Ljiljana Šarić
Geisteswissenschaftliches Zentrum
Geschichte und Kultur Ostmitteleuropas
Leipzig

Prepositional categories and prototypes: Contrasting some Russian, Slovenian, Croatian and Polish examples[1]

The subject of this article is the interface between the Croatian prepositions *na* and *u* (as well as the interface between their Russian, Slovenian and Polish equivalents), and the meaning of the preposition *nad* and the relation of the meaning of the prepositions *nad* and *na* in the four languages. The meaning relation between the prepositions *na* and *nad* and their related prefixes is analysed as well.

Key words: spatial prepositions, Slavic languages, prototypical meaning of prepositions and prefixes, cognitive linguistics, language development and meaning extensions

1. Introduction and theoretical preliminaries

This analysis is a part of a planned cognitive linguistic study of the main spatial prepositions in the Slavic languages inherited from the Old Church Slavic prepositional inventory. These prepositions demonstrate the compatibility of the main spatial senses in different Slavic languages. However, prepositional usage varies to a

certain extent from language to language, even between historically closely related languages, in what at first glance seems to be an unpredictable manner. It is a challenge to contrast examples of prepositional usage that do not show compatibility and to attempt to explain the differences by structuring the prepositional categories differently. For this analysis the author examined one language from each branch of Slavic: Croatian (South), Polish (West) and Russian (East). Slovenian (South) was also chosen in order to provide a comparison within one branch.

A complete analysis of the spatial and related meanings of the preposition *na* in Croatian, Slovenian, Polish and Russian has already been worked out (Šarić & Brlobaš 2001). In this study the following problems will be discussed:

a) The interface between the prepositions *na* and *u* (Rus, Sln *v*, Pol *w*)[2] in some spatial uses;

b) The meaning of the preposition *nad* and the interface between the prepositions *nad* and *na*, – that is, the relation of the meaning of the prepositions *nad* and *na* in the four languages. This last topic raises the third point of interest:

c) The meaning of the prepositions *na* and *nad* and their related prefixes.

Spatial prepositions are radial categories and a major task in describing them is a definition of the central (prototypical) member of the category and a description of the ways in which the non-central members are related to the prototype. The term "prototypical meaning" refers to the best instance and function as a central model that shapes a category. In the case of prepositions, a very abstract geometrical relation shapes this category. The entire prepositional category is structured by resemblance to an idealised relation. The spatial relation expressed in any given use of the preposition is distinctly derived from that idealised relation. A simple relation must exist that is a "precondition" for an expression construed with a preposition to be acceptable. The prototypical meaning of a preposition reflects the intuition of a central idea connected with it. Deciding on a prototypical meaning is a matter of analysing the range of uses of the given preposition. A preposition may have several prototypical meanings. When one thinks of one of the central notions in cognitive linguistics – PROTOTYPES – one does not automatically think of prepositions and their prototypical meanings because of the highly abstract functional meanings involved; prototypes are originally related to natural categories. Traditional grammars usually describe prepositions as synsemantic, or functional words that receive some kind of meaning only in context. From this perspective, a complex expression would have a meaning that would not be implied in its parts at all. This contrasts with all theories of meaning – even with the practice of lexicography, in which prepositions have more or less suitable definitions.

---

[2] The following abbreviations will be used throughout the paper: Rus = Russian, Sln = Slovenian, Pol = Polish, Cro = Croatian, OCS = Old Church Slavic.

Prepositions have often been discussed in a cognitive framework as polysemous items. Analysis of prepositions in the cognitive framework has produced significant results (cf. for example Brugman 1981, Cyuckens 1988, Herskovits 1988, Vandeloise 1991, Deane 1993, Boers 1996). Prepositions do have a certain kind of meaning – their meaning is probably more complex than the meanings of other lexical categories – and the nature of this meaning has not been definitely determined. The term "prototypical meaning" is used even though the notion of prototype in this case is of a nature distinct from the prototypes for natural kinds: they correspond to the best instance and function as a central model to shape a category. In the case of prepositions, a very abstract geometrical relation shapes a category. The entire prepositional category is structured by resemblance to an ideal relation. The spatial relation expressed in any given use of the preposition is distinctly derived from that ideal relation. The complete set of uses of the preposition can be subcategorised into types. These types undergo certain semantic transformations and then manifest the prototypical meaning. A level of geometric conceptualisation mediates between our representation of the physical world and the application of prepositional expression. Choice and interpretation of a prepositional expression are influenced by contextual factors: relevance, salience, tolerance and typicality. Pragmatic principles related to these explain many characteristics of the usage situation. There is a permissible tolerance for deviation from the simple relation. The shift from the simple relation can be conceived as gradual, measurable by some distance or angle. Transformations of the ideal meaning are of two kinds: a) transformation to another relation – a sense transformation, and b) gradual transformations connected with the tolerance principle. No general principle regulates the sense transformations. The transformed meaning can be related to the prototypical one by a process involving resemblance in appearance. Some transformations represent conventional extensions of the range of use of the prototypical meaning, while others represent allowances for graded deviations from either the prototypical meaning (a kind of a geometric description) or the conventional extensions.

