

Titel: Synchrony versus Diachrony, [Uldall] 031-0030

Citation: "Synchrony versus Diachrony, [Uldall] 031-0030", i *Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds*, s. 3. Onlineudgave fra Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds: https://tekster.kb.dk/catalog/lh-texts-kapsel_031-shoot-wacc-1992_0005_031_Uldall_0030_p3_bP2_TB00001/facsimile.pdf (tilgået 18. 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.

the language, i.e. on the nature of its structure as a whole, which again shows that we cannot properly understand any kind of linguistic change without reference to the whole structure, a view which is further strengthened by the fact that a change like the one sketched does not occur as an isolated phenomenon but is likely to have widespread effects on other parts of the structure: if you push the man at the end, the whole queue will feel it. Diachronic grammar across the structure and indifferent to it, seems to me of very doubtful value. If it does consider the relation between part and whole, it becomes, as Hjelmslev says, a comparison between a series of synchronic studies.

It is interesting to note ^{that} a similar war is raging between the functionalistic (i.e. synchronic) school of Ethnology and the historic-diffusionistic (diachronic) group.

As to Hjelmslev's exclusion of phonetics from grammar, I think there is something to be said for that view. It is possible to analyse the sounds of a language and even to work out its phonemic structure without reference to or knowledge of the morphology of the language or the meaning of the linguistic material. So far, phonetics is completely extra-grammatical, but when it comes to determining what Sapir calls the ideal sound pattern, we are dealing with the very soul of the language and can, of course, not proceed without a thorough study of morphology. It would, perhaps, be wise to distinguish between the two: phonetics, the analysis and clas-