

Charles University
Faculty of Arts
Department of Linguistics

Bachelor thesis

Jan Židek

Hypostasis, Conversion, Categoriality
Hypostáze, konverze, kategorialita

Prague 2013

Supervisor: Mgr. Jan Bičovský, Ph.D.

I would like to hereby thank these people, without whose immense knowledge and a great deal of patience this work would not be possible:

Jan Bičovský, Reiner Lipp, Martin J. Kümmel, Ronald I. Kim, Dagmar S. Wodtke, George E. Dunkel, Lukáš Zádrapa, Jiří Rejzek, Petr Nejedlý, Jan Křivan, Václav Cvrček, Sergio Neri, Tamah Sherman, Jan Křivan, Petr Hrach, Delia Fuchsová-Musteliová, Hana and Tomáš Zelba, my mother Jiřina and my friends and dear colleagues from the faculty.

I would like to express my thanks for cooperation to these professors:

Jiří Nekvapil, Tomáš Halík, Petr Zemánek and of course the General linguistics department head Mirjam Fried for letting me do this research.

Prohlašuji, že jsem bakalářskou práci vypracoval samostatně, že jsem řádně citoval všechny použité prameny a literaturu a že práce nebyla využita v rámci jiného vysokoškolského studia či k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.
V Praze dne 11.8. 2013

.....
Jan Židek

Abstract

In modern linguistics since the 1970s, there seems to be a general shift from *langue* to *parole* and from discrete categories to more "blurry" ones. With it comes a need for revitalisation of some older terms that fell out of usage because of the fact that they describe something (seemingly) outside system. One such term is *hypostasis*, a synchronic phenomenon of word-formation under certain constraints (e.g. null derivation from an inflected form). This work's aim is to probe its usefulness in modern linguistics and the viability of its revitalisation.

In this work, I agree with now generally accepted idea that every grammatical system is in itself inadequate with regard to completeness of its function, and that it needs from time to time adapt to new situational contexts through compensation strategies; some of the ways it does that can collectively be called "hypostasis".

Abstrakt

V moderní jazykovědě došlo, zdá se, od 90. let minulého století k posunu zájmu od *langue* k *parole* a od diskrétních kategorií k více "mlhavým". S tím přichází potřeba revitalizovat některé starší termíny, které se postupně přestaly používat protože popisují něco (zdánlivě) vně systému. Jeden takový termín je *hypostáze*, synchronní fenomén slovtvorby při jistých omezeních (např. nulová derivace z již skloněného slova). Účelem této práce je prozkoumat jeho užitečnost v moderní jazykovědě a možnost jeho revitalizace.

V této práci souhlasím s dnes již přijímanou představou, že každý gramatický systém je ze své podstaty nedostatečný s ohledem na kompletnost svých funkcí a potřebuje (se) čas od času adaptovat na nové situační okolnosti prostřednictvím kompenzačních strategií; některé z těchto způsobů lze společně nazývat "hypostáze".

Keywords

hypostasis, conversion, categoriality, typology, parasynthesis, quotation, metalanguage, degrammaticalisation, derivation, terminology

Klíčová slova

hypostáze, konverze, kategorialita, typologie, parasyntéza, citace, metajazyk, degramatikalizace, derivace, terminologie

Index

1. Introduction.....	7
1.1 Defining a term.....	7
2. Methodology.....	10
3. Hypostasis as a term.....	11
3.1 History of the term.....	12
3.2 History in linguistics.....	13
3.3 Dictionaries, encyclopedias, textbooks, handbooks.....	13
3.4 Studies directly addressing hypostasis in relation to linguistics.....	16
4. Hypostasis as a phenomenon.....	23
4.0 Related phenomena (as mentioned in literature).....	23
4.0.1 Use across linguistic branches.....	23
4.1 Intersecting the definitions and uses.....	24
4.1.1 Hypostasis and quotation.....	25
4.1.2 Hypostasis and lexicalisation.....	25
4.1.2.1 Hypostasis and univerbation.....	25
4.1.2.1 Ellipsis.....	25
4.1.3 Hypostasis and word formation.....	26
Connection with the type of language.....	26
Hypostasis as a universal.....	26
Other ways of deriving neologisms.....	27
Hypostatisation devices.....	27
Zero derivation: ending as part of the stem.....	27
Zero derivation: cliticon as part of the stem.....	27
Fake zero-derivation: Hypostasis and conversion.....	28
Relation to meaning: Synsemantics.....	29
Autosemantics - composition not involved.....	32
Autosemantics - compounds.....	33
4.2 Synchrony and diachrony.....	38
5. Discussion.....	40
Hypostasis as a part of a noun phrase.....	43
Relationship between with parts of speech.....	44
Productivity.....	44
Attestation across languages.....	44
6. Conclusion.....	47
Literature.....	50
Used Websites*.....	52
Additional literature.....	52

Used abbreviations

2_tu - tu form, familial form of second person marker

2_vf - vous form, non-familial form of second person marker; usually identical form with either 2PL or 3SG

COMP - Comparative; in PIE used concurrently with other ADJ markers

EXC - exclamation, exclamatory interjection

OBS - archaism

PAST - perfect

PERF - perfective

PIE - (late) Proto-Indo-European

PG - Proto-Germanic

PS - Proto-Slavic

REFL - reflexive

TRANS - transgressive form of verb, roughly equivalent to participle

<> - sharp brackets mark correction or an implied fact not stated in the source

VP verbal phrase

NP nominal phrase

PP prepositional phrase

LOC locative

PC personal communication

MG - Modern German

OHG - Old High German

COL - collective

ADJ - adjective (marker)

SUBST - substantive (marker)

1. Introduction

The focus of linguistic study is often the description of what is in the centre of a system, however vaguely defined. Traditionally, only well-defined, highly-productive phenomena are included. Sometimes, the productivity is not relevant, only the frequency of occurrence of its results leads to the necessity of description, in other cases only the regularity of the phenomenon suffices, as in the case of the Czech gradation of adjectives.¹

Many interesting phenomena do exist on the periphery. One of such presumably low productivity processes is what, based on prevalent use in previous studies, I decided to call "hypostasis".

1.1 Defining a term

The scientific terminology is an integral part of the scientific method. Unlike with layman terms, where the semantic meaning is understood by their use, expert terms should be explicitly defined with as little ambiguity as possible. Terms in science come into existence in three ways, either by refining a layman intuitive term, by coining, that is, by invention along with the concept, or by taking it over from another discipline. A scientific term without an explicit definition is not, in a strict sense, scientific. There exist, without any doubt, some terms that are used in science and yet whose semantics are not derived from any single concrete definition, or whose definition is no longer available to its users. Some of these terms are in the centre of an ongoing debate, like the word "word", others are not.

Much like with "word", *hypostasis* has more than one definition and those who actually use the term don't reference their source and are quite often oblivious to a mere existence of any definition². This may lead to a gradual shift from one meaning to a set of heterogenous, mostly independent designations of phenomena that may or may not exist and may have other, institutionalised, terms affiliated.

The easiest way to let the expert community know of a new concept/term is by publishing a work. More than a few works using the term hypostasis have been published by respected authors (Brugmann, Bloomfield, Pike), yet the term still lingers in obscurity

1 In *Mluvnice současné češtiny* (205-6), it is claimed that only 6% of Czech adjectives are gradable, furthermore only 3% of adjectives have all three grades, that is, positive, comparative and superlative; the main reason for non-gradability is stated as semantic. The gradable adjective forms make up more than half the adjective tokens in the <Czech National> corpus (ibid:206).

2 A conclusion derived from personal communication with linguists.

probably owing it to the absence of a useful, widely known and publicly accessible definition, without these criteria, only the most intuitive of terms can come into general use.

A subject's acquisition of expert category is usually done by a combination of being exposed to definitions from either the primary sources (studies, in most cases dictionaries, handbooks, textbooks...) or a secondary one (explanation in schools, conferences...) and a subsequent intuition based on the corresponding term's use. The second part may, when respecting the rules of scientific method³, come only after the first one has been completed, however, it is arguable whether it is usually so.

As concepts evolve, terms are being redefined continually. These terms should always reflect reality, yet, reality is not as purely categorial as the models we build upon the terms would require. The problem, then, may lie in our essentialist tradition, in which we do not try to merely describe the phenomenon, we try to capture its essence.

Language is an open, dynamic system. The categories change their shape with time, their members transgressing from one to another. This makes the possibility for the existence of transitional states. To investigate these properties precisely, categorial terms defined in relation with these "fluid" categories are needed. In history, these terms changed extensively as knowledge evolved, sometimes disappearing, at other times reappearing with a new meaning.

Research questions can be summed up as follows:

- 1 - Is a coherent and usable definition of hypostasis available to linguists (albeit unbeknownst to them)?
- 2 - If not, can a definition be created by a synthesis of currently available ones? Does the phenomenon even exist?
- 3 - What are the exact ways hypostasis exhibits itself in languages of the world? Is it universal in this sense?
- 4 - What are the implications on both synchronic and diachronic categoriality stemming from the existence of such phenomenon?

³ We need to be sure the results of implementation of a model are comparable.

5 - Is the phenomenon necessarily restricted to derivation?

A note regarding derivation and inflection

The focal point of this work is an analysis of certain word-formation processes, therefore the delimitation of derivation against an inflection as used here is presented to make the reasoning behind some more controversial claims easier to understand.

The differentiation between inflectional and derivational morphemes in this work is done on the basis of prototypical usage of the affix. If the prevalent use is in creating a new word, it is a derivation.

Working hypothesis: a phenomenon, or a group of phenomena, do exists outside the system or on its periphery, which does violate the traditional view of categoriality by using members of one class in syntactic constructions it is not permitted to take part in.

Null hypothesis: there is no single phenomenon which would fall under aforementioned criteria, the term does not denote a meaningful concept.

2. Methodology

As this work is concerned with both the vaguely defined phenomenon and the use of a corresponding term in the expert community, there is a need for a synthesis of this dichotomy in approaching the matter.

The base of this work is a critical analysis of opposing views concerning hypostasis and their shifts, and a subsequent evaluation with the aim of establishing a consensus. Therefore the first task is to gather all relevant data.

Data gathering

Data gathering consisted primarily of literature survey, therefore it was imperative to gain access to large enough collection of literature. This seemingly trivial task has proven rather challenging. Due to the scarcity of relevant studies and examples of the relevant phenomena, the term is nearing obscurity.

The opinions on the matter are also to be sought after directly by discussion with linguists either in the "physical" world⁴ or through communication on the internet where specialised mediated forums exist. The forums⁵ used are Yahoo techgroup Cybalist and the Linguistlist. No special questionnaires were handed out, simple set of "do you know the term, how do you use it and what is that usage based on?" questions was used, with additional "who are you?" in the forums. Where there is a need for additional data, e.g. in case of aspect previously unmentioned in literature, it has been arrived at through introspection. The author, after consultation⁶, decided not to use corpus based approach, as the amount of data analysis needed for such research far exceeds the scope of this work, it is therefore left to be possibly undertaken in a future work.

The body of data consists of two parts - different views on hypostasis by different linguists (part 3) and model cases with analysis where available (part 4).

Processing of model cases consists of morphological, semantic and to some extent pragmatic analysis. Where needed, the historical development and other relevant context (social...) is presented.

4 Consulted were members of Charles University's (CU) general and comparative linguistics departments, and many visiting linguists, where data has been gathered this way, the source is mentioned as per standards.