2. The interface between the prepositions *na* and *u* (Rus, Sln *v*, Pol *w*)

a) The conceptualisation of locations and geographical areas

In the analysis of the spatial meanings of *na* (Šarić & Brlobaš 2001) three prototypical relations expressed by this preposition have been distinguished: it is applicable (a) for a trajector (TR) and a landmark (LM) if a LM supports a TR and the surface of a TR is contiguous with the surface of a LM; (b) for a TR and a LM if the boundary of a TR is contiguous with a LM, and (c) for a TR and a LM if they coincide. The preposition *na* as a preposition of contact/coincidence in its spatial uses overlaps in some contexts with the use of the preposition *u* (Rus, Sln *v*, Pol *w*), which in its static uses corresponds to the container schema and in its dynamic uses to a combination of the container and the path schemata. In OCS the phrases *vъ* + Loc./Acc.

and *na* + Loc./Acc. exist side by side in those cases in which the characteristics of the LM are not definitely determined (i.e. there exists no notion of measure or proportion) and in those cases in which it is not determined whether one is talking about total or partial inclusion (the nouns *strana* 'side' and *město* 'place' occur with both prepositions). Hodova (1971) mentions the possibility of using both prepositions with the names of towns, countries and settlements. This partial overlap of the use of *na* and *vъ*, which is already found in OCS, exists in all the Slavic languages considered here.

In the conceptualisation of small spatial areas or of larger geographical areas it is important whether an area is primarily understood as an area with closed and defined boundaries in which some other object can be seen as enclosed, or as an open area or a surface whose boundaries are defocused. This can explain the use of different prepositions in the Polish example *na okolicę* and Croatian *u okolici* 'in the vicinity'. Astaf'eva (1974: 26–27) gives some Russian examples in which both prepositions can be used (*v/na kuxne,* 'in the kitchen', *vo/na dvore,* 'in the yard', *v/na sele* 'in/at the village') and examples in which the choice of one preposition is not clearly motivated (*na počte* 'at the post office' - *v vokzale,* 'at the railway station', *na ulice* 'on/in the street' - *v pereulke* 'on/in the small street', *na Kavkaze* 'in the Caucasus' - *v Krymu* 'in Crimea'). When an area is conceptualised as a bounded space, the possibility of the use of *v* is expected, whereas the use of the preposition *na* is connected with an open area without emphasising its boundaries. Some parallel usage is explainable in terms of analogy. Therefore, the expression *v dvore* could be diachronically motivated because the back yards and front yards were surrounded by tall walls and were roofed over in some parts of Russia. The expression *na dvore* 'in the yard' has appeared by analogy with the expression *na ulice* 'on the street'. Here it is not the properties of the street and yard in the expressions *na ulice, na dvore* that are salient, but the situation of being somewhere outside and not in the house. One and the same constellation of objects, or setting in the real word, can evoke two different images in mental space, which results in the use of two different prepositions. Both are motivated: in one image some aspects of the objects are highlighted – and in another different, sometimes contradictory, aspects. The basis for the English expression *a bird in a tree* is an image in which the interior of the crown of the tree is prominent: its ability to enclose and to include the other objects (birds). In the equivalent Croatian expression *ptica na stablu,* the prominent aspects of the image are the branches, that is, the outside of the crown. The same setting can be conceptualised differently in one and the same language. The Croatian expression *na hodniku* 'in the corridor' is motivated through the image of a broad corridor as a surface. The walls are not prominent in this image. However, if the corridor is narrow, the walls that surround it become more prominent. The whole image evokes the impression of a bounded space and the container characteristics of the image are the basis for the expression *u hodniku*.

In Russian and Polish the preposition *na* is used in some geographical names (Pol *na Ukrainie*, Rus *na Ukraine* 'in Ukraine') whereas in Croatian and in Slovenian the

preposition *u/v* is used instead. We consider such uses not as "idiomatic", but as diachronically motivated in a different way of conceptualising a concrete location.[3] The use of the preposition *u* (*v, w*) and *na* varies with the names of mountains. The general principle determining the use is: if one refers to the top of the mountain or an outer area of it, *na* is used, in other cases *u* (Cro *u planini* 'in/on the mountain', Cro *na planini* 'on the top of the mountain').

b) **na** − **u (v,w)** *with forms of transportation as a LM*

In OCS *na* was used with open forms of transport as a LM (*na kolesnici* 'on a cart') and the preposition *vъ* with closed forms of transportation as a LM (*vъ korabi* 'in a ship'; Hodova 1971: 62). This situation is observable in the Slavic languages considered here as well.

Vehicles in general can provide containers for passengers or a passenger can perceptually be located on the surface of a vehicle. For example, the salient shape of a bus can be a container. One can express the relation in which a TR is on a form of transportation as a LM 1) with *na*, 2) with *u* (Rus, Sln *v*, Pol *w*) or 3) with the instrumental without a preposition (in Rus, Cro, Pol). Russian exhibits all three of these possibilities with many forms of transportation (*exat' poezdom/na poezde/v poezde* 'to travel by train'). The possibility of using *na* in Croatian and Polish is limited to forms of transportation that are open, or to forms in which the upper or outer side is used (Pol *jechać na koniu/na wielbłądzie;* Cro *jahati na konju/na devi* 'to ride on a horse/on a camel'; Pol *na sankach/na nartach/na łyżwac*h; Cro *na sanjkama/na skijama/na klizaljkama* 'on a sledge/on skis/on skates'). It appears that the instrumental case in all these languages is a neutral form in which it is not the characteristics of a form of transport (being on its inner or outer side) that are emphasised, but only the possibility of transportation or moving within the space. When expressing the idea that the passenger is inside a form of transportation, the preposition *u* (*w, v*) is used: Cro *u vlaku,* Pol *w pociągu,* Rus *v poezde* 'in a train'. In Russian, the expressions *exat' na poezde/na avtobuse/na tramvae/na trollejbuse* ('to travel by train/by bus/by tram/by trolley') are used when the position of the passenger is not emphasised, but rather the form of transportation as an instrument (usually expressed with the instrumental, Cro *vlakom/autobuso*m, Pol *pociągiem/autobusem* 'by train/by bus'). These uses in Russian are said to have arisen by analogy with the expression *exat' na izvozčike* ('to travel in a half-opened coach'; Astaf'eva 1974: 27). When the position of the passenger inside the vehicle is emphasised, the preposition *v* is used (*sidet', spat' v poezde/v avtobuse/v tramvae/v trollejbuse/v lodke* 'to sit, sleep in a train/in a bus/in a tram/in a ship'). In these expressions the equivalent preposition *u* is used in Croatian (but *na* with transportation forms that do not have an inside and with transportation forms on water: *na biciklu, na motoru, na brodu,*

