

Titel: notes for introduction to Sproget, [whitfield] 015-0130

Citation: "notes for introduction to Sproget, [whitfield] 015-0130", i *Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds*, s. 31. Onlineudgave fra Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds:
https://tekster.kb.dk/catalog/lh-texts-kapsel_015-shoot-wacc-2014_0144_015_whitfield_0130_p31_bp30_TB00011/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.

Page 4

2-3 Dimension
(can be abstract)

	masculine +	feminine -
+ abstract		
- concrete		

Numeral number has become a special application of grammatical numbers.

GENDER

Concern with sex, and just as we would expect: French, feminine (F), masculine (M)
 German: feminine (F), masculine (M), neuter (N)
 squares can specifically denote male (♂) and, in a contrasting way, female (♀) as sexual beings without relation to sex (♂). *Die Person, Die Memme, Die Magd* can be inflected if feminine is F, but gender difficult with *die Schilfroste*, where only men can be read.

But a real difficulty is the fact that all substantives have genders, whether denoting beings with sex or not. There come various particular rules and exceptions. Clear that building on sex to explain gender is building on sand. Maynard's attempt to see 'transformed meaning', with *Freudian Sozialisierung des Weltbildes*.

But it's hard to find any other meaning for gender. Sex cannot be the basic meaning of gender, but it is the only more or less pregnant application of gender.

Georg and Gebelentz and Mallat represent the view that is predominant: historical explanation: Gender now has no semantic content.

But we must try to maintain in writing together that there are no categories that are empty of meaning.

Algebraic distinction between living and lifeless. But, contrary to IE, all names of human beings and animals belong to the class living. On the other hand, many actually lifeless things belong to the class living. Jespersen draws the conclusion that genders do not express an objective understanding but a subjective evaluation. (This is true for all linguistic phenomena).

Since the Algebraics are animals, the contrast cannot be between living and lifeless, but between a higher class (which has more power — man, animals, trees, plants (but not fruit), women's breasts, other parts of the body with magical properties (sex organs), sun, moon, stars, etc.) and a lower class. Expansion: (higher class objects have property of acting, forming, influencing the environment) or concentration.

A	A

for example: 'child'

In Indo-European, with three genders, has feminine (F), masculine (M). [not as sharp a distinction as in Algebraic]

of feminine abstracts; *die* f and *der* m; *jeune* - *jeune*, *sauve* - *sa*. Of course, it all depends on the way taken, on the mobility of the people. The sociological conditions are decisive for the application of the grammatical form, but not for the basic meaning of them. In Norse, the man is seen as actor,