~acoustic~~ acoustic  
ideas (voiced etc.) are realized  
in the same <sup>phonemes in the</sup> archi-phonemes p: b  
t: d etc. (each with their reverse  
function).

I make this point partly  
because I think I may seem to  
have used significant rather  
equivocally in the note just. I mean  
of course the formal type (morpheme)  
not the phonemata associated  
(formants). The significant may be  
a unit of an archi-morpheme as  
the phoneme is a unit of an  
archi-phoneme; only then can  
they belong respectively to categories  
of e.g. case or stop-consonant

Yours truly  
C.E. Bayle

P. S. Under signifiant  
would be included the "<sup>grammatical</sup> functions"  
of a semanteme-signifiant as  
under formant the phonemic  
functions