

Titel: notes, [whitfield] 015-0040

Citation: "notes, [whitfield] 015-0040", i *Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds*, s. 1. Onlineudgave fra Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds: https://tekster.kb.dk/catalog/lh-texts-kapsel_015-shoot-workidacc-2014_0144_015_whitfield_0040/facsimile.pdf (tilgået 25. 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.

→ EFJ February 18, 1941

1 *G is the blend procedure. Not until ag are the constituents named after their place in the system.

n2 (in *GIII) The next higher class (very often the expression plane as a whole) :: consonomic marginal nexus - manifested, for example, by tryk tone - selecting and consonomic central nexus

n3 Central and marginal nexus :: initial and final nexus

^{initial} ^{marginal} ^{final} ^{central}
hvis han kommer, og hvis han har penge med, saa tager vi pant emod ham, og saa siger vi ham tak

n4 Initial and final nexus :: primary nexus-parts (morphemes) and secondary nexus-parts (nexus-theses)

1-2 The "nexus" one starts up with will all be simplex, i.e. nexus (but we don't know this in the blend procedure)

s2 Morphemes :: central and marginal parts; nexus-theses :: central and marginal syntagmata (i.e. syllable-units) (But by the general rule, the syntagmata will always be individual syllables.)

s3 Central and marginal syntagmata :: initial and final

s4 Initial and final syntagmata :: primary syllable parts (accents) and secondary syllable parts (syllable-theses)

t2 (Correspondingly, the t-operations are analyzed into taxias (= taxeme-units) acting in taxeme.

Accents and syllable-theses :: central and marginal taxias. Consider only analysis of syllable-theses. In general, by the same rule, the taxias will in practice turn out to be the individual taxemes (simplex taxias). Central taxias will be vowels; marginal taxemes will be consonants. (There may also be γ "semi-vowels" and τ : (e.g. the click of pity)

t3 Central and marginal taxias :: initial and final

t4 Initial and final taxias :: primary (vowel-nex) and secondary (vowel-thesis) (with possibility of γ and τ)

(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 glossemes, but the
 glosseme-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 hypothesize 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 consonantal substitution 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. 131, I identify \mathfrak{s} with \mathfrak{l} by the commutation test. That is
 all.

Q → E.F.J Feb 18, 1941 page 3

Of the vowel in Tisch. The commutation paradigm is set up on the basis of a maximal number of oppositions. For the non-maximal oppositions, we could say that there is one base as a synchronon. Simpler to say there is one base, for nothing against it.

I call the i in Tisch 1, but whether it is identical with the vowel in hitze or the er in later I don't know until ordering of the substance. Tascher are empty bases, defined by their relation-possibilities.

"Der vil min sko stærke hjemm til at studere i vor tid"

Q

→ E.F.J. February 21, 1941

1. 089 "non-commutable" \mathcal{L}^0 - contradictory to "commutable" - (everything that is not commutable)
 "non-commutable" \mathcal{L}^0 - contrary to "commutable" - this is the glossomatic meaning
 (= everything that is not commutable, except what is neither commutable nor non-commutable)
 I never say that two entities are commutable

2. 184 Non-commutation in sense \mathcal{L}^0 I shall call substitutions following Hjelmslev's selection to sign-systems

"Identification of pre-members in different functional categories can only take place if these pre-members have mutual substitutions. This is tested by performing the commutation test within units of increasingly greater extent: if one finds units of a given degree where the pre-members involved have substitution with informal (i.e. non-contradictory generalization of) a unit-boundary, the two pre-members are identified with elimination of a ~~signal~~ signal for a unit of given degree (as, for example, \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{I} in Danish, since \mathcal{I} includes a signal for syllable-final-unit; this signal enters in, to be sure, only under given syntagmatic conditions (cf. words like lygd and words with latent \mathcal{L} like kand), \mathcal{L} , on the other hand, does not contain a signal for syllable-initial-unit, since \mathcal{L} can also appear finally under the conditions under which one does not have \mathcal{I} ...)

If 2 or more pre-members are thus found to have substitution to one pre-member in another functional category, the last is to be regarded as a symmetrization of the two or more.

This clears up difficulty with the Korean example. One must have substitution as basis for identification.

Identification of pre-members within one and the same functional category is 1) arbitrary without harm 2) possible to carry out in practice. If 1) is true, 2) is unimportant.

E.F.J. → L.H. Feb 22, 1941 and notes of Feb 23, 1941

Driven by selectivity
Why is initial selected and final selectivity?
Commutator and mutation
Contradictory and contrary
Partial commutator test
Commutator with 2000