---

[3] Astaf'eva (1974: 29) claims that this use in Russian has been influenced by the Ukrainian language. This use emerged from the expression *na okraine* 'on the margin of an area'.

na jahti, na jedrenjaku 'on a bike, on a motorcycle, on a ship, on a yacht, on a sail-boat').[4] The use of the preposition *u* (*v, w*) is excluded in those cases in which the form of transport has no inside (Rus *naxodit'sja na parome/na drožkax* 'to be on a ferry/in a half-open coach').

c) na – u (v, w) *with semiotic LMs*

Spatial experience influences how something is represented in the non-spatial domain. In the Slovenian example *prevesti v slovenščino* 'to translate into Slovenian', the preposition *v* with its landmark provides its concrete spatial meaning and thus transfers it to the semiotic landmark. The language is conceptualised with its "enveloping" property – it envelops the ideas and representations. This is slightly different from Croatian, Russian and Polish, in which the preposition *na* is used (Cro *prevesti na hrvatski,* Rus *perevesti na russkij,* Pol *przetłumaczyć na język polski*). This usage implies the understanding of the LM as a base on which the contents are "situated".

3. General remarks on the meaning of the preposition *nad* in Croatian, Slovenian, Polish, and Russian and the relation *nad* – *na*

In describing the particular prepositional senses of a preposition, the following parameters may be relevant:

a) The nature of a LM – its shape, size, etc.

b) The nature of a TR – whether it is smaller or larger than the LM

c) Contact or distance between a TR and a LM

d) The orientation of a TR with respect to a LM (whether the TR is in the horizontal dimension of the LM, total or partial enclosure, etc.)

e) Static vs. dynamic relation. If at some point in time the TR–LM relation is a static one, the preposition designates the Place of the TR. A dynamic relation is realised over some stretch of time, that is, the TR moves in relation to the LM. Three kinds of dynamic relations can be distinguished: Goal, Source and Path. Goal focuses on a Place that is the end-point of the TR's movement, Source focuses on the initial point of its movement and Path specifies a Place that defines the trace of the TR.

---

[4] There is an interesting exception in Croatian: the expressions *ići na vlak, ići na autobus* 'to go catch a train, to go catch a bus' are used in those contexts in which the intention is expressed to reach a form of transportation in general.

f) The role of an observer. Some prepositions are strongly deictic, whereas others may refer to perceptually prominent aspects of an entity or require that both TR and LM be in the perceptual field of an imaginary observer. How the situation is construed is important. One and the same entity may be construed either as a surface or as an enclosure.

A particular use may profile some highly idiosyncratic aspects of a TR–LM relation.

The prototypical meaning of *nad,* common in all the languages considered here, is the relation of a TR and a LM in which the TR is located higher than the LM (the preposition designates the Place of the TR) or moves on a higher level than the LM (the preposition designates the Path of the TR; in contexts with the instrumental, examples (1a–d). In other contexts, a TR moves towards a level higher than the level of the LM, as in examples (2a–c). In this use the dynamic relation designated is Goal. In Croatian, Slovenian and Polish this preposition is found in static and dynamic contexts in which the LM is in the instrumental case, as well as in dynamic contexts in which the LM is in the accusative case, but in Russian only in static contexts with the instrumental case:

(1a) Pticy kružilis' *nad* nami.   [Rus]
      'The birds circled over us.'

(b) Samolot leciał *nad* miastem.   [Pol]
      'The plane flew over the town.'

(c) *Nad* Slovenijo je visok zračni pritisk.   [Sln]
      'There is high pressure over Slovenia.'

(d) Magla se nadvila *nad* gradom.   [Cro]
      'Fog appeared over the town.'

(2a) Burza idzie *nad* miasto.   [Pol]
      'The storm wind is approaching the town.'

(b) Balon se je dvignil *nad* oblake.   [Sln]
      'The balloon rose over the clouds.'

(c) Oblaci se nadvijaju *nad* grad.   [Cro]
      'Clouds appear over the town.'