5 No useful information (a single answer on Cybalist, for which I am thankful) about the phenomenon could be obtained this way, which in fact could be interpreted as a confirmation that the term is not widely known in the expert community.

6 Consulted was my supervisor, Mgr Jan Bičovský, PhD, member of the dept. of historical linguistics at CU; and the director of Czech national corpus dept. of CU, Mgr. Václav Cvrček, PhD.

3. Hypostasis as a term

The literature serves here as a primary data source. There are four categories the works fall into - dictionaries, encyclopedias, textbooks and handbooks; works directly addressing the phenomenon while using the term or using a near-synonym; and works only mentioning the term. The investigation was done to show whether hypostasis exists as a term in linguistics, that is, whether it is fully institutionalised and well-defined.

The basic problem with “hypostasis” is such that most users of the term seem to understand its meaning more on the basis of their intuition⁷ (as stated by themselves in personal communication) than explicit definition. This seems similar to the problem of defining “word”. An obviously useful term describing a concept generally understood yet lacking a single common concrete-enough definition to be used in all contexts.

Another problem is that many early works using the term are manifesting a “borderline science” or at least have a novel view on certain axioms. One such example is Hiorth (1963) who treats hypostasis as a textual phenomenon while maintaining the idea of linguistic forms, that is, sounds, and treats “hypostasis expressions” as a combination of the word used for its sound value and its graphical marking in print - either by quotation marks or italics. While stating “It is logically possible to define ‘linguistic form’ so as to include quotation marks, but it is unusual to do so and it serves no reasonable purpose.” (ibid:212) he does exactly that by stating that quotation marks are graphemes, that is “written phonemes” that remove ambiguity and “...This classification supports the solution, at which I arrive below: that the subjects of (6) and (7)⁸ are the quotation marks and the words between the quotation marks.” (ibid:213). This is in direct conflict with modern linguistics and its view on what language is - a meaning coded in sound. While in textual linguistics we can analyse quotation marks as part of a sign, they are at best facultative markings which never occur in spoken language and even in writing, it is non-existent pre-1500⁹ in Europe and completely in pre-contact non-European texts. It would also remove the obvious

7 By intuition, I mean their assessment of what the term means gained by reading works using the term without explicitly defining it, that is, mostly works that do not address the issue directly.

8 This does not respond to my example numbering.

9 The origin and development of the quotation mark: <http://aphelis.net/origin-development-quotation-mark/> retrieved on 2013-08-08; there are alternative forms of marking, e.g. in Hittite, but usually facultative and rare.

existence of hypostasis as a derivation process and make it simply a type of quotation, which for purposes of this work is unsatisfactory.

3.1 History of the term

According to Possekel (1999:70), the word *ὑπόστασις* was "first used by the Greek physicians and scientists for a support or a sediment...". "The Stoics use hypostasis to denote the substantial existence of something." (ibid:72) The origin of the modern sense of the word lies in the Greek Neoplatonic philosophy. The first recorded use is in *De mundo*, a Pseudo-Aristotle work probably written by Apuleius in 2nd century CE in Latin, or translated by him from an earlier Greek source.

The term *hypostasis* is also being used in the Christian theology to denote an underlying substance. It came there through the Fifth Ennead of Plotinus (3rd cent. CE), the founder of Neo-Platonism, and evolved to a specific meaning of Christ's hypostasis, the person aspect of the holy trinity. The trinity may also be understood as a synthesis of the three hypostases (essences, substances) of God. The term is often incorrectly cited as originating in the 16th century (see e.g. online *Oxford Dictionaries*¹⁰).

Vocabolario della lingua italiana online version defines it as "Ciò che sta, che resta fermo al di là del fluire dei fenomeni, ovvero la sostanza, la natura stessa delle cose".¹¹

In modern philosophy, the term is used rather sparsely and relatively inconsistently. For example a prominent phenomenologist Lévinas (1987:43) defines "hypostasis" as "the event by which the existent contracts its existing". Lévinas, a Jewish thinker, is in a way a direct inheritor of the neoplatonic tradition.

Other disciplines that make use of the word are psychology, mathematics, and medicine. In mathematics and logic, hypostasis, or hypostatic abstraction, was introduced¹² by C.S.Peirce, a philosopher, mathematician and linguist living at the time of Bloomfield and Usener (see 3.2). Zeman (1982) quotes from a Peirce's personal letter: it "consists in making a subject out of a predicate. Instead of saying, Opium puts people to sleep, you say it has dormitive virtue."

¹⁰ To be precise, "origin... early 16th century (in theological use)".

¹¹ Roughly translated as "That, which remains behind surface phenomena, the substance".

¹² A claim by Wikipedia: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hypostatic_model_of_personality, retrieved on 2013-08-07. I was unable to locate any claim disputing it.

3.2 History in linguistics

Fought (1999:307) states that the term hypostasis was introduced into descriptive (that is synchronic general) linguistics by Leonard Bloomfield in his *Language* (1933:148): '...*hypostasis*, the mention of a phonetically normal speech-form, as when we say, "That is only an *if*," or "There is always a *but*," or when we talk about "the word *normalcy*" or "the name *Smith*." One may even speak of parts of words, as I shall speak in this book of "the suffix *-ish* in *boyish*." Hypostasis is closely related to *quotation*, the repetition of speech.' The possible use of this definition is limited.

Fought's claim, while mostly undisputed in English language literature, is mistaken, as an earlier use of the word is attested in earlier German sources (see e.g. Eino 1962:9). It does substantiate, however, my claims that: The term never came into a real (international) use in synchronic linguistics and it has been used quite rarely and for different phenomena in historical linguistics thanks to its vague or implicit definition.

The author hypothesises that while the underlying mechanism seems not to be (very) productive in the languages where it has been described, it is quite common, if not universal, in the sense of existence in languages across the globe, and points to some general principles, and therefore should not be ignored. A single explicit clear-cut definition is the main objective of this work. Another is finding out how the phenomenon may change the view on categoriality.

To paraphrase the cryptic definition Bloomfield provides in a more modern way: Synchronically, hypostasis is use of a word or a phrase outside its usual syntactic restrictions; since the term is being used by etymologists, I supposed it would mean in diachrony a conventionalisation of such use of the grammatical constituent and its subsequent lexicalisation.¹³ Its basis I see as a shift from pragmatic meaning to a semantic one, which has reflexes in morphosyntax but not in its segmental structure.¹⁴

3.3 Dictionaries, encyclopedias, textbooks, handbooks

Most explanatory linguistic dictionaries do not seem to mention the term. To name a few: *Dictionary of Historical and Comparative Linguistics* (ed L.R.Trask), *Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics 6th ed.* (ed. D. Crystal), *Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics* (H. Bussmann), *An Encyclopedia of Language* (ed. N. E. Collinge), *The Linguistics*

13 That proved to an incorrect, or at least inaccurate, assumption, see the sub-chapter on use in disciplines.

14 This may not be entirely true - if parasynthesis intersects with hypostasis, as I believe, the affixes appended may require a different allomorph of the root. For elaboration, see respective chapter.

Encyclopedia, 2nd ed. (ed. M. Malmkjær), *Encyclopedia of Linguistics vol. 1* (ed. P. Strazny), *Concise Encyclopedia of Philosophy of Language and Linguistics* (ed. A. Barber & R. J. Stainton) for English, *Diccionario de lingüística moderna* (ed. Varó, Martínez Linares) for Spanish, *Dizionario di linguistica* (ed. G.R.Cardona) for Italian, *Glosář praindoevropštiny* (P.Vavroušek) for Czech, *Lingvistický slovník* (ed J.Mistrík) for Slovak show no mention of the term.¹⁵

The spread in French and German context seems to be much wider. In Glück (1993) the entry for *Hypostasierung* states that is a special case of change to a different part of speech¹⁶ in which the lexeme retains its inflectional affixes, e.g. genitive -s <in German> (*flugs* "quickly" < *Flug*). *Terminologie zur neuen Linguistik, Band 1* (ed. Abraham, 1974) has two entries: *Hypostase/Verselbständigung* - inflecting already inflected or adverbial forms, e.g. *zufrieden, mittags*¹⁷; and *Hypostasierung* - with reference to Leisi (see 3.2 - Lipka).

Among dictionaries aimed at general public, one exception exists - online version of *Duden* states: "...(*Sprachwissenschaft*) *Verselbständigung* eines Worts als Folge einer Veränderung der syntaktischen Funktion (z. B. der Übergang eines Substantivs im Genitiv zum Adverb wie »des Mittags« zu »mittags«)".¹⁸ Its source, however, is not credited.

SIL online glossary of linguistic terms offers a translation from French *hypostase* to English as either "conversion, functional shift, or zero-derivation". On the other hand, the English glossary of linguistic terms does not have a corresponding entry.

Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics 2nd ed. (ed. K. Brown)¹⁹ mentions the term in relation with morphologisation and degrammaticalisation. "The term 'morphologization' ... the reanalysis of any nonmorphological element or process as a morphological one." It is claimed that while earlier literature claims that "hypostases" like MG *heute* (< OHG **hiu tagu* "on this day") are summed usually described as both morphologisation and grammaticalisation, it is neither, since there was "no change to the morphological rules or building-blocks of the language."

In *A Dictionary of grammaticalization, Band 1* (ed. A. Lessau) the entry for "hypostasis" states that it is "a reverse process of abstraction... concretization", regarding a

15 While I was able to locate find translation of the word hypostasis into other languages (Romanian, Bulgarian, Russian), a preliminary search in google returned no results in relation to linguistics.

16 *Wortartwechsel*

17 Adverbial genitives seem to be cited quite often, I would, however, argue mostly against that, as this seems to be a phenomenon quite productive in some stages of languages it exhibits itself in.

18 <Lexical> independence of a word as a result of a change in its syntactic function (e.g. the reanalysis of a noun in genitive as an adverb in *mittags* from *des Mittags*).

19 Section written by B.Fortson; p.290-1

concept "as a distinct substance or reality", "nominalisation might be seen as an instance of categorial hypostasis". The definition in this dictionary does not seem to agree with use of the term in linguistics.

Encyklopedia językoznawstwa ogólnego (ed. K. Polański & M. Jurkowski) lists three meanings: 1. in semantics, a mistaken assertion that the designating must have a concrete counterpart in the real world²⁰. 2. Transition of a word or a group of words from one class to another, e.g. using the name of a hyponyme for a hyperonyme and vice versa. 3. In the Polish tradition a change from non-inflectable to inflectable, e.g. *nad morzem* > *nadmorski*.

Among handbooks, the situation is not very different from dictionaries, they mostly ignore the term: e.g. *Handbook of Historical Linguistics* (ed. B.D. Joseph & R.D. Janda), and finally *The Oxford Handbook of Compounding* (Štekauer, Lieber) mention nothing.

On the other hand, authors of one of the books do mention the term elsewhere (Štekauer & Lieber 2005:356):

“Hypostatization is a side-effect of the naming- function of word-formation, whereby the existence of a word seems to imply for speakers the existence in the real world of a single corresponding ‘thing’ or clearly delimited concept. Indeed, this could help trigger semantic specialization: making one out of several readings of a potentially ambiguous formation become fixed, the word thus becoming a sign in its own right, losing its character of a syntagma – which is the general default characteristic of lexicalization in the diachronic sense”

with reference to works by Lipka (see 3.2). This seems rather strange - a secondary effect of inventing a word, that is, creating a form for a concept, is implication of existence of the concept, which in turn leads to semantic specialisation by univerbation.

