Titel: Propositions, [Nice1951] 046-0050

Citation: ”Propositions, [Nice1951] 046-0050”, i *Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds*, s. 3. Onlineudgave fra Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds: https://tekster.kb.dk/text/lh-texts-kapsel_046-shoot-wacc-1992_0005_046_Nice1951_0050_p3_bP2_TB00002.pdf (tilgået 29. juli 2024)

Anvendt udgave: Louis Hjelmslev og hans kreds

3/51 instance in many systems the vowel may be defined, as against the consonant, by its non-presupposition of another unit - a syntactic do- finition - or by its acoustic features, in the Trubetzkoyan style). These semantic units have not yet been isolated from the speech- continuum, not because this is impossible, nor even because it is diffi- cult, but rather because the climate of structural linguistics is opposed to the question being raised. When these units have been Isolated it will be found that they have their own syntax, and that they have their own syntax, and that they have their definitions in terms of this syntax; that they are definable extensionally as well as intensionally, and have a structure wofcth investigating for its own sake. (4) The structural definition of semantic relations. Structural semantics is governed by the same general principles as phonemics, and in particular by the principle of relevance. Hence if two connected semantic ’’units” stand in complementary distribution (thus never answering to a distinction of expression) they must be regarded as variants of a single semantic unit. For instance the relations ’’possessor of (an object)” and”agent of (a process)” between which the difference is automatically regulated by the meanings of the semantemes to which the relation apllies, are variants of the same semantic unit. (Both variants occur iv nominal combinations, only the second In actor-action phrases, and so on. It is not of course asserted that these are the only relations holding between the terms in question). The structure of semantic relations, apart from their complexity, is similar to that of phonemic relations. Hence the same terms can be used, and illustrated first from the phonemic plane, where we have three principle relations i (i) Two asymmetric relations (ArB is incompatible with BrA) t (a) A relation with equipollent poles : sequence. (Equipollent, since an isolated unit is both before and after zero. (b) A relation with privatively contrasted poles s prominence (usually actualised by stress-differences as between syllables, or by differences of syllabicity as between phonemes). (Pri- vative, since an isolated unit is ’’more prominent than” the surrounding zeros). (li) One symmetric relation : juncture (open, closed etc.) (ArB-BrA). Juncture seems always to be privative i an isolated unit has open juncture with surrounding zero. (Hence open juncture is the urmarked pole of the opposition. We return to the semantic relation cited above. This relation is obviously asymmetric. It can also be described as privative, since the terms mast normally in isolation (e.g. impersonal verbs) are prooessive and not agental, other ter^s being neither. The relation thus comes the heading of ”prominenee”• (Though its definition is purely structural, the term answers well enough to our Instinctive feeling that the pre- dicate is more prominent than the subject, that the object possessed rather than the possessor is the ’’centre of attention” in genitival constructions, and so on. But it must be noted again that such terms as predicate and genitive do not belong to this level of analysis; they have semantic relevance but no semantic status). But it is obvious that a term such as prominence is insufficient