

Titel: BREV TIL: Thomas Albert Sebeok FRA: Louis Hjelmslev (1952-06-30)

Citation: "BREV TIL: Thomas Albert Sebeok FRA: Louis Hjelmslev (1952-06-30)", i *Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds*, s. 1. Onlineudgave fra Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds: https://tekster.kb.dk/catalog/lh-texts-kapsel_028-shoot-workidacc-1992_0005_028_Sebeok_0150/facsimile.pdf (tilgået 13. 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.

Sebeok, Thomas, 11

Thomas A. Sebeok: The Structure and Content of Cheregis Charms.

I have read the article with considerable interest, particularly III: Structural Analysis in Folklore, which presents an exceptionally large view and contains highly interesting observations concerning the history of scholarship. (I am particularly interested in the statement p. 11 l. 8-10: "a structural statement is everywhere one which says something about relations rather than about the relata themselves". This, by the way, has, as far as I remember, been pointed out not only by Carnap but also by Kaila, and of course by Hilbert. It is, at least to my own opinion, the main point in my article 'Structural Analysis of Language' 1947, which you cite in your Bibliography.)

I have gone through III: Sample Analysis, with particular care. I have no objection to the dichotomy principle as carried out here, partly because all necessary reservations have been taken in fn. 85 (p. 13), and partly because it is evident that the dichotomy principle works excellently, and sufficiently, in the example(s) chosen. -- I have been particularly interested in the statement p. 13, according to which the reasons for the boundaries laid down between the resultant of one single analysis can only be given by the further analyses; this, in fact, is a completely general principle which holds good for all analyses of this kind, although it is often neglected or ignored in present-day linguistics; much discussion on immediate constituents might have been avoided as superfluous, if this (together with the recognition of the necessity of an exhaustive procedure, passing through as many stages of analysis as possible) had been recognized.

These remarks are not objections. I have no alterations to suggest. (In the Bibliography, it might however be added that Brøndal's paper 'Linguistique structurale' 1943 is a reprint of his editorial paper in the Acta Linguistica I, 1939.) I might, of course, suggest *maris* as an alternative term beside Cheregis.

It is pleasant to me to see that your vast and well-informed documentation includes my old 'guide, philosopher and friend' and my first teacher of Finnish, F. Ohrt. Among his qualifications was that of being what in Danish is called a 'German-eater' ('tyskereder'), so he might have felt a little uneasy about your fn. 2, although I do not doubt that your statement about his discussion being essentially German-based is fully adequate.

I might suggest that you contact Prof. Ad. Stender-Petersen (Aarhus) for a general discussion on structural analysis in folklore, in case you have not already done so. He has been working in the field and will no doubt be highly interested in your approach. Some years ago he wrote a short article on the structure of a folk-tale with methodological remarks, in a Festschrift to Arthur Christensen of which unfortunately I cannot recall the title just now.

Bloomington, Ind., June 30, 1952.

Louis Hjelmslev.