In Booij (2004:1628), "hypostasation" is mentioned in the sub-chapter concerning lexicalisation in the same way as in Štekauer & Lieber (2005) with a note that in contrast to popular belief, not every hypostatized word has a real-world object it refers to; this connects it to Jakobsen's view (see 3.2).²¹

20 Conf. Jakobsen's view (3.2)

21 I do not believe that this claim is valid as the concept hypostatized must exist before the word is created and whether "real-world existence" of an act of murder is more real than a literary concept of "unmurder" is arguable.

Novotný (1946:109) mentions hypostatisation of prepositional phrases. From the endocentric compounds with nominal head and adverbial dependent, we have to differentiate compounds created through hypostatisation (objectification) of adverbials expressed through prepositional cases, the adjective *superbānus*, for example, therefore did not come to be the same way as *permagnus* did - by compounding an adjective with adverb, and instead through the null derivation of a phrase *sub urbe*, probably in analogy to *urbānus*... Through hypostatisation substantives are derived from adverbs, e.g. *supernus* from *supernē* ..."22

He further states (ibid:110) "Od spřežek se liší i ta zdánlivě složená slovesa, která vznikla verbalisací předložkových pádů (srov. jména vzniklá hypostasí, D 173), na př. *peragrō* je z *per agrōs*... nikoli z *per-agrō* (*agrō* bylo později vytvořeno z *peragrō*)..."23

The Oxford Handbook of Case (Makhulov & Spencer 2009:236) refer to the phenomenon in an extremely restricted sense, which does not seem to be connected with the original one any longer - with no mention of self-reference or extra-grammaticality. The hypostasis is considered to be a construction "consisting of a genitive determiner that lacks its head and is marked both for genitive and for the case assigned to the understood head ... makes perfect syntactic sense." An example is given (in bold): "I gave the picture to Anne's brother and the book to Susan's". Hypostasis is a special case of genitive constructions. The reason for such inventive naming is not given, a reference is given to an earlier work by the author of the corresponding section - Moravcsik (2003).

Bičovský (2012:57) shows his example of hypostasis with a mention that the cases presented for PIE may actually have resulted from reanalysis instead as time obscures many workings of a system.

3.4 Studies directly addressing hypostasis in relation to linguistics

22 My translation.

23 "From <compounds that can be de-unverbated> are to be differentiated also those compounds, which came to be through verbalisation of prepositional cases (conf. names derived through hypostasis, mentioned earlier), e.g. *peragrō* comes from *per agrōs*... and not from *per-agrō* (*agrō* was later <backformed> from *peragrō*)..."

Usener (1878, reprint 1973) introduces his concept of hypostasis into linguistics. For example ἀνάλογος from ἀνά λόγον ('in proportion, harmony'). The language used is quite unique, which makes this an unsuitable source for modern linguists. His terminology, obviously connected with Peirces's logic (forms expressing <objectification> of relations). Hypostasis is a process of forming a noun (or adjective) from a prepositional phrase, which embodies the expression of relationship - by inflection. This shows why verbs are not the primary domain of hypostasis.

Brugmann (1906:290-1) speaks of *grammatische Transfiguration*, or *Hypostasierung* in the section 366 - main motivations and ways of word-formation in PIE, where he specifically mentions his belief that these ways also exist outside the IE family.

Alongside hypostasis is reduplication, univerbation as a part of composition, *retrograde Ableitung*²⁴, ellipsis, *Gefühlslautung*²⁵, accent shift, ablaut alternation, losing the etymological connection between doublets resulting from sound changes, metanalysis and suppletivism (using a different lexeme for a certain form of the word).

Hypostasis is explained as a process where the need of a part of speech enters a new syntactic context while retaining its form <which comes from the original context>. A classification can be made regarding a. whether the form actually enters the paradigm, <or just used ad-hoc in a phrase> b. whether it is based on a single word or a phrase.

Risch (1973:187-9) has a chapter on hypostasis, prepositional hypostasis and parasyntesis²⁶. For PP compounds, a list of usual prefixes in Old Greek is given with a list of examples. Terms for certain types as per the grammatical case demanded by the preposition are named (possessive determinative compounds). *Verbale rektionskomposita* are excluded and are explained in a separate chapter.

Lipka uses in his works "hypostatisation" in a rather different sense from the traditional use in historical linguistics.

Lipka (1977:161) states "Unter Hypostasierung durch das Wort verstehe ich die Erscheinung, daß die Existenz eines sprachlichen Zeichens auch die Existenz eines einzigen

24 Back-formation; creating words by discarding a perceived suffix (resemblance → resemble, commentary → comment).

25 If I understood correctly, it means deriving an interjection by zero morpheme from a member of another class, that is, not by inventing it euphonicly.

26 *Präpositionale Rektionskomposita und Ableitungskomposita* (← *Zusammenbildung*)

von diesem bezeichneten Dings suggeriert. Diese Suggestion, der vor allem naive Sprecher erliegen, bewirkt eine Vergegenständlichung, eine Erhebung zur Substanz. Die Hypostasierung betrifft sowohl Simplizia als auch komplexe Lexeme.”²⁷ and (1977:162) “Die Hypostasierung ist damit eine Ursache der Lexikalisierung, d. h. eines Prozesses, der ja gerade bewirkt, daß ein komplexes Lexem zu einer Einheit wird.”²⁸

In Lipka (1975) “As pointed out by Leisi as early as 1952, there is a tendency for all lexical items, whether simple or complex, to imply that the entity denoted by a word actually exists as a substance or person - something he calls “*Hypostasierung durch das Wort*””.

In Lipka (1992:16) he explicitly states “...process of 'hypostatization'...By this term I mean, following Leisi, that the existence of a word implies the existence of a single entity denoted by it. ... *Other alternatives* for this admittedly clumsy term, such as hypostasis or reification, *do not seem to have caught on*. I believe that the reverse of the medal of this phenomenon is the 'concept-forming power of the word'.”²⁹

Eino (1962:11) supposedly takes his basic idea of what hypostasis is from Hermann Usener, a clear-cut definition, however, is not given. In the introductory chapter, examples of hypostasis are given, which seem to actually result from backformation (see 4.1.3, part on conversion).

Eino (ibid:11) proposes a subdivision of the traditional hypostasis by into three ranks:

1. Nominal, hypostasis (nomina from prepositional phrases³⁰), and hypobasis (nomina from verbal phrases).
2. Adverbial, apostasis (particles from PP) and apobasis (particles from VP).
3. Verbal, metabasis (verba from PP³¹; e.g. *exorbitare*).

Hypostasis "proper" further divides into prepositional hypostasis (e.g. *intervallum*), casual (e.g. *meridies*) and aclitical (e.g. *posticus*). Hypobasis is divided into imperative h. (e.g. *Vincemalus*) and syntactic h. (e.g. <*Quodvultdeus*>).

27 Under hypostatization by a word I understand the fact that existence of a linguistic sign suggests the existence of a single entity designated by it. This causes, especially in a naive speaker, an objectification of the substance. The hypostasis affects both simple and complex lexemes.

28 The hypostatization is therefore a cause of lexicalisation, i.e. the process by which complex lexemes unite.

29 Emphasis in italics not present in the original.

30 *Verhältnisformen*

31 *Prepositionalausdrücken*

Apostasis is either decasuative (e.g. *adversus*), or prepositional which has further subdivision of nominal a. (e.g. *affatim*) and aclitical (e.g. *abhinc*). Apobasis is either imperative (e.g. *puta*).

The work concentrates on listing words in Latin, Greek and Sanskrit with hypostatic etymologies. The author tries to derive both quantitative and qualitative conclusions from this list, although the work predates modern text corpuses and therefore the validity of such conclusions is arguable at best. An attempt to somehow sort the possible outcomes of the phenomena partaking in hypostasis, is innovative.

Němec

From personal communication with linguists³², it seems that the work of a prominent etymologist and Slavic comparative linguist, Igor Němec (e.g. 2009;reprint) is the primary and probably the only source in this matter at the Czech academy of sciences and in the Czech academic context. The author chooses to address the prepositional hypostasis as the most important sub-phenomenon for etymology (ibid:369). He states his belief that in a contemporary literature, prepositional hypostasis is equal to "L. Bloomfield's syntactic compounds", "V. P. Grigoryev's³³ syntacticomorphological formations" and "I. Y. Gladney's³⁴ dephrasals" - no differentiation between hypostasis and univerbation seems to be made. It is explicitly stated that he believes in existence of system inherent conditions leading to propensity towards prepositional hypostasis (ibid:371), here in the meaning of a grammatical case-inflected as required by the preposition.

The term is used with reference to Brugmann (1904). The possible cases are often concurrently explained in different sources as hypostasis and <parasyntesis> (OCS *bezbožije* "godless:SUBST" < *bez bog-a* "without god-GEN"); or hypostasis and verb prefixation (OCS *dovoliti* "to allow" < *do-volję* vs. *do-voliti*).

Pike (1955) states "Any abstraction of an activity from a normal participant sequence for purposes of viewing it, studying it, mentioning it, analyzing it, listing it, cataloging it, or discussing it as such, we shall call HYPOSTASIS³⁵ of that activity. The mention of a word is an activity of hypostasis." (ibid:138-139) That means it is a meta-action, hierarchically higher

32 P. Nejedlý, PhDr., member of the Czech Academy of Sciences, institute for the Czech language, department of language history was the first one to point me in that direction.

33 *Григорьев, Виктор Петрович* - a Russian linguist and an expert on the works of Victor Khlebnikov.

34 Profesor emeritus of history at Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies, university of Illinois.

35 In this place, original note was present inviting the reader to compare it with Bloomfield's definition.

than metalangage, at the same time including it. It is the process by which we abstract our doing, an initial step in creating expert categories, even as laymen: "The native speaker, in quoting a word out of normal context, is performing an act of hypostasis." (ibid:139). This work is evidently connected with the idea of "objectification", or concept-concretisation/conception. While defined by a linguist, it was certainly not to introduce a term useful for structuralists.

Nussbaum (1986)

The term is not explicitly used, however, the work is often cited by authors who delve into the analysis of hypostasis. The examples as he analyses them are thought of as reanalyses and therefore the author's understanding of them as extra-grammatical is improbable.

Jakobsen (1982:4) mentions a term *suppositio materialis* (word referring to itself) as a synonym. He mentions two senses of the word hypostasis - the Bloomfield's, and the French sense ("transition of a word from one word-class to another") and mentions that when referring to the form, there is no need to understand the meaning (ibid:3-4). Jakobsen believes that the referentiality implies that the word occurring in hypostasis creates a homonymous word, which in turn can be used in hypostasis and that he sees as unacceptable and goes on to state that the forms are not homonymous, although they are identical. He claims they violate the postulate of arbitrariness of a sign. (ibid:6)

As a concluding remark, he states that as he believes "hypostasis forms" do not reference any meaning at all, they are not linguistic signs and when written, "counts as a squirt of a pen", which discards them from being part of a metalanguage, calling them "level zero occurrences" (ibid:13) which is earlier equalled to the *signifié* (ibid:12).

