

Titel: Lingvistskredsen, [EliFischer]jørgensen1948-51] 038-0460

Citation: "Lingvistskredsen, [EliFischer]jørgensen1948-51] 038-0460", i *Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds*, s. 1. Onlineudgave fra Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds:
https://tekster.kb.dk/catalog/lh-texts-kapsel_038-shoot-wacc-1992_0005_038_EliFischerJogensen1948-51_0460_p1_bP0_TB00003/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.

Lingvistikredsen 26/5 50 (ad Eli Fischer-Jørgensen).

HJELMSLEV agrees with Miss Fischer-Jørgensen on several essential points. Among other things, he agrees completely in the view that it would be, for most practical purposes, of no use, and perhaps even ridiculous, to construct new languages with particular manifestations, considering that the number of languages which have ^{not} been adequately described up to the present date equals exactly the number of languages empirically given. It need hardly be emphasized, by the way, that ^{many} ~~most~~ of the best-known languages happen to be manifested in a graphic substance only. On the other hand, he does not see that the belief (which is nothing but a belief, or, to put it in more scientific terms, a glottogenic hypothesis) in the ~~prevalence~~ ^{prevalence} of one substance over the others is relevant for the argument presented in the paper, *if not for the sake of excusing the phonetical bias of some writers who have been unable to see the fundamental problem.*

Bloomfield,

Further, he agrees that categories have to be established and to be defined on a purely relational basis. However, in advocating (in explicit accordance with Mr. Tooby and in tacit accordance with his predecessors, such as Trager, Bjerrum, and others) the further establishment of subcategories of a higher range than those established in glossematics, Miss Fischer-Jørgensen seems to overlook the possibility of contingent gaps in paradigms, set forward with so much sagacity by herself in her paper in TLG V. Besides, the splitting up of relational categories in smaller ones precludes definitely any approach like the one preconized by Jakobson and the one which in glossematics makes it possible to utilize substance criteria in the universal categorial distribution of the taxemes. It is obvious that the difference between Jakobson's and Lotz's approach and that of glossematics is in the fact that Jakobson and Lotz, who take all phonemes together, disregard completely the linguistic categories.

Hjelmslev is of opinion that the so-called "jump" is, and must necessarily be, exactly at the point where the taxeme is split up in its component parts, because this point means per definitionem that the analysis on the basis of selection is exhausted. We may easily, according to Miss Fischer-Jørgensen, construct a language where each sentence or each syllable is symbolized by a taxeme, thus translating the facts into an artificial language where the "jump" will be at this particular point; it is however difficult to see the advantage of any such procedure. Hjelmslev does not see the analogy advocated between the 'he' and 'she' in 'bull' and 'cow' and in the pronouns, respectively, and the consonant categories which were discussed; 'he' in 'bull' and in the pronoun are variants and so is 'she' in 'cow' and in the pronoun, whereas p and n, for instance, are invariants. The main fact remains that 'bull' can be split up into 'he' and 'ox' because of the fact that 'he' and 'ox' occur separately in the paradigm, and that, in the same way, ph may in a given language, say Ancient Greek, be split up into p and h, because both p and h occur separately in the same paradigm. On the other hand, the four quantities m, nasality, plosion, and labiality do not occur separately in one and the same paradigm, but belong to ^{at least} two different levels.

Hjelmslev agrees that the phoneme has to ^{at least} split up into component parts. He does not see that this idea is an innovation or a new step forward. It is an inexplicable misunderstanding that glossem-