

Titel: Hjelmslev lecture, [1961] 052-0030

Citation: "Hjelmslev lecture, [1961] 052-0030", i *Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds*, s. 5.
Onlineudgave fra Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds: https://tekster.kb.dk/catalog/lh-texts-kapsel_052-shoot-wacc-1992_0005_052_1961_0030_p5_bP4_TB00003/facsimile.pdf
(tilgået 22. maj 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.

of maximal extent (larger than one complex clause) down to glossemes or minimal elements. Thus the stages which, according to conventional use would belong to syntax, are imbedded in the whole analysis, and have no characteristics of their own. I mentioned in my first lecture, as an example, the relation between subordinate clause and principal clause which I defined as what we call selection. A compound clause may consist of a principal clause only to which you may add one or more subordinate clauses, whereas a clause of the first degree could not consist of the subordinate clause only. So we call this a selection and say that the subordinate clause selects the principal clause, or, if you would prefer that terminology, the subordinate clause presupposes the principal clause. This case, of course, is one of the cases which conventional linguistics would class under the heading, "syntax." But the relation between subordinate clause and principal clause is exactly in the same relation as the other one I mentioned the other day--that between the consonant unit and the vowel unit of a syllabic theme where we are faced with units much smaller than the so-called syntactical units. And the same will hold good if we take units larger than so-called syntactical ones. Say, for instance, the relation in the content between something which is called "third volume" and something which is called "second volume." These units are larger than what is ordinarily recognized as syntactical units but the relation is the same. If you say that a book is a second volume, this doesn't imply that there will be a third volume whereas the reverse is true. There would not be a third volume without presupposing a second volume. Or take the case of the relation of the New Testament and the Jewish Bible, which is also a relation in