

Titel: Glossematic algebra, [Uldall] 008-0020

Citation: "Glossematic algebra, [Uldall] 008-0020", i *Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds*, s. 16.  
Onlineudgave fra Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds: [https://tekster.kb.dk/catalog/lh-texts-kapsel\\_008-shoot-wacc-2009\\_0049\\_008\\_Uldall\\_0020\\_p16\\_bP15\\_TB00006/facsimile.pdf](https://tekster.kb.dk/catalog/lh-texts-kapsel_008-shoot-wacc-2009_0049_008_Uldall_0020_p16_bP15_TB00006/facsimile.pdf)  
(tilgået 29. 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.

however, the two separate analyses are fitted into a larger deduction where both are seen to derive from a common point, the two connexions can be defined in terms of their degrees of derivation, and we shall thus obtain an unambiguous differentiation without drawing on feelings, estimates, or other extra-scientific sources of "knowledge". It is easy enough to understand this as a theoretical principle, but experience shows that it is extremely difficult to impose upon oneself the discipline of not listening to the siren-song of traditional and intuitive "knowledge", to renounce the comfortable feeling that "after all, we know what a proposition is".

This is, of course, not to say that any apparent connexion can be adequately described as a simple both-and function between two otherwise anonymous functions; clearly the conjugal relations between any specific Mr and Mrs X have considerably more to them than that. But a marriage is a complex of connexions, each of which is a simple both-and function defined by its place in the hierarchy, and we can be certain of a complete definition only if the deduction embraces the whole universe and everything in it.

[an example of hierarchies

1. In his book Power (London, 1938) Bertrand Russell makes a very good case for the view that social relations are a matter of power. This he conceives as a constant, like the "energy" of physics, transmutable into various forms such as political power, military power, economic power, etc. according to ascertainable laws. It is a popular book, and it is not clear whether Russell visualises power as the content of social relations--substituting, as it were, pipelines for the strings of the net--but such a theory is not necessarily incompatible with