

Titel: BREV TIL: Louis Hjelmslev FRA: Hans Jørgen Uldall (1951-01-23)

Citation: "BREV TIL: Louis Hjelmslev FRA: Hans Jørgen Uldall (1951-01-23)", i *Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds*, s. 1. Onlineudgave fra Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds: https://tekster.kb.dk/catalog/lh-texts-kapsel_034-shoot-workidacc-1992_0005_034_Uldall_0610/facsimile.pdf (tilgået 28. 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.

HJU/MMT



MINTO HOUSE
CHAMBERS STREET
EDINBURGH

23rd January, 1951.

Professor L. Hjelmslev,
Ordruphøjvej 40,
Charlottelund,
Denmark.

Dear Hjelmslev,

There is, believe it or not, some sense in my postcard, though I will admit that the woollen helmet is perhaps slightly frivolous. The thing is this: we have always acted on the assumption that the various directions of relations form a hierarchy so that there is a priority relation between them, but we have never explicitly stated the structure of this hierarchy. What I have in mind is facts like the following. In the English paradigm plight + light there is determination between p and l since plight does not occur. While in the paradigm play + lay + pay there is combination; now our usual practice is to generalise the combination and say that the unfilled rubric in the first paradigm is due to the usage not having exploited all the possibilities of the norm. In other words, we regard the determination as being subordinate to the combination. Similarly a solidarity would be subordinate to a determination. It is these relations that I have tried to elucidate by the diagram I sent you, though I suspect that it is fairly easy to formulate these relations of relations algebraically. What I am wondering about now is whether this procedure should be generalised.

Yours sincerely,

Upton.