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ABSTRACT

Prepositional usage in spatial constructions in the Slavic languages is frequently unpredictable and perplexing to the non-native speaker. This is especially true in the case of the preposition *na*. By examining categories of spatial phenomena with which the preposition *na* is used, it is possible to better understand why *na* is used in many circumstances. This not only has implications for language pedagogy, but promises to aid the understanding of certain aspects of diachronic change in the semantics of the prepositional systems of the Slavic languages.
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THE SEMANTICS OF THE PREPOSITION НА
IN SLAVIC SPATIAL CONSTRUCTIONS

by

DONALD F. REINDL

I Introduction

Although prepositions have been recognized as parts of speech for quite some time, it is only fairly recently that they have been analyzed as thoroughly as many of the other parts of speech, such as nouns and verbs. Horace G. Lunt (1982:327) has noted that prepositions 'receive little or no attention in most historical studies and dictionaries'.

I.1 Research on Slavic Prepositions

In the some of earliest Slavic grammars, prepositions were recognized as separate parts of speech in the same fashion as nouns, pronouns and adverbs. Нина Ивановна Астафьева cites two early Russian grammars in particular, those of Л. Зианц (1596) and М. Смотрицки (1619) (1974:3).

Even so, it is not uncommon to find a full treatment of prepositions lacking in relatively modern grammars of the Slavic languages. August Leskien's 1871 Handbuch der altbulgarischen (altkirchenslawischen) Sprache entirely leaves prepositions out of its grammar section, although they are defined with a few exemplary phrases in the glossary. In Paul Diels' Altkirchenslavische Grammatik (1963), prepositions are relegated to a single brief paragraph, along with conjunctions and adverbs, in a section entitled Andere Wortarten 'Other Types of Words'.
(282). This grammar even lacks the exemplary phrases found in Leskien's glossary.

Nonetheless, there have been a number of studies of prepositions in the major Slavic languages, many of them quite extensive. Several of these are appropriate for pedagogical purposes. Among these are Frank J. Miller's *A Handbook of Russian Prepositions* (1991) and Terence Wade's *Prepositions in Modern Russian* (1983). Others works are more research-oriented, such as Alan J. Cienki's *Spatial Cognition and the Semantics of Prepositions in English, Polish and Russian* (1989).

However, all of the above studies examine Slavic prepositions within the domain of a single, or perhaps two, Slavic languages. It is my intent to examine the entire spectrum of the living Slavic languages, as well as Old Church Slavic. In doing so, I hope to go beyond a merely historical approach—tracing back the usage pattern to its earliest form—by being able to examine emerging patterns in the use of the preposition *na* not only in the various branches of the Slavic languages, but in the individual languages themselves.

### 1.2 The Preposition *na*

One of the great conundrums of students of Slavic grammar lies in the proper use of the preposition *na* 'on', especially when it is used in a locative sense in opposition to the preposition *v* 'in'. The difficulty stems not so much from its multiplicity of meanings—in a study of Slovak prepositional constructions, Miroslav Bážlik (1985:27) noted that Slk. *na* translates into sixteen different English
prepositions—but more from the fact that *na* is frequently used in locative expressions which English (and many other languages) would express with 'in'. For example, in Lower Sorbian:

(1) Mamy na dworje kwiśecu kšušcynu
    have-1PL on yard-LOC blooming pear.tree

    'We have a blooming pear tree in our yard' (Nowak 1988:44)

but:

(2) Žeši grajkaju w gumnje
    children play-3PL in garden-LOC

    'The children are playing in the garden' (Nowak 1988:175)

In these two examples, the use of the prepositions *na* and *w* is determined by the noun in the prepositional phrase, and nothing else. In Lower Sorbian, one is, in essence, 'on' a yard, but 'in' a garden. No inferences can be drawn about the size, accessibility, etc. of the respective spheres of location.

Grammars of Slavic languages are often at a loss to describe the use of the preposition *na*. Beyond a few general guidelines, the student is frequently advised to simply memorize the situations in which the preposition may manifest itself.

A grammar of Russian states: 'The most persistent trouble spot in the area of unbound prepositional usage [that not dictated by a verb] is whether one assigns *na* or *v* to large and spacious objects, rooms, buildings, establishments, open expanses of land or ground, and the like’ (Townsend 1980:76). Yet another Russian grammar advises: 'sometimes the distinction between these two preposi-
tions [na and b] seems rather arbitrary to foreigners. When rules do not seem to apply, the phrase should be memorized.’ (Davis and Oprendek 1973:282).

