

Titel: Propositions, [Nice1951] 046-0080

Citation: "Propositions, [Nice1951] 046-0080", i *Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds*, s. 4.
Onlineudgave fra Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds: https://tekster.kb.dk/catalog/lh-texts-kapsel_046-shoot-wacc-1992_0005_046_Nice1951_0080_p4_bP3_TB00004/facsimile.pdf (tilgået 02. august 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.

to define the relation in question (which for want of a name may be called "participation"); for there are many other semantic relations answering to the same definition: in fact superordination in syntax (as usually understood) normally answers to prominence in semantics. Many other structural terms lie ready to hand for the narrowing of the definition: transitive and intransitive in the logistic sense, computational and permutational in the glossematic senses, and so on. (For instance the relations expressed by the cases are normally permutable, not commutable). Such terms have however hardly yet been exploited for the structural definition of relations, in the field of linguistics.

It is not only in richness that the semantic relations exceed the phonemic. To take again the relation whose variants have been united under the common label of "participation"; it will be easy to find this same relation expressed by a stem-morpheme, most commonly of the type *have*. But then in the group "A has X" two analyses will be necessary: on the one hand there is the relation of participation between A and the group has X (as in any other verbal group); on the other hand there is the same relation between A and X, the verb itself cumulating the semata of participation and other relations. These analyses ($A\bar{X}$ and $A\bar{X}A$, in which *have* plays the roles of \bar{X} and \bar{X} respectively) are contradictory.

These contradictory analyses must not be confused with merely indifferent analyses (for instance it is indifferent whether we regard an inflection as affecting a noun or a whole nominal group). Analyses are indifferent when the whole system can be described with equal economy and completeness one way or the other. But here neither analysis can be deduced from the other and both are necessary for a complete description of linguistic relations. The principle of non-contradictory analysis, which (though often some sacrifice of realism) may be maintained in phonemics, breaks down at the start on examination of the semantic system.

C.E. BAZELL