

Titel: notes, [nominalmorferne] 014-0080

Citation: "notes, [nominalmorferne] 014-0080", i *Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds*, s. 103.
Onlineudgave fra Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds: https://tekster.kb.dk/catalog/lh-texts-kapsel_014-shoot-wNKS-2757_0000_014_nominalmorferne_0080_p103_bP102_TB00016/facsimile.pdf (tilgået 31. 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.

It does not clearly appear, how Hjelmslev actually

regards the ~~type~~ subordinative relations of traditional syntax ~~of~~ the "ranks" of Otto Jespersen. In ~~his~~ Principes de Grammaire Générale (1926) p. 153 he defines primary terms as terms that are "governing as to concord", secondaries as terms that are "governed as to concord" and tertiaries as terms that ~~cannot~~ contract concord. ~~These definitions are, however, not applicable on English (because the adjectives are not inflected) or modern Danish (where there is no concord between subject and verb), and it seems that they have later on/abandoned.~~

From a glossematical point of view one might try to define the relations in question as relations between categories of complex unities. In Danish, f. inst. we have three types of (catalysed) independent utterances that may occur alone, viz. vocatives (Peter! / Frøken! 'Madame'), imperatives (Kom! 'come') and interjections (Jå! 'Yes'). Accordingly we dispose of three types of ~~primary~~ "primary units", viz. units including nominal morphemes, units including verbal morphemes and units that cannot contract syntactical relations at all. All other types of units presuppose some of these units and consequently ~~they~~ must be viewed as secondaries. But I find no hints of such a view in glossematical papers.

The only possibility left, then, is to regard ~~subordination~~ subordination as a relation between variants. But, if so, it seems to be fundamentally different from "determination" in its strictly glossematical sense. When we say, that the attribute gammel in den gamle mand 'the old man' "determines" the noun, we do not mean the same thing, as if we say e.g. that the suffix -ig in mandig / ~~the radical~~ the radical mand , for in the last case we speak of dependence between the category of radicals and the category of derivatives, and that cannot be ascertained for the first case. As far as I can see (setting aside logical, ontological or