Similar difficulties are expressed in grammars of Polish: 'The use of na... is connected, in Polish, with the idea of going to, on to an open space (on to a street, an island) but its usage is not always predictable’ (Mazur 1983:56), 'the use of prepositions [specifically, w vs. na] in Polish ... is IDIOMATIC and presents some difficulty to the beginning student of the language’ (Birkenmeyer and Folejewski 1965:16); Ukrainian: 'both prepositions [na and b] are often used irregularly, and such phrases have to be memorized’ (Жуктенко et al. 1978:129), 'The words used in the accusative with the preposition na and γ(b) must be memorized’ (Макарова et al. 1975:146); Serbo-Croat: 'Les emplois respectifs de na et u «dans» sont réglés par l’usage qui est souvent capricieux (Meillet 1952:143), 'Fifty or so such words require na. Some of them can be put into categories... [but] it is probably easier to simply identify the words that take na without worrying about the logic of the situation." (Magner 1991:254); and Czech: 'note the difficulty in choosing between v(e) and na when referring to a locality: v Československu - na Moravě - na Slovensku. There is na with names of islands: na Kubě (but v Anglii, v Irsku = in Ireland)’ (Šára et al. 1969:334).

In commenting on the wide semantic range of the preposition na, Wade (1982:28) says:

'...no compound preposition can hope to vie in sheer multiplicity of meanings with the primary prepositions, among which pride of place is enjoyed by the preposition na, whose range of meaning in contemporary Russian exceeds even the twenty-five semantic categories established by Vinogradov
[1972:542-544], since *na* + accusative case alone can be shown to account for meanings of space, time, state, condition, direction, projection, including sonic projection, activity, feeling, resolve, expenditure, allocation, the object of study, testing or competition, benefit, encouragement, authorization, submission, departure, suitability, division and disintegration, determinative meanings, meanings of extent, quantification, scholastic achievement, proportion, means, purpose, similarity, basis, circumstances, climatic features, while under many of the categories a further subdivision is possible. The potential for further proliferations of meanings seems unlimited, as far as *na* + accusative is concerned, since quite common collocations appear as yet to be unrecorded.'

The difficulty of this is not lost on the Slavs themselves. Астафьева, in her treatment of Russian prepositions, says that 'there appears to be discord in the use of the prepositions *в* and *на* in the expression of spatial relationships.' She notes that although the use of these prepositions is usually in accord with their lexical meanings, 'in many particular cases it seems that the use of the prepositions *в* and *на*, not always sufficiently justified at first glance or altogether unjustified, is prompted by tradition.'1 (1974:26).

---

1Unless otherwise indicated, all translations from Old Church Slavic, Bulgarian, Serbo-Croat, Slovene, Macedonian, Russian, Czech, Slovak, Polish, Greek, German and French are mine.
II Slavic Locative Preposition Typology

The Slavic languages generally express movement into, existence in, and movement from spheres of location with various sets of prepositions. Generally, there are three types of locations. The nature of these locations determines which set of prepositions they are referenced with.

II.1 Main Patterns

First, there are those locations which are referenced with the prepositions \( v-v-iz \).\(^2\) These locations are characterized by being enclosed. The following examples from Slovene illustrate this:

\[
\begin{align*}
(3a) & \quad \text{Moj brat gre } v \text{ sobo.} \\
& \quad \text{my brother go-3SG in room-ACC} \\
& \quad '\text{My brother goes into the room.'} \\
(3b) & \quad \text{Kaj imate } v \text{ tem kovčku?} \\
& \quad \text{what have-2PL in this suitcase-LOC} \\
& \quad '\text{What do you have in this suitcase?'}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^2\) The formulae \( v-v-iz \), \( na-na-s \) and \( k-u-ot \) are used here to refer to the three prepositions used to express 1) movement into a sphere of location, 2) existence within a sphere of location, and 3) movement from a sphere of location. Although the Slavic languages show a variety of cognates for some of these prepositions (e.g., \( v = \text{Slov. } v, \text{SC. } u, \text{Pol. } w(e) , \text{Rus. } y \), etc.), \( v \) is used to refer to all those prepositions which correspond to OCS. \( \text{in} \) for the sake of convenience. The other prepositions in the formulae are chosen for similar reasons. When treating individual languages, explicit reference will be made to their prepositions.
(3c) Vino je  izteklo iz soda.
    wine be-3SG out.run from cask-GEN
    'The wine leaked out of the cask.'

