

Titel: notes, [whitfield] 015-0040

Citation: "notes, [whitfield] 015-0040", i *Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds*, s. 2. Onlineudgave fra Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds: https://tekster.kb.dk/catalog/lh-texts-kapsel_015-shoot-wacc-2014_0144_015_whitfield_0040_p2_bP1_TB00014/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.

(open procedure, but the entities registered in \mathcal{G} are defined)
 \mathcal{G} ends with the operation where the acoustic-inventory (registered in \mathcal{T}_0)
 is resolved into prime factors. After this comes the ordering of the substance.

In each operation under \mathcal{G} II-III, the members of the categories are set up
 on the basis of the commutation test. The substance could be ordered
 in each operation, but this is not necessary, as simplicity principle leads us to
 order it at the end of the form procedure. Not only the phonemes, but the
 glossemic categories as well, have substance ordered to them.

The phonemist must have undertaken all possible deductions of the
 phonetic substance, from which that deduction is to be chosen that
 goes congruence with the linguistic deduction. (Remember that for the
 physicist, etc., sounds as physical phenomena are forms. One must
 free oneself from the popular conception that there is a substance in the
 sense of certain absolute "things". Fortunately, physics has realized this
 first of all the sciences.)

3. What happens in the commutation test in each operation of \mathcal{G} ?

First, it is interesting to note that in \mathcal{T}_1 we still don't have consonants in
 different "positions" (initial and final, primary and secondary); all the
 consonantal classes stand in one and the same paradigm. So it would be a
 logical error to introduce varieties at this point.

But more important is the danger of using symbols like p , k , etc., which
 we tend to hypostatize into forms.

Take Trubetzkoy's Korean example. I don't know in \mathcal{G} (or in \mathcal{G}) that
 the functions in question are manifested by \mathfrak{s} , \mathfrak{l} , and \mathfrak{z} . I have three entities.
 I observe that \mathfrak{s} occurs only finally, \mathfrak{l} and \mathfrak{z} only initially. I premise that
 a concrete identification is possible. I identify \mathfrak{s} and \mathfrak{l} , so that \mathfrak{s} and \mathfrak{l}
 constitute one class, \mathfrak{z} another.

When I order the substance, the question arises which phoneme manifests
 which feature. Here I must see the substance. But not on the basis of arbitrary
 similarities and dissimilarities. Rather on the sound's membership in given
 classes in the phonetic hierarchy.

I need only know that there is one feature that can appear both initial and
 final, and another that can appear only final.

The substance is decisive — but for the substance-ordering, not the
 commutation test.

4. In p. 1313, I identify \mathfrak{s} with \mathfrak{l} by the commutation test. That is
 all.