One can find the preposition *nadъ* with this prototypical meaning in OCS as well. The preposition *nadъ* is used in contexts in which a noun in the instrumental or accusative case serves as a LM. In the first case there exists a relation between the TR and the LM in which the TR is situated higher than the LM or an action takes place at a position that is higher than the position of the LM. If the LM is an object in the accusative case, the relation expressed with *nad* implies that the endpoint of the motion of the TR is higher than the LM. Some examples from the OCS texts that Hodova (1971: 92; 57) cites are: *samarěninъ… pride nadъ nъ, nadъ nьže ouzьriši*

dhъ, poimъše že jego voini vedošę nadъ brěgъ rěky; … i napisanie napisano nadъ nimъ kъnigami elinъskami i rimъskami, oblačьcъ malъ… nadъ narodomъ. Hodova notes that this form was very often used with the names of the prayers in *Euchologium Sinaiticum*: *mo*(*l*) *na*(*d*) *agnьcetь, zaklinanie… na*(*d*) *dhy.* This usage is predictable if the locative uses of *nadъ* are considered. It is motivated by an image in which a person prays over an object of prayer (prototypically, a sick person) that is situated lower than the person who is praying. Examples (3a–j) illustrate the variety of geometrical relations that a TR and a LM can realise if the utterance X *nad* Y is to be true (the distance between the TR and LM, the dimensionality of the TR and LM, etc.). The *nad*-relation is applicable for various kinds of relations between a TR and a LM. Some of them concern the dimensionality and prominence of the TR and the LM:

a) The TR is a static object smaller than the LM; the LM is a more prominent object as in example (3a)

b) The TR is a static object bigger than the LM; the TR is a more prominent object as in example (3f)

c) The TR is a moving object smaller than the LM; the LM is a more prominent object as in example (3h)

d) The TR is a moving object bigger than the LM; the TR is a more prominent object as in example (3e)

e) The TR and LM are parts of the same object; it may not be possible to determine which object is more prominent in the relation TR *nad* LM as in example (3i).

Some relations vary concerning the distance between a TR and a LM. The examples in (3a–j) illustrate a variety of possibilities connected with the distance between the TR and LM in the relation TR *nad* LM. It can vary from a very small distance of some millimetres or centimetres, as in example (3i), to an immeasurable distance as in (3c) or (3f). One more factor in the *nad*-relation is the concreteness/abstractness of the TR and LM. Although the first examples are those in which the TR and LM are concrete objects, one or both of them may be an abstract object—cf. example (3g):

(3a)   Lampa wisi *nad* stołem.   [Pol]
        'The lamp is hanging over the table.'

(b)   Usiedli *na* brzegu, w cieniu pochyłonej *nad* wodą rozłożystej wierzby.
                                                                                          [Pol]
        'They sat on the bank in the shadow of the branching willow which was bent over the water.'

(c)   Jeżeli… zwrócisz ku wodom lice, gwiazdy *nad* tobą i gwiazdy pod tobą.
                                                                                          [Pol]

'If you turn your face to the water, the stars over you and the stars beneath you.'

(d) *Nad* bolotami podnimalsja gustoj tuman.   [Rus]
‘A thick fog appeared over the swamp.’

(e) *Nad* njegovom glavom letjeli su avioni.   [Cro]
‘The planes flew over his head.’

(f) Zvjezdano nebo *nad* nama.   [Cro]
‘The starry sky above us.’

(g) Sjena sumnje nadvila se je *nad* njegove misli.   [Cro]
‘There is a shadow of doubt over his thoughts.’

(h) Letalo kroži *nad* mestom.   [Sln]
‘The plane is circling over the town.’

(i) Obrvni lok *nad* očmi.   [Sln]
‘The curve of the eyebrow above the eyes.’

(j) Voda *nad* jezom.   [Sln]
‘The water above the levee.’

The geometrical relation between a TR and a LM, which can be described as a *nad*-relation, also implies closeness, but not necessarily physical proximity. It is important that the TR and the LM are conceptualised as a part of the same mental image in which an imagined vertical line binds one object of the image with the other. The semantic component of closeness is a common element of the meaning of the prepositions *na* and *nad*, but the relation expressed by *nad* does not signal direct contact. The common element in the meaning structure can cause an overlap in the use of these two prepositions. Overlap is possible, and its occurrence and degree vary from one Slavic language to another. In the languages concerned here, some historical changes have occurred in the conceptualisation of space. As a result of these changes, one can follow the slight differences in the meaning network of the prepositional category in each language. In Polish the preposition *nad* is used in contexts in which the preposition *na* is usually used in Croatian and in Russian. These are contexts in which nouns such as *river, sea, lake* are LMs. In spatial expressions with these nouns the relation between the TR and LM determines that the TR is close to the LM, that is, at the edge of a geographical area. This relation implies that the TR is contiguous with the edge of a concrete geographical area serving as the LM: Rus *gorod na reke/na more/na ozere*; Cro *grad na rijeci/na moru/na jezeru* ‘the town on the river/on the sea/on the lake’. This relation is conceptualised in Polish as a relation in which it is emphasised that the river, sea or lake is physically at a lower level than the objects that are situated close to it:

(4a) Mieszkać *nad* rzeką.   [Pol]
‘To live on the river.’

(b) Spacerować *nad* brzegiem mora.   [Pol]
'To walk on the seashore.'

(c) Osiedle *nad* jeziorem.   [Pol]
'The settlement on the lake.'

(d) Miasto *nad* ujściem rzeki…   [Pol]
'The town at the mouth of the river.'

Thus, in Polish, the notion of the lower and higher level at which some objects are situated is more prominent in the understanding of the physical world. In Russian and Croatian, the preposition *nad* is used in contexts in which the emphasis is on the elevation of physical objects in comparison to the level of the water. Consequently, the emphasis on the significantly higher position of the TR in comparison to the LM results in the utterances such as (5a, b):

(5a) Moj dom stoit *nad* ozerom na vysokoj beregovoj gore.   [Rus, Prišvin]
'My house is over the lake on the high mountain near the seashore.'