Second, there are those locations which are referenced with the prepositions na-na-s. These locations are characterized by being unenclosed. The following examples from Russian illustrate this:

(4a) Ступите на платформу!
    step-2PL,IMP on platform-ACC
    'Step onto the platform!'

(4b) Книга лежит на столе.
    book lie-3SG on table-LOC
    'The book is on the table.'

(4c) Работники вернулись с площади.
    workers returned-PL from square-GEN
    'The workers returned from the square.'

Third, there are those locations which are referenced with the prepositions k-u-ot. These locations are characterized by being associated with people or being people themselves. The following examples from Serbo-Croat illustrate this:

(5a) Idem k zubaru.
    go-1SG to dentist-DAT
    'I'm going to the dentist.' (Magner 1972:287)
(5b) On je bio kod nas.
he be-3SG been at us-GEN
'He was at our place.'

(5c) On je dobio poklon od brata.
he be-3SG received gift from brother-GEN
'He received a gift from his brother.' (Magner 1972:288)

This pattern was not strictly fixed in the earliest Slavic records--compare the use of pret in OCS:

(6) по вса дни при вась сидъхь
for all days-ACC at you-LOC sit-1SG,IMPF
'I sat with you every day' (Mt. 26.55)

alongside the more usual u:

(7) оу тебе сотворю пасхоу
at you-GEN make-1SG Passover-ACC
'I will keep the Passover at your house' (Mt 6.18)

and even the use of u with a non-personal location:

(8) стояше оу гроба
stand-3PL,AOR at grave-GEN
'they stood at the grave' (Jn 20.11)

---

3 This preposition had a wide range of meanings, including 'by' and 'during' as well as 'at'.

4 All Old Church Slavic Biblical passages are from Господа нашего... 1878.
Hence, there is a wide variety of prepositions used to express personal areas in the Slavic languages. For example, Slv. pri, SC. u or kod, USrb. pola are equivalent to u.

These three groupings are valid for all of the Slavic languages. The pattern na-na-s appears to be universal, while the pattern k-u-ot shows much more variation. As this pattern is used for personal, rather than geographical, spheres of location it will not be dwelt upon here, although it will come up again later in the discussion of Slovenian city names (see page 51).

II.2 Subpattern do-v-iz

Regarding the pattern v-v-iz, the Slavic languages can be divided into two broad groups. First, there are those languages which express movement into an enclosed area with the traditional v + ACC. This pattern is seen in the oldest Slavic documents:

(9) ВНІДНЬ ВЪ КІЛЬТЬ ТВЮ.
in.go in room-ACC your

'Go into your room...' (Mt 6.6)

and is used throughout the South Slavic and East Slavic languages.

However, a second pattern developed in West Slavic, spreading to some dialects of East Slavic, in which movement into an enclosed area came to be expressed with a new construction, do + GEN. This seems to be a fairly old innovation; it appears in the Czech Biblical translation of 1613:
(10) Vejdi do pokojíka svého.
    in.go-2SG to room-GEN your

    'Go into your room...' (Mt 6.6, in Nový Zákon 1613:8)

Among these languages which substitute do for v in the pattern v-v-iz, three
variations emerge. First, v + ACC may have been completely lost. In Lower
Sorbian, w(e) + LOC is used to indicate location within an enclosed area. For
example:

(11) Žěši grajkaju w gumnje.
    children play in garden-LOC

    'The children are playing in the garden.' (Nowak 1988:175)

However, the construction w(e) + ACC is completely unknown to modern
Lower Sorbian (Janaš 1976:239). Instead, do + GEN is used to express motion
into an enclosed area. For example:

(12) Myška lězo do žčrki.
    mouse crawled to hole-DIM-GEN

    'The mouse crawled into the little hole' (Nowak 1988:22)

Second, v + ACC may survive in restricted contexts. Mazur (1983:55) notes
that in Polish 'movement to a place is indicated, in most cases, by the preposition
do + Gen. There are some very common examples, however, where 'to' is
rendered by w + Acc.' Among these seem to be abstract and temporal expres-
sions:
(13a) patrzeć w oczy
look in eyes-ACC
'to look into one's eyes' (Meckelein 1926:339)

(13b) w środę
in Wednesday-ACC
'on Wednesday'

rather than concrete spatial notions:

(14) Pojechał do Lublina.
went-3 to Lublin-GEN

'He went to Lublin.' (Meckelein 1926:339)

Third, v + ACC may appear as an alternative to the formula do + GEN without any apparent difference in meaning. In Ukrainian, location within an enclosed area is indicated by γ/β + LOC. For example:

(15) Сірник лежить у коробці.
match lies in box-LOC

'The match is in the box.' (Жуктенко et al. 1978:169)

To express motion into an enclosed area, the preposition γ/β + ACC is generally used:

(16) Я кладу сірник у коробку.
I put match into box-ACC

'I am putting the match into the box.' (Жуктенко et al. 1978:169)

However, according to Юрий Алексеевич Жуктенко et al. (1978:171), do +
GEN is optional after verbs of motion, and is equivalent to γ/β + ACC. According to this, the following two sentences are equivalent:

(17a) **ВиН пІшов γ садок.**

he went-3 into garden-ACC

'He went into the garden.' (Полдевько 1962:936)

(17b) **ВиН пІшов до садка.**

he went-3 into garden-GEN

'He went into the garden.'

II.3 Distinctions

Bearing in mind this general picture regarding the used of ν-ν-из vs. na-na-s, it should be pointed out that *na* can sometimes be substituted in a phrase where one would expect *ν* in order to produce a variety of effects.

First of all, a literal distinction can be made, as in these examples from Slovene:

(18a) **Jaz sem Šel ν hišo.**

I be-1SG gone-3SG in house-ACC

'I went into the house.'

(18b) **Bombe so padale na hišo.**

bombs be-3PL fallen-3PL on house-ACC

'Bombs fell on the house.'

This example corresponds exactly to the distinction made in English between 'in
the house' and 'on the house'.

Another, more abstract, distinction that can be made in Slavic when choosing between *n* and *na* is one of focus. In Polish, this is seen when *n*-n-*iz* or *na-na-s* is chosen to reference a building. In two examples from Barbara Klebanowska 1971:19 (cited in Cienki 1989:84) we read:

(19a) W sali było dużo osób.
    in hall-LOC was-3SG much people-GEN
    'There were a lot of people in the hall.'

(19b) znaleźć się na sali, wśród tłum
    find-INF REFL on hall-LOC among crowd-GEN
    'to be in the hall, amongst the crowd'

In the first example, the emphasis is on the whole, undifferentiated interior of the building, while in the second, the emphasis is on the floor area as the sphere of location (Cienki 1989:84). Maria G. Sysak-Borońska’s perspective (quoted in Cienki 1989:84) on this choice between *n* and *na* is that when *na* is chosen:

The point of observation becomes transferred from outside the localizer to its inside so that the enclosing, encircling aspect of a localizer recedes to the background and is suppressed instead by its other salient features, that of relative flatness and vastness of one of its interior surfaces. (1980:76-77)
III Spatial Phenomena

The semantic fields in which the prepositional patterns \( \text{v-v-iz} \) and \( \text{na-na-s} \) are used for spatial phenomena in the Slavic languages can be divided into four broad categories. These are geographical phenomena, such as mountains, hills, and islands; political phenomena, such as countries and cities; social phenomena, which include institutions (e.g., churches, factories and bus stops) and events (e.g., dances, weddings and holidays); and directions.

III.1 Geographical Features

The significant geographical features between which \( \text{na-na-s} \) and \( \text{v-v-iz} \) are distributed in the Slavic languages can be divided into five broad areas; mountains and other elevated areas, islands, peninsulas, places associated with water, and expanses. These places can be looked at not only in terms of their generic names (e.g., mountain) but also in terms of the names of places derived from or associated with these physical features (e.g., Urals).

III.1.1 Elevations

Looking first at mountains and other elevated places, nearly every Slavic language makes exclusive reference to these places with \( \text{na-na-s} \). For example, we have Bul. на планина, SC. \textit{na planini}, Slv. \textit{na gori}, Ukr. на гори, Slk. \textit{na vrchu} and Kash. \textit{na górzê}, all meaning 'on a mountain'. Similarly, we see SC. \textit{na brdu}, Slv. \textit{na hribu}, Mac. на рид, Kash. \textit{na grzépie} 'on a hill'. This seems quite logical;
mountains and hills are, after all, open, exposed surfaces.

