Lengthened adpositions in Sater Frisian

Eric Hoekstra – Fryske Akademy KNAW
Bouke Slofstra – Bureau Lingua Slofstra
Henk Wolf - Oldenburgische Landschaft
Sater Frisian

• One of the three Frisian languages, with West Frisian and North Frisian
• Settled 11-12th century, by migration from Emsland (NW of Ostfriesland).
• Speakers: 1000-2000
• Gemeinde Saterland: Kleinste Sprachinsel Europas

Smallest language island of Europe
Sater Frisian is spoken today in Saterland (Map from: lowlands-l.net)

https://www.lowlands-l.net/anniversary/frysk-info.php
Adpositions

Cover term for prepositions, postpositions and verbal particles. Use of the term is justified, as related lexical items are found as prepositions, postpositions and verbal particles in West Germanic languages.
Lengthening of adpositions in Sater Frisian

Is sensitive to two factors:

• type of construction
• semantic distinction between permanence and change
Type of construction

1. Bare adpositional construction (verbal particle, ‘Verbzusatz’)
2. R-construction (R pronoun + Adp)
3. PP + Adposition
4. PP construction (Prep. Phrase)
Examples of basic constructions

1. Bare adpositional construction:

he came in
(English)
2. R-construction

R-pronoun + Adp:

*deeruut*  
(Sater Frisian)

*daraus*  
(Deutsch)

Especially Frisian and Dutch
3. PP + Adposition construction

PP + Adposition:

*ins Blaue hinein* (D)
4. PP construction

Preposition + NP:

*in* Saterland
Lengthening is only found in three constructions

1. Bare adpositional construction (verbal particle, ‘Verbzusatz’)
2. R-construction (R pronoun + Adp)
3. PP + Adposition (so: not in Prep Phrase)

Summary main body of our talk
Lengthening is only found in constructions expressing permanence (as against mutative constructions, that is, those expressing change or process).
Bare adpositional construction
Bare adpositional construction

(1a) Permanence

Now is the game out-E
‘Now the game is over.’
Bare adpositional construction

(1b) Change

Dou dät Lucht uut. (*ute)
put the light off

Change and the adposition is not lengthened.
Bare adpositional construction

(2a) Permanence

Wie wieren noch ap-e
we were still up-E

The construction expresses permanence => Lengthening
Bare adpositional construction

(2b) Change

Ju Sunne  kumt  ap.  (*appe)
the sun  comes  up
‘The sun rises.’

Change correlates with absence of lengthening
Bare adpositional construction

(3) Permanence

Hie häd naan Jikkel oan-e.
he has no jacket to-E
‘He doesn’t wear a jacket.’

TO HAVE is like TO BE a verb expressing permanence
(4) Permanence

*He häd dät maaste mäd dut Wucht appe.*

He has the most with this girl up.

‘He likes this girl best.’

This is an idiom, *appe* has not its literal meaning. Nonetheless ...
Bare adpositional construction

(5) Permanence

Du skääst mie ove blieuwe.
you should me off. E stay
‘You should stay off me.’
The R-construction
R-construction

A construction containing an R-pronoun and an Adposition which are construed together.

R-pronoun: deer ‘there [da(r)]’, hier ‘here’, wier ‘wo(r)’.
R-construction

(6) Permanence

Deer is neen Jeeld oane.
R is no money in.E
‘There’s no money in it.’
(7) Change

\[ \text{Du moast die deeroun reke.} \]

‘You must go into it.’
R-construction

(8) Permanence

Dät sit deeroane.
that sits R.in.E
‘That is his / her nature.’
R-construction

(9) Change

\[ Hie \ is \ deeroun \ ferkemen. \]
\[ he \ is \ R.in \ mistaken \]
‘He is mistaken in it.’
Observation

Normal form: oun ‘in’
Lengthened form: oane ‘in’

1. Here, not just lengthening, but also change in lexical form (suppletion).
2. Oun/oane, when meaning ‘in’, occurs in R-construction.