(b) *Nad* dolinoj reki Kači stojala staraja i gustaja dubovaja rošča.
                                                   [Rus, Sergeev-Censkij]
'Above the valley of the River Kača was an old thick oak forest.'

The contexts in which *nad* appears in its prototypical meaning include not only the location on the higher level, but also a notion of closeness (contact or contiguity with a line). In Polish, one can follow the meaning shift of the prototypical meaning of *nad* towards the meaning in which the TR and LM are only close to each other. Some uses of this preposition in the temporal domain show this:

(6a) Wracał *nad* ranem.   [Pol]
'He came around morning.'

(b) Już *nad* świtaniem blask jutrzenki gasnał…   [Pol]
'Just around morning the glow of the Morning Star faded.'

In those contexts the secondary relation of closeness is a component that is retained from the relation "X is on a higher level than Y".

In Slovenian there is an instance of the overlap of *na* and *nad* that is not observed in the other languages considered here – thus Slovenian examples (7a–c) in which the preposition *na* is used and examples (7d–e) in which the preposition *nad* is used. The relation expressed with *nad* and *na* is the same relation in which a TR makes concrete or abstract contact with a LM or is about to make contact with it. The LM can be a concrete entity, a geographical point, an abstract action/performance or a person occurring as a Goal of the action expressed by a verb. The relationship between the TR and LM includes the notion of target.

(7a)   Streljati *na* sovražnika.   [Sln]
       'To shoot at the enemy.'

(b)   Napoleonov pohod *na* Moskvo.   [Sln]
       'Napoleon's march on Moscow.'

(c)   Iti z gorjačo *na* koga.   [Sln]
       'To go at someone with a cane.'

(d)   Planiti *nad* sovražnika.   [Sln]
       'To fall upon the enemy.'

(e)   Iti *nad* petelina.   [Sln]
       'To go for (catch) a rooster.'

In the other languages considered, one finds the preposition *na* in similar contexts. The preposition *na* contributes to the idea that the LM is a target or reinforces it:

(8)   Puca *na* sve živo.   [Cro]
       'He shoots at anything that moves.'

Other meanings of the spatial prepositions are derived from central or prototypical spatial meaning as its metaphorical extensions. They are created, for example, by varying the referents of the LM and the TR. The notion of higher location in the prototypical meaning of *nad* extends to the notion of superiority and domination. The use of *nad* where the LM is an object or a group of objects with which a TR is compared, as in examples (9a–c) below, illustrate this, or the use of *nad* with the meaning 'more than' as in (10a–b):

(9a)   Pesnej *nad* pesnjami stala by eta pesnja.   [Rus, Nekrasov]
       'This song would be the song of songs.'

(b)   To był skandal *nad* skandale.   [Pol]
       'It was the scandal of scandals.'

(c)   Skopuh *nad* skopuhi.   [Sln]
       'The miser of misers.'

(10a) Kochać, cenić kogoś, coś *nad* życie.   [Pol]
       'To love, respect someone, something more than life.'

(b)   Nic milszego *nad* muzykę.   [Pol]
       'Nothing is so precious as music.'

As the basic preposition of a concrete or a metaphorical contact, the preposition *na* extends the contact meaning component to the meaning components "topic", "theme", "target", "object of interest/activity" and "focus of attention". The last is related to the notions "topic" and "target". They all imply contact of the TR with the

LM and closeness between the two. The TR and LM are conceptually very close. The notion of "topic" entails contact and closeness. The notion of closeness is also very important in some uses of *nad*, and this preposition also extends its meaning to the notion of "topic" and other related notions. One can follow this extended use of *nad* in all of the languages considered, but not to the same extent. Thus, in Polish it is used in examples such as (11a), where the expressed relation includes a concrete physical activity, or a verbal activity as in (11b). In such utterances – for example in Croatian – *na* instead of *nad* is used. But one finds *nad* in all languages in the examples in which the expressed activity is mental or emotional, and the LM is a theme, or an object of the activity, as in (11c–h):

(11a) Praca *nad* słownikiem.   [Pol]
       'The work on the dictionary.'

(b)   Dyskusja *nad* projektem.   [Pol]
       'The discussion regarding the project.'

(c)   Rozmyślać *nad* ludzkim losem.   [Pol]
       'To think about human fate.'

(d)   Ne sprašivaj, *nad* čem zadumyvajus' ja.   [Rus, Fet]
       'Do not ask about what I am considering.'

(e)   Ne rydaj tak bezumno *nad* nim.   [Rus, Nekrasov]
       'Do not cry so madly over him.'

(f)   Zamisliti se *nad* vsebino romana.   [Sln]
       'To think about the content of the novel.'

(g)   Jokati, vzdihovati *nad* kom.   [Sln]
       'To cry, sigh over somebody.'

(h)   Veselje *nad* dogodkom.   [Sln]
       'The joy of the event.'

The set of verbs taking prepositional complements with *na* varies in the languages considered.[5] Comparing semantically equivalent constructions in two of the languages considered, one again observes an overlap of the semantic space of the prepositions *na* and *nad* – cf. Polish example (11a) and its Croatian equivalent *rad na rječniku*. The spatial semantic component according to which a TR is on a higher level than a LM occurs in the examples in (11) as well. This position allows the TR a specific objective point of view from which it is able to "see" all aspects of the LM and direct its attention, emotions or any other kind of psychological activity towards the LM.

---

[5] *Nad* is a part of the verbal complements in some archaic Polish constructions: *zabawiać się nad, przeglądać się nad*.