Reference can, though, sometimes be made to mountains with \textit{v-v-iz} (without the expected literal sense of 'in a mountain', such as one might assign to a hole in a mountain, or to the place where the Pied Piper took the children of Hamelin). For example, one usually sees constructions of the following sort in Old Church Slavic:

(20) Оуздъь вь народы, взыде на гороу...

see-PTA.PTC and people-ACC go.up-3SG,AOR on mountain-ACC

'And seeing the people, he went onto a mountain...' (Mt 5.1)

However, it is not unusual to see this same concept expressed with the prepositions \textit{v-v-iz}:

(21) Отцы наши вь горы сей поклонишаса...

fathers our in mountain-LOC this worship-3PL,AOR

'Our fathers worshipped on this mountain...' (Jn 4.20)

Perhaps this choice of \textit{v-v-iz} instead of \textit{na-na-s} expresses the perspective that the scene of the activity in the second example takes place not so much \textit{on top of} the mountain, but rather among the nooks and crannies which one might find located on the mountain. B.M. Groen (1977:198) cites an example of the use of \textit{v-v-iz} with a mountain in the Macedonian dialect of Dihovo:

(22) vo planinata ima koli'ba

in mountain.the has-3SG hut

'There is a hut on the mountain.'
This idea of being in a mountainous terrain is reflected in English in phrase in the mountains, and this use of 'in' when the mountains are in the plural finds parallels in Slavic as well. In Serbo-Croat, for example, one says u planinima 'in the mountains'. Similarly, in Old Church Slavic we find:

(23) Тогда сончи во Йудеи, да бъгаятъ въ горы
then be-PRA.PTC in Judea-LOC that flee-3PL in mountains-ACC

'Then let those who are in Judea flee to the mountains' (Lk 21.21)

However, the use of н-н-из with 'mountains' is not universal in the Slavic languages; cf. Bul. на планина, Slv. na gorah, LSrb. na gorach 'in the mountains'. Usage varies even within the Slavic languages. Indeed, the above passage from the Gospel of Luke appears in Mark as well, but here the otherwise identical wording uses the preposition на:

(24) тогда сончи во Йудеи да бъжатъ на горы
then be-PRA.PTC in Judea-LOC that flee-INF on mountains-ACC

'then let those who are in Judea flee to the mountains' (Mk 13.14)

This does not, as is often the case, reflect a difference in the original Greek manuscript. In these two passages, the Greek is identical:
(25) τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ
then the in the Judea-DAT flee-3PL,AOR,IMP unto the
ὁρη
mountains-ACC

'Then let those who are in Judea flee to the mountains' (Mk 13.14, Lk 21.21)\textsuperscript{5}

It seems that the choice of preposition is frequently left to the speaker who may choose either, depending on the particular nuance he wishes to convey.

When speaking of chains of mountains, or the areas named after these chains, the Slavic languages use either в-в-из or на-на-с. There does not seem to be a fixed pattern. Bulgarian, for example, uses в-в-из throughout: в Алпите 'in the Alps', в Стара планина 'in the Balkans', в Кавказ 'in the Caucasus'.

Russian, on the other hand, uses в-в-из for the Alps: в Альпах, but на-на-с for the Balkans and the Caucasus: на Балканах, на Кавказе. Even though a region may take на-на-с (for example, Ukr. на Кавказ 'in the Caucasus') places within that region can nonetheless be referenced with в-в-из (e.g., Ukr. в Грузии 'in Georgia').

Wade (1983:10,45) has observed that Russian tends to use в-в-из for ranges with plural names and на-на-с for ranges with singular names. He notes the Balkans as an exception; they are plural in Russian but take на-на-с (Wade 1983:45). Дитмар Эльшевич Розенталь tries to explain this as a reference to

\textsuperscript{5}All Greek Biblical passages are from Kurt Aland et al. 1975.
the Balkan peninsula rather than the mountain range. He similarly explains the use of *na-na-s* with the Carpathians, another plural range in Russian (на Карпатах 'in the Carpathians'), as due to the perspective of being 'on the surface' of the mountains (1968:300, cited in Астафьева 1974:30).

Usage can even vary within a language. In Slovene one may say either *na Jelovici* 'in the Jelovica range' or the more colloquial *v Jelovici* (Slovenska... 1962:43).

Specific mountains and hills are always referenced with *na-na-s*. This is seen in the following examples in Slovene: *na Voglu* 'on Mount Vogel', *na Rožnik* 'on Rožnik [a hill in Ljubljana]', and Bulgarian:

(26a) На Трапезица съ жиъди бояри.  

on Trapezica be-3PL lived boyars.the

'The boyars lived on Trapezica [a hill in Veliko Търново] (Данчовъ и Данчовъ 1936:1544)

(26b) там нейде на Парнас  

there somewhere on Parnassus

'somewhere there on Parnassus' (Бояджиев 1952:98)

Despite the regularity in the modern languages, there was some degree of variation exhibited in Old Church Slavic. For example, the Mount of Olives was variously referenced with *na-na-s*:
(27) Сълцщю и емоу на горъ Елеъстъй...

sit-PRA.PTC and him on mount-LOC Olive

'And as he sat upon the mount of Olives...’ (Mt 24.3)

or v-v-iz:

(28) Інсоусъ же иде въ гороу Елеънскoу.