A strange idea is that since quotation marks can be used recursively, hypostasis is also recursive and therefore the postulate of these forms being reflexive (regarding their form) is a nonsense (ibid:6). This is a logical jump where typography is identified as stemming from semantics rather than stylistics. If we restrict ourselves to the sound in "let's talk about the word 'Boston'", we will see it is either an anaphora, referencing an earlier use (which might have been reflexive), or a reflexive use. Either way, it is either an index or a symbol, a proper sign with semantics.

The analysis presented in Jakobsen's study is in my view a collection of strange twists of terms and a bunch of wild hypotheses, as it contradicts the elementary notion that even when creating the object in a real world through language, it is still done in language, a referencing apparatus. For a part of an utterance to be an object, it has to first be part of a language, even if only at that single instance.

Biloa (2004)

The work mentions hypostasis as defined by Fosso: "C'est une opération par laquelle un mot change de nature et de catégorie grammaticale quand on passe d'une langue à une autre"³⁶ which is an incomplete definition that seems incompatible with all the others (see analysis of ex. [8]).

Layton (2004:108) states in his Coptic grammar "Hypostasis: other kinds of element functioning as entity term. Any kind of textual element (word, phrase, clause, sentence, fragment, letter of the alphabet) can be treated as an entity term." which links it to the objectification of Lipka/Leisi.

Widmer (2004) argues for certain words in the Indo-European languages to be of hypostatic origin as opposed to some earlier hypotheses about their etymology. Among them PIE *d^hg^hém-on* "human" as a delocative noun (ibid:50) in accordance with findings of Nussbaum (1986) and Armenian յոյն, *yolov* "in large numbers" an instrumental prepositional hypostasis (ibid:66).

Yakubovich (2006:44) states that the term hypostasis "is used in Hittite when the dependent noun assumes all the grammatical functions (including the case-marking) of the reconstructed head-noun and acquires the lexical meaning of the reconstructed noun phrase. According to the frequently cited or implied, although never proven, assumption" ... "free-standing genitives have a special propensity towards hypostasis." ... "<they> must rather be regarded as parallel phenomena that owe their existence to the omission of head-nouns in nominal phrases with and without case

³⁶ "A process by which a word changes its nature and grammatical category while being borrowed into another language."

attraction." (ibid:47) "case attraction... is parallel to that of hypostasis in that in both cases morphological

change triggers semantic shift."

(ibid:49)

"FREE STANDING GENITIVE = [- CASE ATTRACTION, + ELLIPSIS]

HYPOSTASIS = [+ CASE ATTRACTION, + ELLIPSIS]."

This means that hypostasis in hittitology sense is a completely different phenomenon from the one inspected here. If we inspect chapter 3.1.2 again, we can see it is used in this sense in (Makhulov & Spencer 2009:236) also for Quequa, Basque and even English.

To discern this term from the one inspected here, I decided to call it a "head-ellipsis" hypostasis.

Nikolaev (2009:466) describes the hypostasis in PIE as an external derivation from a case-inflected form where the system does not permit a direct derivation from one class to another, as opposed to an internal derivational strategy (reassignment to a different accent class and then inflecting it) for overcoming the same problem. In this view, hypostasis is not a null derivation, rather, it is a "use" of inflection-derivation combination.

Brachet (2009) believes parasynthesis, a word formation done by compounding (a phrase) and adding an affix at the same time³⁷, to be different from hypostasis.³⁸ His examples include Latin *expectorāre* (to expel from the breast³⁹). His use proves the French specialisation of the term to only mean conversion.

3.5 Use across languages

In French and German, the term is relatively wide-spread in historical linguistics and there are some referential books on the matter.

37 According to some encyclopedia aimed at general public (e.g. Unabridged Random House Dictionary), parasynthesis could also be understood as the act of derivating by a circumfix or a combination of pre- and suffix. This, however, in my view, is not useful and I refrain from using the term in this way here.

38 It should be noted that his work is in French where SIL cites hypostasis equals to conversion.

39 Source: "Dictionary.com", dictionary.reference.com; retrieved on 4.8.2013

In English, Czech and Italian, the use is extremely scarce and usually points to an academic background of the researcher in Germany (as evidenced by the relevant researchers' respective biographies).

In **older Czech literature** (pre-1970), there seems to be a very sporadic use of the term *hypostasování* in a "linguistic sense" in a philosophical literature which comes from the German *hypostasierung*, it does not, however, equate with the linguistic sense completely, it is best compared to the Lipka/Leisi view.

4. Hypostasis as a phenomenon

The next sub-chapters sum up delimitations of intersected terms that can be confused with hypostasis in some cases.

4.0 Related phenomena (as mentioned in literature)

Some authors explicitly mention what other terms are related to the one investigated here.

The terms *suppositio materialis* and quotation are closely related to hypostasis, they do not, however denote the exactly same concept.

A number of sub-phenomena of decasuative derivation do exist, they are usually not referred to by the term hypostasis and a more exact name is used, e.g. the delocative derivation.

There seems to be a dual dichotomy of internal-external derivation: either introflexion and infigation as opposed to standard inflection, or system-integral inflection (through introflexion) combined with system-internal derivation as opposed to system-external hypostasis, a double-ending combination.⁴⁰

Although not referential, a simple google search⁴¹ shows that two of the terms proposed by I.Němec do not seem to have a widespread use. The word "dephrasal" has only 826 results. "Syntacticomorphological formation" shows 4. Syntactic compound has 4950 results.

In hittitology and possibly some other philologies, the word is used for a special kind of constructions unrelated to the phenomena investigated here. Nikolaev (2009) might be the only connecting point with the other hypostases - through the double ending appending routine common to both phenomena.

4.0.1 Use across linguistic branches

There seem to be three separate ways to use the term which roughly correspond to linguistic disciplines.

Deriving the use from philosophy of language, general linguists (e.g. Bloomfield 1933) use hypostasis in the meaning nearly identical to the medieval *suppositio materialis*,

40 It should be noted that while no-one refers to the question of system-externality directly, most uses seems to correspond with this view.

41 Retrieved on 26.5.2013

that is, as an objectification, a reference to the material of the word, in a modern sense to its form. In this sense, hypostasis is related to quotation, which also references a form.

In hittitology, the term hypostasis was possibly independently invented with the same motivation for naming - a substantiation. This term denotes a special construction where ellision of a head renders it unable to receive a case marking which is then transferred to the dependant. This term seems to be also used by some general linguists.

Third way to use the word hypostasis is in the etymological sense, which is done by historical linguists. It is this meaning that is the primary focus here.

Noteworthy is a fact that the use in any discipline does not seem to correspond completely with any of the definitions found in linguistic dictionaries.

4.1 Intersecting the definitions and uses

By restricting the broad scope to more "workable grounds", a working definition has been arrived at: Hypostasis is a morphosyntactic system-peripheral phenomenon of (null) derivation introduced as a compensation for the lack of prototypical derivational process in a certain case. That is, a derivation from inflected forms, phrases, and meta-linguistics - specifically the use of grammatical word in a position where syntax would require an autosemantic word.

The hypostasis as presented here requires a conscious act. On this basis, it can be differentiated from other phenomena which are similar on the surface level. Mainly the difference between hypostasis and univerbation is to be maintained when speaking of the etymological term. When using the traditional philosophical term, this distinction is impossible. And for the hittitologist version, it is irrelevant.

If validated, a possible conclusion from this would be that categories are not as fixed as it would seem and that a cognitive approach to grammar building is the one to solve the problem of including those phenomena that are only seemingly outside the system.

4.1.1 Hypostasis and quotation

The obvious difference between hypostasis and quotation is that in the view presented here, hypostasis in form cannot be composed of multiple lexemes as a result.⁴² When defining the quotation simply as a repetition of speech, the two phenomena intersect with hypostasis being a means of including the quote into a sentence. Both of them could be thought of as a *suppositio materialis*, summing the two in one term, such analysis would be undesirable for linguists, however, as the usability of such concept is doubtful.

4.1.2 Hypostasis and lexicalisation

Traugott (2005:96) sees lexicalization as "the change whereby in certain linguistic contexts speakers use a syntactic construction or word formation as a new contentful form with formal and semantic properties that are not completely derivable or predictable from the constituents of the construction or the word formation pattern. Over time there may be further loss of internal constituency and the item may become more lexical."

This definition would also fit some of the views on hypostasis - but not the one presented as useful. That is an act of synchronic word-creation, not a diachronic process.

4.1.2.1 Hypostasis and univerbation

The primary way to distinguish these two on a historical level is by the number of steps needed for the actual lexeme to appear. Since synchronical hypostasis requires a deliberate word-inventive action on the part of speaker, the process is indivisible and we should not find any traces of gradual change (reanalysis).

4.1.2.1 Ellipsis

The problem of ellipsis is pragmatic - it is expected that what is left unsaid will be understood from the context, therefore the word it resulted in, should be a result of reanalysis, as the need to use it in other contexts arises and the "feel" of it as a phrase fades. It is not a process of inventing a new word for a new concept.

⁴² There is, of course, a question of what is still a phrase and what is already a word. The hypostasis is defined as a single-step act, therefore, it should not include ambiguous cases. In the "Bloomfield type" hypostasis, there is, of course, no such problem: examples the likes of "Don't you '*do you mind me*'" are valid.

4.1.3 Hypostasis and word formation

Hypostasis exhibits itself on surface through composition, to be precise the rection composition (which includes prepositional hypostasis and parasyntesis) and a composition of "uncomposable". We can include under composition also parasyntesis, which does not, in fact, fall completely under hypostasis.

Technically, hypostasis is separate from both derivation and composition. Both of them use bare stems and some kind of marking (affix, accent shift...).

Connection with the type of language

As was already stated in the summary of the Literature review chapter, we can easily make a mental shortcut - from a complex model (of interwoven processes) lacking sufficient data to an idea that hypostasis is not a generally occurring phenomenon, that it may be restricted to a single language family and a single stage when the morphologies adhere mostly to the flective type. If we stick to the proposed working definition, finding an example in an analytic language is indeed highly improbable if not outright impossible⁴³. However, there is no need to restrict ourselves to a single family, as the basic morphological prerequisites have been attested in many languages and nothing disproving the idea of hypostasis' universality has been presented in the literature. The possible cases should be analysed by experts on respective languages as the study of system-peripheral processes requires an extensive knowledge of the system.

Hypostasis as a universal

Identifying hypostasis in isolating languages is made difficult by the fact that composition and derivation without morphological marker is usually the primary way of word-formation, only hindered by traces of (flective) morphology present in every real language.

When discussing the connection with a type of language, one must mention the hypothetical early stage of both phylogenesis and ontogenesis, the isolating monocategorial associational (IMA) language. Gil (2007:4) cites Riau Indonesian as a Relative IMA language, that is the closest real-world example of IMA. I believe that Classical Chinese may be better for our purposes, since it has a large body of available data and has been studied for a long time by many linguists. Let's review the properties: (a) no word-internal structure, (b) no

43 Yet I propose in the next section one possible example in English.

distinct syntactic categories, and (c) no distinct construction-specific rules of semantic interpretation. For Chinese, (a) is true (but may not be true for a pre-stage), (b) is untrue as proven by modern linguistic analysis of words rather than separate ("logographic") graphemes; while association operators do have a relatively strong position, (c) also does not obtain here. What does it mean for this analysis? Hopefully, that it can be used for our purposes as long as we understand the restrictions (a limited morphosyntax exists).

Such analysis is far beyond the scope of this work, therefore I will refrain from it.