4. The meaning of the prepositions and their related prefixes

The example of the preposition *nad* is an illustrative example for the consideration of the relation between the main spatial prepositions and their related prefixes in Slavic. The spatial prepositions and prefixes, being etymologically connected with them, share the main meaning concepts, but the prefixes also undergo semantic bleaching in the grammaticalisation process. Janda (1986) demonstrates on the basis of Russian examples that, among all the configurations associated with a given prefix, one is central or prototypical. All other configurations are connected or related to the central configuration by means of a series of links, which represent the transformations by which the configurations differ from one another. In the meanings of words with prefixes, one can follow the prototypical and peripheral meanings of the preposition, its metaphorical extensions and meaning shifts.

The prefix *nad-* serves to illustrate the predictable metaphorical extensions of the preposition in the non-spatial domain. As a nominal and adjectival prefix, it extends its prototypical meaning (a) "*nad*-X is spatially on a higher level than a referent of a base word X" to another meaning (b) "*nad*-X a is higher in the hierarchy, better than the referent of the base word or superior", "*nad*-X is higher, better than normally expected". This is closely connected with the notion of excess, i.e., meaning (c): "*nad*-X exceeds the expected measure, dimension or category":

a) Rus *nadgortannik* 'uvula', *nadzemnyj* 'above-ground, raised above the earth', *nadsmotr* 'supervision', *nadpis* 'inscription, title'; Pol *nadziemny* 'above-ground, raised above the earth', *nadwozie* 'superstructure'; Sln *nadcesten* 'raised above the street', *nadpalubje* 'upper/top deck'; Cro *nadgrobni* (*spomenik*) 'raised on the grave (tombstone)', *nadvožnjak* 'overpass, overhead bridge, overhead rail span'

b) Pol *nadburmistrz* 'head mayor', *nadradca* 'head counsel'; Sln *nadlogar* 'head forester', *nadporočnik* '(first) lieutenant'; Cro *nadbiskup* 'archbishop', *natkonobar* 'head waiter'; Pol *nadczłowiek* 'superman', *nadforteca* 'main fortress'; Sln *nadljudje* 'supermen', *nadčloveški* 'superhuman'; Cro *nadčovjek* 'superman', *nadljudski* 'superhuman'

c) Rus *nadklassovyj* 'out of the class', *nadzvezdnyj* 'out of the space of the stars, higher than the stars'; Pol *nadciśnienie* 'high atmospheric pressure', *nadnaturalny* 'supernormal, supernatural'; Sln *nadizkustven* 'out of one's experience', *nadrealizam* 'surrealism'; Cro *natprirodan* 'supernormal, supernatural', *nadstvarnos*t, 'superreality'.

The examples above show very similar concepts connected with the prefix *nad*-shared by Polish, Slovenian and Croatian:

X is higher than Y > X hierarchically superordinates Y > X is outside of the borders of Y > X exceeds the (value) category of Y

In Russian, the prefix *nad-* does not exist in the category "*nad-*X is higher in the hierarchy, better than the referent of the base word or superior"; instead, the role of the prefix *nad-* is assumed by another prefix or adjectival element (Rus *sverhčelove-českij*, *nečelovečeskij* 'superhuman' *staršij lejtenant* '(first) lieutenant', *verxnjaja paluba* 'upper deck'). However, it does exhibit the basic spatial meaning "X is situated higher than Y" and its extended version "X is outside of the borders of Y". The metaphorical uses of the prefix *nad-* are extended from its prototypical meaning. The objects that are on a higher level than the others are superior (e.g., Cro *nad-čovjek*) in comparison to those on the lower level.

The prototypical meaning of the preposition *nad* is fully apparent in prefixed verbs such as Pol *nadlatywać*, Sln *nadletavati*, Cro *nadlijetati* 'to fly over'. In Russian, the prefix *nad-* is not used in this semantic subcategory of verbs (*proletat' nad* 'to fly over'). In Polish, Slovenian and Croatian, there is also the possibility of using *pre-/prze-* (Sln *preletavati*, Cro *prelijetati*, Pol *przelatywać* 'to fly over'). In its extended meaning, the verbal prefix *nad-* adds the component "more, better" to the meaning of the base verb: Cro *nadigrati* 'to outplay, defeat' (= Sln *nadigrati)*, *nad-mudriti* 'to outwit' (= Sln *nadmodriti)*, *nadvikati* 'to outdo in shouting'. Russian uses the prefix *pere-* in these cases (e.g., *pereigryvat'* 'to outplay'). In Polish the prefix *nad-* is also not used in such verbs, but instead *prze-* or some other prefix (*przechy-trzyć*, *podchodzejść* 'to outwit'). Another sub-meaning of the verbal prefix *nad-* modifies the action of the base verb with the semantic component of 'adding something onto the surface'. The prototypical meaning of the preposition would imply that the result of adding is higher/bigger/longer than the surface or the initial object of the verbal action. It is thus in many examples, as in Rus *nadstroit'* 'to build onto the top of', *nadstavit'* 'to lengthen', *nadvjazat'* 'to lengthen, add by knitting'; Pol *nadbudować*, *nadmurować* 'to build on top of'; (= Sln *nadzidavati*, Cro *nadgraditi)*, but in other cases the action of adding does not result in two levels or in the augmentation of the initial object. The prefix *nad-* implies only some changes on the surface/initial object of the verbal action, as in Rus *nadkleit'* 'to paste on', *nadrisovat'* 'to write on'. One finds here the possibility of overlap for the prefixes *na-* and *nad-*. Prefixed verbs such as those in Russian are not formed with *nad-* in Slovenian, Croatian and Polish. Examples such as *nadkleit'* show the meaning domain in which the prefixes *na-* and *nad-* overlap (or could overlap). Consequently, *nalijepiti* is the Croatian equivalent for *nadkleit'*.