Jesus and go-3SG.AOR in mount-ACC Olive

'And Jesus went to the Mount of Olives.’ (Jn 8.1)

apparently at the choice of the writer.

Again, as in the passages from Mark 13.14 and Luke 21.21, this is not a reflection of the Greek text. By comparing the parallel Old Church Slavic and Greek versions of Matthew 24.3:

(29a) Сълцщю и емоу на горъ Елеънскoу.

sit-PRA.PTC and him on mount-LOC Olive

'And as he sat upon the mount of Olives...’

(29b) Καθημενου δε αυτοι επи του Ὠρους των Ἡλαων...

sit-PRD.PTC and him upon the mount-GEN the Olives

'And as he sat upon the Mount of Olives...’

and Mark 13.3:

(30a) И сълцщю емоу на горъ Елеънскoу...

and sit-PRA.PTC him on mount-LOC Olive

'And as he sat upon the mount of Olives...’
(30b) Καὶ καθημένου αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ὁρὸς τῶν Ἔλαυνων...
and sit-PRD-PTC him upon the mount-ACC the Olives

'And as he sat upon the Mount of Olives...'

we note that although the alternation between the Greek conjunctions δὲ (in Matthew 24.3) and καὶ (in Mark 13.3) is paralleled by the use of OCS. ἃ and ἃ, there is no corresponding parallel in Old Church Slavic in these passages reflecting the alternation between Gk. ἐπὶ and εἰς.

Since OCS. בּ was used to translate Gk. εἰς in Luke 21.21 (see page 16), and since either בּ or ה can be used with the Mount of Olives, the translator could have chosen to have the text better reflect the distinction in Greek. The fact that he did not suggests a relative freedom in the choice of preposition, strengthening the hypothesis that use of ν-ν-ιζ or na-na-s was a matter of free variation in some situations.

III.1.2 Islands

When making reference to islands in a generic sense, the Slavic languages invariably use na-na-s; for example, SC. на остров, Slv. na otoku, Russ. на острове, Po. na wyspie 'on an island'. This pattern is carried over to named islands, and size is largely irrelevant. In Slovene, for example, islands as small as Brioni (6.9 km²) (na Brionah 'on Brioni') and as large as Borneo (778,600 km²) (na Borneu 'in Borneo') are referenced with na-na-s.

There are some limits, however. Greenland is so large that it is referred to
with \( v-v\text{-}iz \) in most Slavic languages; cf. SC. \( v \) Grenlandiji, Russ. \( в Гренландии 'in Greenland' \). The idea seems to be that the sphere of location is no longer conceived of as an elevated area surrounded by water, but simply a land area. The continents, including Australia, are consequently always referenced with \( v-v\text{-}iz \): for example, Pol. \( w \) Azji 'in Asia', \( w \) Europie 'in Europe', \( w \) Australii 'in Australia', \( w \) Amerycy 'in America' (Brooks 1975:344).

Thus, there is a general pattern of using \( na-na\text{-}s \) to refer to islands until the size of the island compels the use of \( v-v\text{-}iz \). Different languages have different thresholds for when this shift in perspective occurs. In Slovenian, for example, some speakers will use \( na-na\text{-}s \) with Greenland (\( na \) Grenlandiji) (Vinko Ahlin, p.c.).

This analysis is complicated, however, by the notion of autonomy. That is, if an island is also an autonomous political entity, it is less likely to be conceived of as an island than it is a nation, and the choice of preposition will shift to \( v-v\text{-}iz \) regardless of size. For example, in Russian we see \( na-na\text{-}s \) used with Borneo, the third largest island in the world:

(31) На Борнео имеется 14 эндемичных родов

\begin{align*}
&on \text{ Borneo-LOC} \hspace{1em} \text{have-3SG} \hspace{1em} \text{14 endemic} \hspace{1em} \text{species-GEN} \\
&\text{птиц,} \\
&\text{birds-GEN} \\
&'\text{There are 14 endemic species of birds on Borneo.}' \ (\text{Введенский V:584})
\end{align*}
while Great Britain, less than one-third its size at 232,900 km², is referenced with *nu-*iz because of its nation status:

(32) Высоко в горы лес в Великобритании...