Other ways of deriving neologisms

Other inventive approaches to word-building exist, hypostasis, however differs from them in that it is not a direct violation of underlying mechanisms, rather, some surface structure apparent mechanisms are ignored so that meaning can manifest itself where these surface structure do not allow for it. It is not a play on words (metanalysis the kind of prequel-sequel is borderline), and not an error (metanalysis the kind of hamburger-cheesburger).

A complete transfer from one class to another, that is, a change in affiliation with a certain prototype, is arguably the most grammar-respecting strategy to overcome inadequacies.

Hypostatisation devices

Zero derivation: ending as part of the stem

The PIE word for winter is given in Friedman (2003) and Widmer (2004:90); Nussbaum (1986:52):

[1a]

*ǵ^hheimen LOC < ǵ^hiém NOM

Descendants include Lat. *hiems*, Czech *zima* and Gr. χειμώνας. (< χειμών).

Zero derivation: cliticon as part of the stem

An exceptional example - inspected by multiple researchers⁴⁴

44 Bičovský (2012:57), Widmer (2004:50)

[1b]

*d^hǵ^hémon < *d^hǵ^h-ém-*en LOC < *d^heǵ^hom/*d^hǵ^hm-es NOM

earth -on

"earthling", descendants include *homō* and bridegroom (groom < *guma* by folk etymology).

Nikolaev (2009) does not consider this a hypostasis.

Fake zero-derivation: Hypostasis and conversion

Conversion, or derivation by a zero morpheme, seems to be the central morphological device of hypostasis, on the other hand, conversion arises by various reasons in a language and is therefore usually not restricted to being system external, that is, hypostatic. The "immediate"⁴⁵ hypostasis does not, per se, convert the word in a sense of creation of a new lexeme, it is more akin to Booij's syntactic inflection than derivation, as the word enters a new syntactic context, it has a zero morpheme appended to it and while that changes what part of speech it is, effectively creating a homonym to the original word, it does so only on one instance, otherwise, our lexicon would be full of hypostatic words, for every lexeme there would be another with exactly the same form and meaning, only with different syntactic properties - and not just one, rather, one for every class in said the language. This in turn would render the idea of parts of speech useless in the syntactic sense as words could then only be grouped through semantics. This in my view proves, that the immediate hypostasis, which could be compared to the traditional one presented by philosophers of language, maintained by some general linguists, is indeed not grammatical and is not accessible to the conscious of the speaker. The idea proposed by some, that the resulting forms are "not words" is obviously tempting and that they are not the ones referring, rather ones "being referred to" (e.g. Jakobsen 1982), these usages of words are purely idiomatic, they are not, however, devoid of meaning, "your ifs and buts" hardly refers only to the form; when used in context, the words in used meta-linguistically take on an exocentric meaning, which is in indirect relation to the word they are in form identical to. In "I'm tired of your ifs and buts", "ifs and buts" is a synonym to the word whining. As a proof, we can look at the Cambridge Idioms Dictionary, 2nd ed. entry⁴⁶: "no ifs and buts ...

45 Immediate is used here in the meaning synonymous to ad-hoc, one-time... as I felt the need to invent a term for these cases, other, possibly more intuitive term would be metalinguistic hypostasis.

46 Accessed through The Free Dictionary, <http://idioms.thefreedictionary.com/no+ifs+and+buts>; retrieved on 2013-08-10

something that you say to a child to stop them arguing with you when you want them to do something".

The conversion as a part of hypostasis violates, by its very essence, the Overt analogue criterion⁴⁷ which states that for a zero morpheme to exist, there must be minimal pair, that is, there must be a possibility to add an affix for it (not adding an affix) to contrast with. A phenomenon which intersects with zero-derivation (and metanalysis), is called backformation. It obtains under the Overt analogue criterion in removing the suffix (real or perceived). It is an action that reverses perceived earlier derivation and if needed adds a different suffix. Hypostatic conversion may alternatively be seen as a reanalysis in that the speaker may be unbeknownst to him be forced into reanalysis of "nothing" into zero-morpheme.

Relation to meaning: Synsemantics

[2]

"that is only an if ... there is always a but"

metalinguistics, synsemantics used in positions of nouns - as used by Bloomfield (1933:148).

According to Dagmar S. Wodtko (PC) "A possible definition would be that hypostasis must be based on a syntagm, otherwise one might speak of conversion. Therefore, the "ifs and buts" could be described as hypostasis, however the "Ifs" (alone) could not." definition allows for the interpretation that this is indeed a hypostasis, as opposed to a stand-alone "ifs". The reason is that it has to adapt to syntagmatic needs. The problem here is that while this is parole-specific, it does not create new words that enter a shared lexicon, it merely redefines their standing as a part of speech in the given context.

Another possible set of hypostasis cases may be the use of "agrammatisms"⁴⁸ in idioms:⁴⁹

[3]

Pozdě	<u>bych-a</u>	honi-ti.
Too_late	would-ACC;MAS	chase-INF:OBS.

47 Sanders (1988:156)

48 See Discussion

49 Through introspection, I have concluded that this is the most widespread kind; a further quantitative research would be advisable.

Literally “too late to chase a would”. The auxiliary “*bych*” stands in a nominal position and is suffixed by a nominal category marker. A null derivation from verb to a noun is not permissible in Czech grammar, therefore this is an obvious case of ad-hoc/immediate hypostasis.

The process of hypostatisation may happen by inflecting systematically inflexible word classes, which, in my view, makes degrammaticalisation a possible outcome of hypostasis. A difference from the degrammaticalisation is that it is undertaken in a single step, rather than being gradual.

In Czech we may find possible examples among adverbs

[4a]

jak-se-patř-í

how-REFL-belong-PRES;3

The state of being "how it should be", of being proper.

[4b]

jak-by-[s-met]

how-would-[PERF-sweep]

prepositions

[5a]

po-před-í

after-before-COL

a foreground

[5b]

k-vůl-i

to-a_will-DAT

"because of"

While on the surface [5a] seems to be a proper derivation, when we inspect it closer, we find that the prefix and suffix can not be separated in this case. On the other hand, [5b] has a fossilised dative case and while the word seems like a normal member of its class, it in fact functions in syntax the exact same way the original phrase would, meaning [5b] is unverbated while [5a] is possibly hypostatized. When considering the working hypothesis,

it is a question whether there is in the language already a large enough number of examples of this "circumfixation" to say this is an "allowed" derivation process. This may in fact prove inadequacy of the working hypothesis that equates the process initiation with the act itself in its requirements. While the way the derivation from prepositional phrases (with inflected member) may be in a language quite uncommon, it is not non-existent and it may have led to an evolution of a proper derivation by circumfix. Yet, these borderline cases would probably be in accord with the definition of hypostasis in historical linguistics, the analysis whether it is a result of affixation or a contraction of a phrase is a subject to interpretation.

Among particles:

[6a]

ne-dej-bože

no-give;IMP;2_tu-god:VOC

means "let it not be <that>".

An interjection may stand in any position in a clause in *suppositio materialis*, that is, referring to itself as a word, while being in a sense apart from the syntax of a said clause, rather, creating a separate one in the same way quotation does. Some may take on conjugational suffixes

[6b]

heč-te⁵⁰

EXC;mine-2PL

[6c]

na-te⁵⁰

EXC;take-2_vf

These⁵¹ do seem to be obvious cases of hypostasis at a first glance and in the least restrictive sense, the "ad-hoc" one (and of course "Bloomfieldian"), it indeed is.

Of course, not every compound is an example of hypostasis. The problem of these ([4a-b]) examples is that they may actually be results of univerbation; (more on inflecting

50 The -te suffix combines only with imperative forms of verbs, therefore there is a connotation of commanding, however, it is also used in interjections like *vítejte* (welcome:IMP-2PL), which simply means welcome. The differentiation between marking a plural and vous form depends on the context of utterance.

51 *Heč* probably originally identical to *hled'* - look.IMP with some irregular sound change; *na* - a preposition "on"

particles viz. Dunkel 2007). A morphematic univerbation is a composition of a properly inflected phrase without secondary changes in form. One view is that it intersects the hypostasis where the conditions obtain, another is that the two are mutually exclusive. One way to define them as completely separate is that univerbation does not require 's intentional lexicalisation while hypostasis does. This would support the claim that examples [8] and [11] are of hypostatic origins.

While ex. [3] is an irregularity, examples [6b-c] seem to be perfectly regular, the difference being the suffix used. Interjections as a whole show the tendency to take some verbal markers across various languages, see e.g. Ferklová (2010) for Korean. In contrast it may be hypothesised that interjections do not take any suffix unless they are put in a semantically obscure context, into a metaphor, as in [3]. While relatively uncommon due to the situational context needed for it, the sheer possibility of adding a suffix indicating an imperative to an interjection, the uttering of which is already a directive⁵² by itself, shows that the boundaries between classes are quite fragile where metalinguistic hypostasis occurs more frequently, and that such uses may very well be the beginning of a system-internal conversion process. In this case, it was initiated by the need to explicitly express the level of deference. This connects metalinguistic hypostasis with indexicality and shows its basis in the fact that sometimes the pragmatic needs are not fulfilled by the system and there are some strategies needed to be used to adapt to the situation.

Autosemantics - composition not involved

[7]

normal-cy

-cy is a suffix for deriving abstract nouns from words ending in [-t]. The proper way to derive such nouns from adjectives (such as "normal") is by adding the -ity suffix. A simple case of metanalysis and not an example of hypostasis - there is no need to believe any system-external conversion took place here before appending the affix, as -cy does not require a specific word class⁵³. A similar same case is normalness, where the -n- comes from a proper adjectival ending (cf. e.g. Czech *-ní/-nost*). Here, however, exists a requirement

52 In Slovak language, there is a possibility to add the -te suffix to the expressives, too: *čau-te* (hi-2_vf)

53 "Aristocrat x advocate x pregnant..."; today, more words that do not respect the final -t requirement exist.

regarding the class of the word entering the derivation and it is not being bypassed in any way. While hypostasis works by analogy, same as, arguably, any rule in any language, not every example of system-external analogical derivation process is a hypostatisation. There are alternative suffixes to use here, so no syntagmatic need is observed, which could lead us to the assumption that this word was coined and indeed it is a popular belief⁵⁴. Nevertheless neither alone, nor in the context of "the word normalcy" does this exhibit signs of hypostatisation in the strict sense proposed here.

There is a question whether words arrived at through ellipsis are actually examples of hypostasis, although *präpositionales Rektionskomposita* are generally undisputed. Another example of ellipsis would be medical Latin

[8]⁵⁵

placēbō

which comes from "I will please (the Lord in the land of the living)", supposed to be originally an incipit (partial quotation from a work used as a title) of vespers part of the office of the dead. At least one author (Yakubovich, 2009:1) considers certain kind of ellipsis to be a valid case of (although head-ellipsis) hypostasis.

Autosemantics - compounds

In Czech language, the use of hypostasis was relatively widespread⁵⁶ in creating new surnames for peasants when the royal edict was passed to assign a last name to every citizen.

[9a]

Skoč-do-pole

Jump.IMP.2_tu-into-field.GEN

54 Although often attributed to the W.G. Harding's 1920 presidential campaign, it did exist at that time already and may not have been a case of malapropism in his case.