The relation of the meanings of the prepositions *na* and *nad* has already been mentioned. The existence of different prepositions in the same contexts in different Slavic languages indicates their closeness at some level. This situation also influences the meanings of the verbal prefixes. It is not predictable which possibility one language will take when two or more exist. In the Polish prefixed verbs *nadbiec* 'to hurry, rush' and *nadchodzić, nadjechać* 'to come, arrive' only the relation of closeness in space or time is expressed, the same relation that partly exists in the expression *miasto nad rzeką* 'the town on the river'. In Croatian, Slovenian and Russian one does not find *nad-* as a prefix in the contexts in which only closeness in space or

time is expressed. The prototypical meaning of the preposition *nad* in these languages did not undergo the same semantic extensions as did the prototypical meaning of the preposition *nad* in Polish. In view of the examples given above, it may be concluded that the prototypical meaning of the preposition *nad* is better preserved in the Croatian and Slovenian verbal prefixes, whereas it has a very broad extension in Russian and Polish that goes in the direction of the meaning network of the prefix *na-*. In a very large number of examples with this prefix in Russian and Polish one can follow the meaning shifts to the other category, to the meaning of the prefix *na-*. In numerous Polish examples as *nadłamać* 'to broach, begin', *nadkroić* 'to cut (a little bit)', *nadmarznąć* 'to freeze a little, become frozen on the surface' or in Rus *nadlomit'* 'to break a little on the surface', *nadpilit'* 'to notch with a saw', *nadkusit'* 'to bite (into)', the prefix indicates that the action does not take place to a full extent but only partially. This is also semantically connected with the beginning of an action. These examples are extended from the spatial meaning of the prefix: the prefix indicates that the action takes place only at the surface of the object. This can be illustrated with the Rus verbs *nadlomit', nadkolot'* 'to cut a little on the surface, chop (up) a little', *nadrezat'* 'to notch' or Pol *nadpalić* 'to fire on the surface', *nadszarpywać* 'to broach'. This concrete spatial meaning gives rise to contexts in Polish in which the prefix indicates the beginning of an action or the bounded extent of the verbal action.

5. Conclusion

Lakoff (1982) has suggested that the extension of a category might be influenced by the existence of neighbouring or contrasting categories. As has been seen, the existence of one preposition does not prevent another from encroaching on its semantic space. This phenomenon was observed in the relation between the prepositions *na* and *u*, and *na* and *nad*. They each share a part of a meaning chain that is historically motivated. The development of the meaning chain is certainly motivated, and in this case diachronically explainable as well (due to the roots of these languages in Common Slavic), but not predictable. It is certainly not possible to find one prototypical meaning for all parts of the meaning chain that one preposition (or a prefix related to it) forms. But it can definitely be stated that a few prototypical concepts cover the entire meaning chain, and that many meanings do have a spatial base. The analysis has shown that the prototype meanings of prepositions that undergo this development are shared in the Slavic languages. It implies not only the interrelatedness of the spatial categorisations, but also the interrelatedness of cultural concepts. Predictions can be made for the directions in which the prototypical meaning of the preposition or of the prefix can extend, but not for which part of the meaning chain will be broadly developed in one language or which part will not undergo a meaning extension at all. However, greater similarities in one and the same language branch are expected.

Author's address:

GWZO
Luppenstraße 1B
D-04177 Leipzig
saric@rz.uni-leipzig.de

References

Astaf'eva, N.I. (1974). *Predlogi v russkom jazyke i osobennosti ix upotreblenija*. Minsk: Izd. "Vyšejšaja škola".

Blank, Georg 1993). *Verhältniswörter im Kontext räumlicher Gliederung: Analyse und Vergleich des Russischen, Französischen und Deutsche*n. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Boers, Frank (1996). *Spatial Prepositions and Metaphor. A Cognitive Semantic Journey along the UP-DOWN and the FRONT-BACK Dimensions.* Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Brugman, Claudia (1981). The story of *over*. MA Thesis. Trier: LAUT (1983).

Cienki, Alan (1989). *Spatial Cognition and the Semantics of Prepositions in English, Polish and Russian*. Munich: Otto Sagner.

Cyuckens, Hubert (1988). Spatial prepositions in cognitive semantics. *Understanding the Lexicon*, ed. by Werner Hüllen & Rainer Schulze, 316-328. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 316-328.

Deane, Paul D. (1993). Multimodal spatial representation: on the semantic unity of *over* and other polysemous prepositions. Duisburg: L.A.U.D. Series A 332.

Herskovits, Anette H. (1988). Spatial prepositions and the plasticity of meaning. *Topics in Cognitive Linguistics*, ed. by Brygida Rudzka-Ostyn, 271-297. Amsterdam - Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Hodova, K.I. (1971). *Padeži s predlogami v staroslavjanskom jazyke* (*Opyt semantičeskoj sistemy*). Akademija nauk SSSR. Izdatel'stvo "Nauka." Moscow.

Janda, Laura A. (1986). *A Semantic Analysis of the Russian Verbal Prefixes* (*za-, pere-, do-* and *ot-*). Munich: Otto Sagner.

Johnson, Mark (1987). *The Body in the Mind: The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination, and Reason.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kleiber, Georges (1993). *Prototypensemantik*. Tübingen: G. Narr Verlag.