If you look in dictionary, you won’t find particle verbs meaning ‘in’.
R-construction *uut*/*ute*

(10) Permanence

*Ju Omme* is *deer ut*.  
the breath is *R out.E*  
‘His breath has left him.’
R-construction *uut/ute*

(11) Change

> Wieruum moastest du dät
> why must you that
> so *deeruut* haue?
> so R.out hit

‘Why did you have to blurt it out like that?’
R-construction *ap/ape*

(12) Permanence

*Wan*  *me*  *deer*  *ape*  *sit.*

*When*  *one*  *R*  *on.E*  *sits*
R-construction *ap/ape*

(13) Change

Dan moast du then must you
n Stuk Späk a piece bacon
deer*ap* laze.
R.on put
The PP + Adposition construction
The PP + Adposition construction *ou/ove*

(14) Permanence

\[ \text{He is of the line} \quad \text{ou.} \]
He is of the line off.E
‘He’s lost the thread.’
The PP + Adposition construction \textit{ou/ove}

(15) Change

\textit{Ik \ kuud \ him}

I could him

\textit{fon sien Meläsje \ ou-hälpe.}

of his sadness off-help

‘I could free him from his sadness.’
The PP + Adposition construction *uut/ute*

(16) Permanence

*Die Spon* is *uut dät Hozebeend ute.*

the elasticity is out the stocking out.E
The PP + Adposition construction *uut/ute*

(17) Change

*Ju Bjorenge*  
the party  
*geen*  
went  
*ap n Haueräi*  
on a fight  
*uut.*  
out  
‘The party degenerated into a fight.’
Conclusions

1. Lengthening is found only if the construction expresses permanence (as against change / process).

2. Lengthening is found in three constructions:
   1. Bare adpositional construction
   2. R-construction
   3. PP + Adposition construction

3. Lengthening is not found inside PP.
Suppletive paradigm meaning ‘IN’

We’ll investigate the ‘semanteme’, the meaning unit ‘IN’ in 3 constructions:

1. Bare adpositional construction
2. R-construction
3. PP + Adposition construction
Permanence:
*Sunt jie äuwelg inne?*
are you tonight in. E (at home)

Change:
*Dät brangt nit fuul ien.*
That brings not much in
‘That doesn’t yield much.’
Realization of IN inside R-construction

Normal form: oun ‘in’
Lengthened form: oane ‘in’

Examples 8,9;
Realization of IN inside PP + Adposition construction

Permanence:

Aal, wät in dät Skäin oane waas, ...
all what in the barn in.E was
Realization of IN inside PP + Adposition construction

Change:
1. *Hie geen tou t Huus ien.*
   He went to the house in

2. *Do Rotten frieten sik*
   the rats ate themselves

   *In dän Oukomer oun.*
   in the storage room in

‘The rates ate themselves into the storage room.’
Realization of semanteme IN in three constructions (?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bare adposition permanence</th>
<th>inne</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bare adposition change</td>
<td>ien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-construction permanence</td>
<td>oane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-construction change</td>
<td>oun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP + Adposition permanence</td>
<td>oane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP + Adposition change</td>
<td>(ien) / oun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How did this suppletive paradigm come about?

Hypo 1: derives from Old Frisian.
=> Investigate Old Frisian adpositions

Hypo 2: borrowed from Low German
=> Investigate Low German

Future research
Residual points

- Eastphalian similar phenomenon, Bölsing 2011
- Middle Dutch similar, Stoett 1977
- Expression of location / direction in English: contrast *IN* – *INTO*
- Idem German: *IN* – *IN* ... *HEREIN*
English

Permanence:
“He is **in** the room.”

Change:
“He went **into** the room.”
German

Permanence:
Die Katze ist **in** dem Zimmer.

Change:
Die Katze geht **ins** Zimmer **hierin**
To sum

Adpositional lengthening and similar phenomena does not just involve location vs direction, but rather permanence vs change/process.

Thank you for your attention.