55 Words like *placebo*, *lavabo*, ... possible examples of conversion done at the time of borrowing a word were given by my colleague Petr Hrach. Another example may be εἰς τὴν πόλιν "into that city" > İstanbul; etymology is being disputed; the unsure extent to what the speakers who borrow the term speak the language makes these cases even more complex to analyse.

56 These family names are regarded by native speakers as rather obscure, even funny, because of their unusual etymology and, sometimes, their meaning.

This is a full-fledged sentence instructing someone the utterer is on familial terms with to jump into the fields. More names like that exist: *Hrejsemnou* (Play with me), *Vítámvás* (I welcome you), *Rádsetoulal* (He liked to wander), *Nejezchleba* (Don't eat bread), *Osol sobě* (Salt yourself a meal), *Bezchleba* (Having no bread), *Odvody* (From around the water) to name a few.

Toponyms make up another set of property names where a possible hypostasis occurs in the Czech language.⁵⁷

[9b]

Podě-brad-y

hide⁵⁸:TRANS:M:SG:PRES-chin⁵⁸-PL

Podiebrad, roughly "the one(s), who lost his/their beard".

Etymologies of such names should be regarded as highly controversial. There is more than one possible way to derive words starting *podě-*. Alternatively *Poděbrady* may be translated into modern *pod-brody* "below the fords", which describes the place well, but then we come to the problem of *Poděbaby* (the one who lost/hid a/his woman⁵⁹). In this sense, we could translate it into a modern *Podbaba*, which is a typical name for a town located near a hill called *Baba* - hills with this name are quite common in central Bohemia. There is seems to be no hill called *Baba* nearby *Poděbaby*, however. Therefore the explanation of "the one who lost a woman" may be valid. It has been claimed that the place name comes from a personal name, which would support the basic claim if proven by historical sources. Another problem is that if it is indeed based on the verb, it may not come from the transgressive singular form, it may come from a shortened past participle plural⁶⁰.

In summary, toponyms of this kind in the Czech language are of doubtful source and are not suitable for further analysis in this preliminary study.

There are other possibly deverbal toponyms - *Drštěkryje* (from *krýt* - to cover), *Hajany* (from *haját* - "to sleep" in baby talk), *Hustopeče* (from *péci* - to bake), *Mrkvojedy* (from *jíst* - to)... When created by composition, the first component is a noun (as an object

57 The possibility of this being a hypostasis was proposed by my colleague, Petr Hrach.

58 *Podít* - (to cause something) to disappear; *brada* - in older Czech also possibly a beard.

59 *Baba* is a derogative term for a (older) woman.

60 My personal view is that we can discard this possibility.

of the transitive verb) or an adverb, inflected, and the second is a verbal root followed by a nominal plural marker. For the author as a native speaker, there seems to be no other way to create these words other than parasynthesis.

Returning to the surnames, the whole class seems to have a tendency towards violation of proper nouns' derivation rules. There are even examples of mimetics being used (*Krák*, the sound a crow makes). The same can be said for names of works of art, these are better thought of as quotations, rather than part of proper syntax.

In Czech, there is a class of adjectival surnames. Even though it is possible to use adjectives in a position of subject, it is only through ellipsis, meaning there is always another subject understood semantically and the adjective stands in an apposition, e.g. "*malý je dražší*" meaning <the> smaller-MAS <one> is more_expensive. It should be noted that for first and second person subjects, Czech uses ellipsis in most (situational) contexts, and omits third person pronoun where there is no ambiguity, as the person, number and gender is marked on the predicate.

The whole Czech surname feminisation is done by adding a feminine adjectival suffix *-ová*, which when we investigate typical pragmatic use of the corresponding classes, may lead to the conclusion, that they are agrammatical.⁶¹

Another possible surname type is that of preterites, e.g. Hrabal (<he, who>digged).⁶²

It is, therefore, safe to conclude, that if we differentiate between hypostasis and quotation, then surnames tend to, as evidenced by Czech, behave like quotations reanalysed as proper nouns. The reason could be that they are, unlike, possibly, other word classes, coined, consciously created.

There are some words outside the proper names class that probably underwent the process of hypostasis in relatively recent times, e.g.

[10]

pří-tom-n-ost

at-that-ADJ-SUBST

61 There is presently a debate among feminists whether this is sexist possibly stemming from the fact that unlike masculine surnames, evidently used as designations, feminine by their adjectival nature tend to lead to the conclusion that they describe a characteristic or property.

62 These may be reminiscent of the typical "American Indian" personal names in films the likes of *Dances with wolves*. Supposedly, Siouan really does have these kinds of names and (not as a result of mistranslation), that is, their names may be full sentences. I was unable to verify that claim.

“present (time) / (someone's) presence⁶³”, semantically comes from <being present> at that <event>. This is an example of parasynthesis.

[11]

zá-pas-it

by-belt-INF

“to compete, to fight”, through ellipsis from “to take each other by the belt⁶⁴”.

[12a]^A

Ná-hor-ní Karabach

on-mountain-ADJ⁶⁵ Karabakh

A region in the Southern Causasus derives the first part of its Czech name not from being hilly, but being located on the hills. The English equivalent would be "upper".

[12b]^A

ná-břež-í

on-shore-COL

Much like with [5a], both [12a] and [12b] are examples of parasynthesis. The question is, whether it is a hypostatic one, a contraction of a phrase with added suffix, or non-hypostatic with a double affixation. There may be an inherent connection between emergence of circumfixes and hypostasis.

[13a]^A

Langue-d-oc

language-of-*oc*

Languedoc, the name of a region comes from the French name for its variety, Occitan, it literally means language of “oc”, the local word for “yes”, it stands in direct opposition to “langues d’oïl” (in modern standard “oui”), the main dialect group of French and “langue de si”, or Italian. The particle “yes” is used in a context where the illocutionary

63 Many thanks to Tamah Sherman, PhD for pointing out my inaccuracy in translating the word.

64 An example of prepositional hypostasis given by doc. Jiří Rejzek from the Institute of Czech language and theory of communication in electronic correspondence.*

*Eymologický slovník jazyka českého, ed. V. Machek, 2.nd ed., 1957 + Český etymologický slovník, J. Rejzek, 2001, Leda

65 An alternative view would be na-horní on-upper.

force does not include an affirmation, it is merely descriptive and can be considered degrammaticalised. When understood in the broadest sense, this is a hypostasis, it is not one, however, when inspecting through the narrower definition proposed here.

[13b]^A

co-dzien-ny

what-day-ADJ

daily/everyday

Let us look again at metalinguistics ([3], [6a-c] and [13a]). While the motivation is certainly the same as in other cases - compensation for inadequacies in the grammar - the "ad-hoc" metalinguistic use essentially differs in that its results are not fully collocable words, while the results of "hypostasis proper" adhere to the properties expected of a resulting class prototype. Another difference is that metalinguistic use is almost exclusively restricted to the synsemantics and when occurring more often, it tends to "stretch" the morphosyntactic properties of their synsemantic class itself, rather than creating separate lexemes. Among the examples, the only indisputable separate lexemes are [13a]: Languedoc, however, can be easily explained as a univerbation of a phrase that just happened to include an ad-hoc use of an interjection. [13b] *codzienny* may have also come to be through univerbation, or, possibly through a prefixation of a kind, as in Japanese *nan-* compounds⁶⁶.

[14]

Merry-go-round

ADJ -V -ADV compounding results in a noun. A hypothetical case in an isolating language. According to Online Etymology Dictionary⁶⁷, the earliest attestation is in 1729 with separate noun "go-round" in 1886, which would suggest that there is no original nominal part. As this is not a proper way to derive English substantives, it seems to be in accordance with all requisites for hypostatic origin. It may be hypothesised to be created analogically to happy-go-lucky, originally an adverb with earliest attestation in the 1670s⁶⁷. The word "carousel" (in the sense of merry-go-round) dates back to 1670s⁶⁷. In my view, this

66 何 /naN/ - "what": 何日 /naNniti/ "what day, which day, how many days, several days"; 何時 /naNji/ when, what hour, anytime; a slight problem - naN is a form in compounds, stand-alone "what" is /nani/... naN; maybe more akin to *-mo*: nani-mo what-also == nothing/anything, dare-mo who-also == no-one/anyone ...

67 Online ED entries retrieved on 28.7.2013; www.etymonline.com

indicates that the word was coined to designate the invention at the time of its introduction to the English public.

[15]

The original Hebrew name for the Book of Lamentations is אֵיכָהּ (‘ēkhā(h)) meaning "how". It is an example of a single-word incipit. It can be interpreted as a kind of either ellipsis, hypostasis or a quotation. The most probable one seems the quotation, as with other names of works; in the broadest sense, it does not rule out the possibility of the former two also applying. When a single-word synsemantic incipit is used in place of subject or object, and/or other criteria apply, it may be viewed as an occurrence of "ad-hoc" hypostasis.

4.2 Synchrony and diachrony

I would like to outline here the difference between what I perceive as "proper" hypostasis and the "ad-hoc" one. The proper one is a subtype of lexicalisation in a broad sense, it comes from the ("micro"-pragmatic) need to use a sememe in a new *situational* context, the need to invent a word. The fact it is done through derivation is in a way unimportant here. The "ad-hoc" one, on the other hand comes from the need to adapt the lexeme to a new *syntagmatic* "environment", it does not result in a new word, it could, however, when occurring often inside a class change its properties, as stated above. Its basis is in metalinguistics, but unlike "Bloomfieldian" version, it does not include it whole, it is only the cases where metalinguistics as used result in extra-grammaticality. It is inherently connected with synsemantics.

While in most cases, I use "hypostasis" and "hypostatisation" interchangeably for both the process of derivation and the subsequent addition into a lexicon, it may be wise to distinguish those two as some German-speaking authors seemed to do. That is, hypostatisation as a process and hypostasis as a result.

The hypostasis "proper" is basically a word coining, rather than general word-forming strategy. While not explicitly stated, most of the definitions seems to involve some kind of volition on part of speaker. This in turn makes it incompatible with the idea that hypostasis can be identified with lexicalisation, as that should involve some kind of reanalysis. That is not to say the words that were created through hypostasis did not

undergo reanalysis at other stages of their evolution. This hypostasis is an act, not a process.

In diachrony, hypostasis also describes the phenomenon occurring in at a certain point in time, with inclusion of the process of the word coming into a shared lexicon.

5. Discussion

Finding to what extent is the hypostasis source of members of certain word (sub-)classes seems to be a logical next step. The feasibility of such a task, however, seems rather unreal at this point. The present day corpora do not provide enough (etymological) data so that the researcher can derive some quantitative results without working on a word-by-word basis and such an approach would require a tremendous amount of work, would be prone to mistakes and would be extremely time consuming.² Some data pre-selection may be possible by ruling out the words that were at some point monocollocable or had a very restricted collocability as the most probable cause is that they were merged into a single word from a phrase through reanalysis. This would rule completely out some sub-phenomena possibly taking part in hypostasis (metalinguistics), but would hopefully reduce the needed amount of time.

Further research into proving the universality of the phenomenon should provide interesting results. Not only may hypostasis be universal in the sense of its spread across languages, it may very well be one of the basic ways we learn. It is the both the author's and the work's supervisor's firm belief that the motivation behind hypostasis is not restricted to adult speech uttered in flective languages. The process of (first) language acquisition requires some experiments which could be described as a synchronic hypostasis. While the incomplete system lacks some rules, it is sure to have some over-generalisations and with them the need to invent at least some words through system-external means.