Lakoff, George, Mark Johnson (1980). *Metaphors We Live b*y. Chicago - London: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George (1982). Categories and Cognitive Models. Trier: LAUT Series A 96.

Lakoff, George (1987). *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind.* Chicago - London: University of Chicago Press.

Langacker, Ronald W. (1987). *Foundations of Cognitive Gramma*r. Vol. I. Theoretical prerequisites. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Leys, Odo (1988). Some remarks on spatial prepositional structure. *Worlds behind Words. Essays in Honour of F.G. Droste on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. by Frans Heyvaert & Frieda Steurs, 77–84. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Rosch, Eleanor, Carolyn B. Mervis (1975). Family resemblances: Studies in the internal structure of categories. *Cognitive Psychology* 7: 573–605.

Rudzka-Ostyn, Brygida, ed. (1988). *Topics in Cognitive Linguistic*s. Amsterdam - Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Schulze, Rainer (1987). *The Perception of Space and the Function of Prepositions in English: A Contribution to Cognitive Grammar.* Duisburg: Linguistic Agency of the University of Duisburg.

Seliverstova, Olga N., T.N. Maljar (1998). *Prostranstvenno-distancionnye predlogi i narečija v russkom i anglijskom jazykax.* Munich: Otto Sagner.

Sullivan, William J. (1998). *Space and Time in Russian: A Description of the Locus Prepositions of Russian.* Munich: Lincom Europa.

Šarić, Ljiljana, Željka Brlobaš (2001). Boundaries of the analysis of spatial prepositions in the framework of Prototype Semantics (exemplified by the preposition *na* in Croatian, Slovenian, Russian, and Polish). *On prepositions*, ed. by Ljiljana Šarić & Donald F. Reindl (= Studia Slavica Oldenburgensia 8), 207-261. Oldenburg: BIS.

Talmy, Leonard (1983). How language structures space. *Spatial Orientation: Theory, Research, and Application*, ed. by Herbert Pick & Linda P. Acredolo, 225-282.. New York: Plenum Press.

Taylor, John R. (1989). *Linguistic Categorization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Taylor, John R. (1993). Prepositions: Patterns of polysemization and strategies of disambiguation. *The Semantics of Prepositions*, ed. by Cornelia Zelinsky-Wibbelt, 151–175. Berlin - New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Vandeloise, Claude (1990). Representation, prototypes, and centrality. *Meanings and Prototypes*, ed. by Savas L. Tsohatzidis, 403–437. London: Routledge.

Vandeloise, Claude (1991). *Spatial Prepositions. A Case Study from French.* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Zelinsky-Wibbelt, Claudia (1993). Interpreting and translating prepositions: A cognitively based formalization. *The Semantics of Prepositions*, ed. by Claudia Zelinsky-Wibbelt, 351–390. Berlin - New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Zelinsky-Wibbelt, Claudia, ed. (1993). *The Semantics of Preposition*s. Berlin - New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Żeberek, Teresa (1984). *Rekcja przyimków w języku rosyjskim i polskim.* Warsaw: Wydawnictwa Szkolne i Pedagogiczne.

Dictionaries

Anić, Vladimir (1998). *Rječnik hrvatskoga jezika*. Zagreb: Novi Liber.

Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika (1985). Druga knjiga. Ljubljana: Inštitut za slovenski jezik SAZU.

Słownik języka polskiego (1993). Tom drugi. Warsaw: Wydawnictvo Naukove PWN.

Słownik języka polskiego (1962). Tom czwarty. Warsaw. Polska akademija nauk.

*Slovar' russkogo jazyka (*1982). Tom II. Moscow: Russkij jazik.

Slovar' sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo jazyka. (1958). Tom VII. Moscow/Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.

Tolkovyj slovar' russkogo jazyka (1938). Moscow.

PRIJEDLOŽNA ZNAČENJA I PROTOTIPNOST:
KONTRASTIVNA ANALIZA NA RUSKIM, SLOVENSKIM, HRVATSKIM I POLJSKIM PRIMJERIMA

Analiza značenjskih odnosa prijedloga *na* i *u* (r., slov. *v*, polj. *w*), *na* i *nad*, te s njima povezanih prefiksa potvrđuje Lakoffovu (1982) postavku da ekstenzija jedne kategorije može biti uvjetovana postojanjem drugih, sličnih ili oprečnih kategorija. Tako postojanje razvijenoga sustava značenja jednoga prijedloga ne sprečava ulaženje drugoga u njegovo semantičko polje. Premda za puno prijedloga nije moguće ustanoviti jedno prototipno značenje za cijelu mrežu njihovih značenja, sigurno je da nekoliko prototipnih koncepata pokriva cijelu mrežu značenja, te da mnoga neprostorna prijedložna značenja imaju prostorna kao temelj. Analizirani temeljni prostorni prijedlozi u slavenskim jezicima dijele prototipna značenja, kao i smjerove njihova dijakronijskoga razvoja. Srodnost u konceptualizaciji prostora implicira i povezanost kulturnih koncepata. Premda je smjer u kojem se prototipna značenja prijedloga ili prefiksa mogu širiti predvidljiv, nije predvidljivo koji će dio značenjskoga sklopa u pojedinom jeziku biti proširen. Kad su u pitanju slavenski jezici, veće se sličnosti mogu očekivati u istoj jezičnoj skupini.

Ključne riječi: prostorni prijedlozi, slavenski jezici, prototipna značenja prijedloga i prefiksa, kognitivna lingvistika, jezični razvoj i značenjske ekstenzije