high in mountains-ACC forest in Great Britain-LOC

'High-mountain forests in Great Britain...' (Введенский VII:237)

William J. Sullivan (1984:206) notes that political entities which are coterminous with an island take *na-na*-s, but that those smaller than the island on which they are situated take *nu-*iz. This is exemplified by the contrast which can be found between Haiti the island and Haiti the nation, the second not being coterminous with the island of Haiti:

(33a) Обрабатывающей пром-сти в Ганти почти нет.

manufacturing-GEN industry-GEN in Haiti-LOC almost not

'There are hardly any manufacturing industries in Haiti' (Введенский X:98)

(33b) На Ганти находятся государства Ганти и Доминиканская республика.

on Haiti find-3PL,REFL states Haiti and Dominican Republic

'The states of Haiti and the Dominican Republic are located on Haiti (Введенский X:98)

The pattern can then be summed up thus: *na-na*-s is used for islands up to a certain (usually very large) size, after which they take the prepositions *nu-*iz. If
the island is also an independent political unit, it takes *v-v-iz* regardless of its size. This pattern is not inviolable; in many of the Slavic languages *na-na-s* is used for Sri Lanka despite its nation status: Bul. на Це́йлон, Russ. на Це́йлоне, Po. *na Ceilonie* 'on Sri Lanka'. This could reflect its relatively small size (65,610 km\(^2\)) and recent history as a non-nation (Sri Lanka became independent only in 1972).

Cuba however, despite its nation status, is also referred to with *na-na-s*: Slv. *na Kubi*, Russ. на Кубе,\(^6\) Pol. *na Kubie*, Cz. *na Kubě*. Its relatively small size does not appear to be the deciding factor. Iceland, somewhat smaller than Cuba, is invariably referenced with *v-v-iz*: Bul. в Исландия, SC. *u Islandu*, Slv. *v Islandiji*, Russ. в Исландии. The usage pattern could be an echo of the former colonial status of the island of Cuba, but this is a weak hypothesis, since Cuba became independent 43 years before Iceland.\(^7\)

Wade (1983:10) observes that Russian uses *v-v-iz* with those island names that end in *-ия*. This may help explain why Cuba and Sri Lanka are referenced with *na-na-s* rather than *v-v-iz* in Russian: *-ия* is a fairly common, but not exclusive, nominal ending for the names of nations (*Монголия* 'Mongolia', *Финляндия* 'Finland'; but *Иран* 'Iran', *Ирак* 'Iraq'), and when this ending is found on the name of an island, it can reinforce the idea of its nationhood (i.e., Russ. *Исландия* 'Iceland'). However, this does not explain the patterning in other Slavic

---

\(^6\)Miller (1991:15) notes в Кубе 'in Cuba' as a 'rare' construction, but Sullivan (1984:205) says that this construction 'is not possible'.

\(^7\)Although Iceland achieved autonomy from Denmark in 1918, it did not attain full independence until 1944.
languages which do not have any particular ending on such islands but reference them with ɔ-ɔ-iz nonetheless (i.e., SC. Island 'Iceland').

A more plausible explanation seems to be that Iceland has been in the sphere of Slavic, and general European, consciousness for quite some time—much longer than Cuba. Despite its nominal status as a possession of one or another Scandinavian nation for most of its history, it always had a high degree of practical autonomy. This, coupled with its linguistic independence, has fostered its identity as a nation-state to a greater degree than that of Cuba.

III.1.3 Peninsulas

Peninsulas show, in general, the same prepositional patterning in Slavic as islands; first of all, they are referenced with na-na-s in the generic sense, as in the following example from Bulgarian:

(34) Първи исторически народи на полуострова с х.
    first    historical peoples on peninsula.the        be-3PL
    били травицйци.
    been    Thracians.the

    'The first historical people on the peninsula were the Thracians'
    (Данчевъ и Данчевъ 1936:102).

Named peninsulas are also referenced with na-na-s up to a certain size, after which they take ɔ-ɔ-iz, and politically independent peninsulas tend to be referenced with ɔ-ɔ-iz.
For example, in Slovene Kamchatka is referenced with na-na-s (i.e., na Kamčatki ‘in Kamchatka’), but Scandinavia is referenced with v-v-iz (i.e., v Skandinavij ‘in Scandinavia’) because of its sheer size. With reference to the nation factor, Korea, which is substantially smaller than Kamchatka, is referenced with with v-v-iz: Slv. v Koreji, Russ. в Корее ‘in Korea’.

