

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

Citation: "Synchrony versus Diachrony, [Uldall] 031-0030", i *Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds*, s. 4. Onlineudgave fra Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds: [https://tekster.kb.dk/text/lh-texts-kapsel\\_031-shoot-wacc-1992\\_0005\\_031\\_Uldall\\_0030\\_p4\\_bP3\\_TB00001.pdf](https://tekster.kb.dk/text/lh-texts-kapsel_031-shoot-wacc-1992_0005_031_Uldall_0030_p4_bP3_TB00001.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.

sification of the physico-physiological material of language, and phonology, the study of this material in its relation to meaning and to the morphological structure of the language. It will thus be seen that morphology without phonetics, i.e. the same morphology with different sounds, is perfectly possible - it matters little whether a given suffix is -t or -n - whereas morphology without phonology, i.e. the same morphology with a different ideal patterning of the sounds, is inconceivable - if the singular suffix is -t and the plural -n, you cannot substitute sounds of a different phonological inter-relation without upsetting your morphological applecart. The material of phonetics and phonology is the same, but one is linguistically external, the other linguistically internal. It is therefore obvious that you cannot treat phonology diachronically any more than you can morphology, whereas phonetics lends itself perfectly to that treatment. Another thing is that you probably would not get much out of such a history. The sounds, after all, are nothing but the bricks of the building and are significant only when viewed phonologically in their proper places in the system.