While this is at this point a pure speculation, it may be hypothesised that any change in derivational behaviour of a word class is initiated by hypostasis, which, when occurring in a larger number of word units, may spread the new function of affected grammatical morphemes by analogy to their whole paradigm and therefore be the moving force behind a number of seemingly unexplainable shifts (in what is being marked).

One possible way of narrowing the scope of hypostasis in the pragmatic view is separating the immediate derivations from those cases where it leads to lexicalisation and declare that one the diachronic display of metalinguistic/discursive self-referencing deixis. Another is the exact opposite - stating that such deixis is the ad-hoc use (metalinguistics) while hypostasis proper is not, as it simply arises from the need to use the lexeme with certain semantics in a given syntactic context. The quotation may be in this regard be called

a multi-word hypostasis, phrasal hypostasis, or appositive hypostasis (as it can be thought of as a loose apposition).

The near-exclusivity of use of the term in historical linguistics makes it seem like a historical process, rather than a synchronically occurring one. That is an illusion; as a system-external process, it is hard to describe until we have an attestation of a result. In other words, it is a synchronical process that manifests itself exclusively in a history of language. This may be a valid argument for panchrony in linguistics, as separating the two approaches deprives of an unpredictable number of the so-called universals, that are to be seen only in the synthesis. While it is at this point only a hunch, I believe that the ad-hoc hypostasis is quite a widespread way to change the properties of grammatical classes (as in examples [6b-c]).

A related phenomenon - motivated by the same fact that there are sometimes reasons to use words outside their morphosyntactic restrictions may be adding a borrowed word to a (usually small and closed) class instead of the one that one would expect when we consider the stem, e.g. retaining the masculine semantics when borrowing a word ending in "-a" into a Slavic language, where it is associated with feminine. It is a conscious process based on the knowledge of the source language; while part of speech affiliation is not changed, the declination class does and this causes differences in the potential morphosyntactic context.

A calque may be created through obvious violation of collocability of its components caused by the disparity between the grammatical systems of the source and the target language.

An interesting research might prove to be an investigation of the connection between text genre and its hypostatic content. Introduction of a foreign-language term from a specific field when translating is in my view prone to use calquing, especially in the fields of humanities. An example would be the rare Czech *zdebytí* used exclusively in philosophical works concerning existentialism, which comes from the German *Dasein*. A parallel theological/philosophical term is in Slovak (*jestvovanie*) was mentioned earlier in this work.

An important question is posed in setting the hierarchy of the partaking phenomena. Does the hypostatic composition require its components to undergo a conversion as part of the process? A change in word class is involved every time. But not necessarily through conversion. Parasyntesis, while a type composition, does not require conversion to take place, e.g. ex. [10].

Is there any phenomenon, that is inherently hypostatic? Not in the sense of hypostasis proposed here. Some may be analysed as such an author of a certain work, however, every phenomenon partaking in hypostasis, only intersects it. For example delocative derivation may have started in a certain language as a hypostasis and may have become regular and has been generalised, no longer fulfilling the requirement for extra-grammaticality; even if the process itself did remain irregular, the concrete examples are usually ambiguous and may be easily analysed as univerbation. Of course, if we include univerbation into hypostasis, as some do, this will result in rapid rise in cases analysed as hypostasis.

In the work, I have tried to maintain a distinction between "extra-grammatical" and "agrammatical" words. While occurrences of extra-grammaticality are unusual, they do not go against the L1 speaker's intuition⁶⁸, as we can see in the fact that they often enter the lexicon, on the other hand, agrammatical occurrences go against an intuition and usually have to be standardised by national authorities in prescriptive grammars and/or laws to be perceived as a part of the language.

Some examples of extra-grammatical words may be analysed (synchronically) as agrammatical, that, however, does not change the motivation behind their creation and therefore their standing as a hypostasis. The institutionalised agrammatical words may be seen as a result of extra-grammatical phenomenon of hypostasis of sorts. On the other hand, the L2 induced contamination of declension paradigm cannot be seen as a nothing else than agrammatism.

A question is whether we can discern between agrammaticisms somehow (that is by normative authority of any kind) institutionalised, and hypostasis.

68 On the contrary, they are ruled by what I believe to be a higher set of rules than the "immediate" morphosyntactic ones. The traditional structuralist descriptive grammar, I am lead to believe, sees only prototypes, builds a basic surface model, while usage-based grammar derives its rules from these "higher rules".

An extremely important finding is that while linguistics tends to intersect with natural sciences (phonetics, neurolinguistics...), at least in the case of non-instinctive terms like hypostasis, it tends to ignore the rules of exact science, where models are built on elementary particles of universally shared and agreed-upon terminology, and reverts to its philosophical roots, where terms are used in reference to their concrete source and with every user, they are redefined, allowing for a more dynamic evolution and at the same time obscuring the meaning - without the knowledge of a complete context of the concrete use, they are impossible to decipher correctly and completely.

Aarts (2004:97) states "Subjective Gradience (SG) is the phenomenon whereby a particular set of elements displays a categorial shading in prototypicality from a central core to a more peripheral boundary. We can contrast Subjective Gradience with Intersective Gradience (IG): whereas with SG elements from only one category are involved, with IG there are two categories on a cline." When investigating hypostasis, it may be said that synsemantics (ex. [6b-c]...) exhibit SG, a shift away from prototypicality with time, while autosemantics tend to be created to adhere to prototypes when shifting from one class to another, in effect resulting in IG.

Hypostasis as a part of a noun phrase

As mentioned by Brugmann (1904), there are some cases of phrasal inflection which could be analysed as examples of hypostasis. I will now delve into a wild speculation.

We have already seen that proper names defy some nominal syntactic rules, we can then easily witness in casual speech that instead of using an apposition, speakers tend to inflect parts of the phrase in the normal way (e.g. Czech "*Cesty domů*" > "*v Cestách domů*", <the> road-PL home → in <the> road-PL:LOC home). More often, the non-nominal parts are omitted and/or verbal nominalised (e.g. "*v Cestách*"). When the phrase is understood by the speaker as inseparable, it may not be inflected at all (e.g. "*v Cesty domů*"), this, in my view can be regarded as hypostasis, alternatively it may be seen as a quotation in apposition with omitted object (e.g. "*v <pořadu> Cesty domů*", in <the series> Roads home), either way, it is considered agrammatical. There are phrases which are inherently non-flectible, usually because they make up a whole clause (e.g. "*vítejte v Jak se staví sen*").

Relationship between with parts of speech

One assumption disputed here is that "In a system of parts of speech hypostasis words will be nouns, and other classifications will be open to serious objections." (Hiorth:216). A possible example of a verb resulting from hypostatisation may be Slovak *jestvovat*^{69A} "to exist". More examples can be seen in Eino (1962).

Productivity

As a system-external process it should by definition be non-productive. The actual border between hypostasis and a system-internal conversion is yet to be explored. One defining line lies in the diachrony - as cases of conversion between large open classes should not be a prime suspect of historical hypostasis (as in substantive ↔ verb conversion that goes both ways in English, which is a result of elimination of suffixes due to sound changes supposedly without an intent on part of any single speaker). On the other hand, a one-way conversion from one class to another with no conclusive historically occurring marking has a high probability of being hypostasis-initiated.

Attestation across languages

In the available literature, the phenomenon has been claimed to exist in Czech (Němec 2009), English (e.g. Nikolaev 2009), Ancient Greek (Eino 1962), Latin (Eino 1962), Sanskrit (Eino 1962), Armenian (Widmer 2004) and in reconstructed Proto-Germanic (Nikolaev 2009) and Proto-Indo-European (e.g. Nikolaev 2009). All of those languages are or *were* fleective and have descended from a single ancestor, Proto-Indo-European. The author's claim of hypostasis' universality is therefore not substantially based on data analysis from previous studies. The general amount of historical linguistic literature available for other families, however, allows for an optimistic interpretation that it simply did not come to attention of linguists yet. As noted by Němec (2009:370), at least in the case of parasyntesis, the phenomenon is generally being neglected by linguists.

69 *Jestvovat*' probably < *jest-vo-vať* : be:3SG:PRES-SUBST-HAB:INF - an imperfective derived from another imperfective verb with the same meaning. It was probably created analogically to words like *dejstvovat*' where *dejstvo* "act" is ultimately derived from the substantive *dej* "process" through standard suffix *-stvo* "ship". There does not seem to exist a word *jestvo*, rather, "being" is derived by adding the substantivising suffix *-nie* to *jestvovat*' resulting in *jestvovanie*.

An attempt to sum up the typology has been made in the table 4.1 below by searching works mentioned earlier and descriptive grammars for attestations of partaking phenomena.

language type		isolating	agglutinative	fusional	polysynthetic
hypostasis	phenomenon				
proper	conversion	Yes ³	yes ⁴	Yes ¹	?
	composition	Yes ²	yes ⁴	Yes ¹	?
	::parasyntesis	ff	?	Yes ¹	?
immediate	"ad-hoc" ⁷⁰ use (metalinguistic)	tt	tt	tt	tt
head- ellipsis	"marker shift"	<i>ff</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>?</i>	<i>ff</i>

Table 1: Connection between hypostatic phenomena and the morphological type of language. Cells with question marks contain combinations not attested in languages known to the author but the possibility of its occurrence is not discarded by logic. 1:Czech, 2:English, 3: Classical Chinese, 4: Armenian

The table does not prove universality of hypostasis in the sense that it is present in every language, it should show, at least partially it is possible for certain language types to exhibit certain types of hypostasis.

When inspecting the table, we can see some tendencies. The more fusional the language is the more obvious hypostasis is. We can also see that the immediate hypostasis is present in every language type. Considering the fact that it does not create a new entry in a shared lexicon, unless combined with another phenomenon, like parasyntesis, it may be in fact a valid basis for excluding it from hypostasis altogether.

Since wordhood in the polysynthetic language is a rather different concept from the one in other language types, there is a question whether it is possible for hypostasis to exist there. The fact that multiple autosemantic free morphemes function as bound in a single word causes the concepts of composition and conversion to be a problematic to analyse. At least one author believes a zero-derivation could be observed there⁷¹.

Since the direct observation of hypostasis requires some bound morphology to be present in a language and the more fusional the language is, the more readily it seems to

70 "Ad-hoc, in-situ, immediate... hypostasis": generic term invented for purposes of this work.

71 See Ximena, L. & Vapnarsky, V. (2006:16)

A Examples given by the work's supervisor, Mgr. Jan Bičovský, PhD.

exhibit the "syntactic problems" needed for hypostasis, I conclude that all the prerequisites for its attestation in polysynthetic languages are met.

6. Conclusion

Let us revisit the so-called definition⁷² provided by Bloomfield in his *Language* (1933:148):

'...*hypostasis*, the mention of a phonetically normal speech-form, as when we say, "That is only an *if*," or "There is always a *but*," or when we talk about "the word *normalcy*" or "the name *Smith*." One may even speak of parts of words, as I shall speak in this book of "the suffix -ish in boyish." Hypostasis is closely related to *quotation*, the repetition of speech.'

Based on the framework presented here, we can rule out from the hypostasis in the etymological sense all of the examples given. What is presented by Bloomfield I understand to be in fact the *mention* of a word as opposed to *use* of a word - a philosophical distinction, hypostasis here is a continuation of the medieval *suppositio materialis* and as such is unnecessary in linguistics, where it could be described as a part of metalanguage referring to a certain form.⁷³ A quotation in a broad sense would also suffice as a term for this use. All this shows why the term is not usually used by linguists in this sense.

