

Titel: Categories of conjugational morphemes, [whitfield] 015-0240

Citation: "Categories of conjugational morphemes, [whitfield] 015-0240", i *Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds*, s. 5. Onlineudgave fra Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds:
https://tekster.kb.dk/text/lh-texts-kapsel_015-shoot-wacc-2014_0144_015_whitfield_0240_p5_bP4_TB00008.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.

Rischel suggested that this might have to do with the distinction between constituents and exponents. Spang-Thomsen thought it possible in principle to state the presence of an adjective in any syntagm, if it proved to be pertinent to the description of the language analysed* W thought that introducing an element for the convenience of description, and then to prove its presence was a vicious circle* S-T thought that for Hj* this is not a vicious circle, since the units found by analysis are created by the analysis itself (they are not claimed to have any existence previous to or independent of the analysis)* Thiesen remarked that in Hj's example «sunt* may be added, and present tense, and the other content elements would still be there, whereas a similar process could hardly be thought of in the case of «a man» without any adjective* Hendriksen thought that the commutation test was primarily a question of identifying the different units. Elshel thought that one point in Hj's argument would be that «Omnia praeclara rara» is a sentence (to which you may add, say, "sunt") whereas »Omnia praeclara rara» might be found as, say, the subject of a sentence, where the two adjectives might be replaced by other adjectives, or omitted, but «sunt* could certainly not be added.