My conclusion is that hypostasis is a set of phenomena that do occur. I have also tried to propose a definition that would include the cases a. those who use the term agree on and b) I "felt" would make it more useful where the consensus could not be identified to exist⁷⁴. I have generally excluded some examples that in my view did not contribute to the use in a way that would make the term's intuitive use devoid of confusion. I have tried to delimit it against other word-forming processes.

I have tried to propose a sketch of plausible typology of the partaking phenomena in relation to the morphological typology of languages.

An introspection, while nowadays almost an abhorred approach to analysis, as it is prone to errors and holes, proved to be more fruitful than originally expected. Many examples of phenomena on the borderline were hard to obtain in literature, which was to be expected as the hypostasis itself is both extra-grammatical and generally neglected. In other words, the works show what should be included and not what should be excluded because the examples to be included are quite scarce.

72 I believe it is right say that Bloomfield, in fact, did not mean to introduce a term, from the looks of it, he merely tried to explain his use of an obscure term he was well acquainted with and felt no need to re-define.

73 I actually believe them to be referring to the word as a whole, not just its form. See Hypostasis and conversion.

74 No random additions, it had to be in agreement with at least one other use in literature.

The answers to research questions are:

- 1 - Is a coherent and usable definition of hypostasis available to linguists (albeit unbeknownst to them)?
- 2 - If not, can a definition be created by a synthesis of currently available ones? Does the phenomenon even exist?

An attempt has been made to connect all of the uses of the term in literature. While a single unifying definition is impossible to find or abstract, the concurrent meanings across different linguistic branches and languages are obviously related - in their origin. They came to be through different concretisations of the term. Through yet another concretisation, a single definition has been presented here as the one that I believe to be a useful, in effect enriching the linguistic terminology.

In conclusion, it can be stated that while we *can* propose a new definition, as I did, the one postulated by Brugmann (1904) is both usable and useful and the reason it was not properly institutionalised outside German Indo-European studies is perplexing and worth reflecting upon.

- 3 - What are the exact ways hypostasis exhibits itself in languages of the world? Is it universal in this sense?

See Table 1. in the Discussion section.

- 4 - What are the implications on both synchronic and diachronic categoriality stemming from the existence of such phenomenon?

The work as a whole tries to address that.

- 5 - Is the phenomenon necessarily restricted to derivation?

For the term to be of any use, I have decided to restrict it in this way, although the motivation behind the phenomenon does not necessarily demand that.

Hypostasis seems to be a third word-formation type (along derivation and composition), it takes its input directly from parole. It creates lexemes, that may be part of a phrase or not, but they have their "syntactic independence" - a full collocability. These words are created from syntagmatic unit of any size, especially noteworthy are inflected words, that already have an ending/clitic appended and therefore by default cannot take another suffix.

Further research should concentrate on quantitative data obtained from the corpus with the aid of etymological dictionary. These data should address the presumed distribution between source and target classes (POS, family resemblance semantics → cultural artefacts,). Further analysis of a dictionary should also prove fruitful. And finally connecting the hypotheses behind wordhood in polysynthetic languages with the idea of hypostasis may provide some interesting findings.

Literature

Aarts B. 2007. *Syntactic gradience: the nature of grammatical indeterminacy*. New York: Oxford University Press. xii, 280 p.

Bičovský J. 2012. *Stručná mluvnice praindoevropštiny*. Vyd. 1. Praha: Karolinum. 184 p.

Bloomfield L. 1933. *Language*, London: George Allen & Unwin ltd.

Mikkola E. 1962. *Die präpositionale Hypostase, Apostase und Metabase im Lateinischen, Griechischen und Altindischen: Einige Wirkungsformen der gestaltenden Kraft der Sprache*. Vyd. 1. Helsinki: [Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Kirjapaino Oy] [bzw.] Suomalainen Kirjakauppa. 353 s.

Friedman J. 2003. Notes on IE *ǵʰiém-, *Indo-european studies bulletin*, 10/2003, UCLA

Hiorth F. 1963. Hypostasis in *Lingua* 12 (1963), Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Co.

Jakobsen AL. 1982. An analysis of hypostasis forms in *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia: International Journal of Linguistics*; Volume 17, Issue 1

Lipka L. 1975. Re-Discovery procedures and the lexicon in *Lingua* 37, North-Holland Publishing Company, 197-224

Lipka L. 1977. Lexikalisierung, Idiomatisierung und Hypostasierung als Probleme einer synchronischen Wortbildungslehre in *Perspektiven der Wortbildungsforschung*, Bonn: Bouvier Verlag Herbert Grundmann

Lipka L. 1992. *An outline of English lexicology: lexical structure, word semantics, and word-formation* (2. ed.). Tübingen Germany: Max Niemeyer.

- Němec I. 2009. K hypostasování v etymologii in *Práce z historické jazykovědy*, Academia, Prague, 369-372
- Nikolaev A. 2009. The Germanic word for 'sword' and delocative derivation in Proto-Indo-European. *Journal of Indo-European Studies*, 37(3/4), p.461-488.
- Novotný F. 1946. *Latinská mluvnice pro střední školy, díl třetí: doplňky, svazek první: hláskosloví a nauka o slově*, Praha: Jednota českých filologů
- Nussbaum AJ. 1986. *Head and Horn in Indo-European: The Words for "horn," "head," and "hornet"*, Walter de Gruyter, The Hague
- Pike KL. 1955. Meaning and Hypostasis in *Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics* 8, 134-141, Washington DC: Georgetown UP
- Štekauer P, Lieber R. 2005. *Handbook of word-formation*. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.
- Traugott E. 2005. "Lexicalization and grammaticalization", in A. Cruse, F. Hundsnurscher, M. Job, P. R. Lutzeier, eds., *Lexikologie/-Lexicology*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, Vol. 2: 1702-1712.
- Usener H. 1973. Grammatische Bemerkungen. IX. Hypostase in *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik* 117, 71-80, B.G.Teubner, Leipzig
- Widmer P. 2004. *Das Korn des weiten Feldes: interne Derivation, Derivationskette und Flexionsklassenhierarchie : Aspekte der nominalen Wortbildung im Urindogermanischen*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
- Yakubovich I. 2006. The Free-Standing Genitive and Hypostasis in Hittite in *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*; Vol. 65, No. 1 (January 2006), pp. 39-50; The University of Chicago Press
- Brugmann K. 1904. *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen II/1*,

Risch E. 1973. *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*. völlig überarbeitete Aufl. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter

Brachet JP. 2009. Parasyntèse » et « hypostase »: à propos de quelques verbes « parasyntétiques » latin in *Ktèma* 34, 2009, pp. 25-32

Possek U. 1999. *Concile Vatican II et Église contemporaine. IV. Inventaire des Fonds J. Dupont et B. Olivier*, Peeters Publishers, 265p.

Used Websites *

"cybalist",

<http://tech.groups.yahoo.com/group/cybalist/>

"Duden | Hypostase | Rechtschreibung, Bedeutungen Definition, Synonyme, Herkunft",
retrieved 2013-01-02, <http://www.duden.de/rechtschreibung/Hypostase>

"The SIL French/English Linguistic Glossary", retrieved 2013-01-01,

http://www.sil.org/linguistics/glossary_fe/glossary.asp?entryid=3916&src=y

"Oxford Dictionaries: The world's most trusted dictionaries", retrieved on 2013-07-05,
<http://oxforddictionaries.com>,

* The dates are given in a "YYYY-MM-DD" format.

Additional literature

Into this category falls a. whatever does not directly relate to the topic and b. works I was unable to obtain.

Bazell C.-E. 1949. Syntactic Relations and Linguistic Typology in *Cahiers Ferdinand de Saussure*, No. 8 (1949), pp. 5-20, Librairie Droz

- Cabré Castelví MT. 2003. Theories of terminology: Their description, prescription and explanation, John Benjamins Publishing Company,
- Ferklová B. 2010. Onomatopoeie a mimetika v korejštině. Univerzita Karlova v Praze. 166 s.
- Layton B. 2004. *A Coptic grammar: with chrestomathy and glossary : Sahidic dialect*. 2nd ed., revised and expanded. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. xxi, 544 s.
- Gil D. ?. Early human language was Isolating-Monocategorial-Associational, Leipzig:?
- Bilou E. 2004. *La langue française au Cameroun / analyse linguistique et didactique*,
- Lévinas E. 1987. *The Time and the Other & Additional Essays*, Duquesne University Press, Pittsburgh
- Cvrček V. 2010. *Mluvnice současné češtiny*. Vyd. 1. V Praze. 353 p.
- Booij GE. 2004. *Morphologie (Morphology): No. 2: Ein Internationales Handbuch Zur Flexion und Wortbildung (An International Handbook on Inflection and Word-Formation)*.. New York: Walter De Gruyter Incorporated.
- Glück H. 1993. *Metzler Lexikon Sprache*. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler.
- Zeman JJ. 1982. Peirce on abstraction in *The Monist*. Volume 65, Issue 2, April 1982 . pp. 58-86.
- Tunmer WE, Pratt C, Herriman, ML. 1984. *Metalinguistic Awareness in Children*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg
- Don J. 1993. Morphological Conversion, PhD diss. Utrecht University.

Justice D. 1985. Delocutive sources of Hypostasis in *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia*, vol. 19, no. 2, 56-63

Manning HP. 1996. Hypostasis, explanation and the local case system in Old Georgian"

Leisi E. 1971. *Der Wortinhalt : seine Struktur im Deutschen und Englischen*,

Dunkel GE. 2007. Lithuanian chips from an aptotologist's workshop

Brinton L, Akimoto M. c1999. *Collocational and idiomatic aspects of composite predicates in the history of English*. Philadelphia: J. Benjamins Pub. Co. xii, 283 p.

Closs Traugott, E. 2004. Exaptation and grammaticalization in *Linguistic Studies Based on Corpora*, Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo Publishing Co.

Traugott E, Trousdale G. c2010. *Gradience, gradualness and grammaticalization*. Philadelphia, Pa.: John Benjamins Pub. Company. viii, 306 p.

Croft W, Trousdale G. 2003. *Typology and universals*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. xxv, 341 s.

Dixon RMW, Aikhenvald AY. 2004. *Adjective Classes, A Cross-linguistic Typology*, New York: Oxford University Press

Lipka L. 1989. Der Risalit und seine Folgen: Ernst Leisi und die Prototypensemantik in *Meaning and Beyond - Ernst Leisi zum 70.Geburtstag*, Tübingen

Mumm PA. 1995. *Generische Bezeichnung. Onomasiologische Aufgaben und ihre Lösungen durch das neuhoch-deutsche Artikelsystem*,

Rainer F. 2003. Semantic change in word formation,

Schmidt P. 1985. *Gebrauchstheorie der Bedeutung und Valenztheorie : (Untersuchungen zum Problem der Hypostasierung von Bedeutungen)*,

de Vaan M. 2009. The derivational history of Greek híppos and hippeús,

Vogel PM, Comrie B. 2000. *Approaches to the Typology of Word Classes*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin

Willis D. 2007. Syntactic lexicalization as a new type of degrammaticalization,

Wackernagel J. 1905. *Altindische Grammatik [Bd.] 2,1: Einleitung zur Wortlehre, Nominalkomposition*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. xii, 329 p.