Despite this, Alaska—which at 1,539,000 km² is nearly twice as large as Scandinavia and is arguably the largest peninsula in the world (excluding Europe and India)—is generally referenced with na-na-s (cf. Slv. na Alaski, Russ. на Аляске⁸ ‘in Alaska). In contrast, Crimea—a mere 26,100 km²—is frequently, but not always, referenced with v-v-iz (cf. Russ. в Крыму, Ukr. у Криму, but Slv. na Krimu, Pol. na Krymie ‘in Crimea’).

This last example, the seeming irregular use of v-v-iz in Russian and Ukrainian for Crimea, may be due to the viewing of the peninsula as a region rather than a peninsula qua peninsula in these two languages, since the speakers of these two languages may view the area as a territory. Peninsulas viewed primarily as regions are frequently referenced with v-v-iz rather than na-na-s. For example, in Slovene Istria (v Istri ‘in Istria [the region of Croatia occupying the Istrian peninsula]’) takes v-v-iz like any other region (e.g., v Krajini ‘in Carniola’, v Čičariji ‘in Čičarija’, etc.).

It is interesting to note that Russian researchers themselves cannot agree on the reason behind the referencing of Crimea with v-v-iz, although they note it

---

as anomalous. Розенталь (cited in Астафьева 1974:30) believes that the use of 
\(v\)-\(v\)-\(iz\) implies a perspective which focuses on the steppes, rather than the moun-
tains, of the peninsula (1968:300), while Николай Григоревич Листвинов 
(cited in Астафьева 1974:30) believes that this implies a perspective which looks 
at the geography of Crimea as a whole, noting that there are steppes as well as 
mountains (1965:180). Астафьева herself feels that the use of \(v\)-\(v\)-\(iz\) stems from 
viewing Crimea as an administrative and geographical unit, analogous to Karelia, 
Scandinavia and Kirghizia, all of which are referenced with \(v\)-\(v\)-\(iz\) (1974:30).

III.1.4 Waters

Bodies of water as a sphere of activity are generally referenced with \(na-na\) -
\(s\) in order to specify that the reference is being made to action at the side of or on 
the surface of the water, rather than in or under the surface of the water. Hence, 
in Slovene one would say:

(35) Ладжа je na jezeru.

boat be-3SG on lake-LOC

'The boat is on the lake.'

rather than:

(36) Ладжа je v jezeru.

boat be-3SG in lake-LOC

'The boat is in the lake.'

in order to indicate that said boat is floating on the surface of the lake rather than
lying, sunk, on the bottom of the lake.

It is a universal tendency among the Slavic languages to use *na-na-s* with bodies of water in this sense; cf. Sc. *na moru*, Slv. *na morju*, Russ. на море, Ukr. на мори, Pol. *na morzu*, Kash. *na jezorje, na morju*, Plb. *no mārai* 'at sea'. Similarly, geographical features located at the boundaries of bodies of water also take *na-na-s*; cf. Bul. на бряг, Bel. на березе, Kash. *na strądze* 'on the (river) bank'; Slv. *na plaţi*, Ukr. на пляжі, Pol. *na plaży* 'on the beach'; and Mac. на брег, SC. *na obali*, Ru. на берегу 'on the shore'. This, though, may be partially or wholly due to viewing banks, beaches and shores as elevated areas (in contrast to the adjacent water).

Whatever the root cause of the choice of preposition, Old Church Slavic seems to show a wide variation in choice of preposition with locations alongside bodies of water. For example, in John 21.1 we see:

(37) явиса паки Інусь... на мори Тіберіадство́м

show-3SG,AOR again Jesus on sea-LOC Tiberias-DAT

'Jesus showed himself again at the Sea of Galilee'

Yet, in another passage with parallel meaning, the preposition *pri* is used:

(38) ...и той бъ стол при езеръ

and he be-3SG,IMPF stand-PRA.PTC. at lake-LOC

Гернесаретство́.

Gennesaret-LOC

'...and he was standing at the Sea of Galilee.' (Lk 5.1)
In yet another place, the preposition ν is used:

(39) снизд боура вътре на въ езеро
down.go-3SG,AOR storm-GEN windy-GEN on lake-ACC

'some windy storms came down on the lake' (Lk 8:23)

This variance is likely a reflection of the Greek text, rather than an expression of nuance in Old Church Slavic. In the above passages, the Greek prepositions ἐπὶ, παρά and εἰς correspond to the Slavic prepositions на, при and въ with more or less the same denotations; i.e., 'on', 'by' and 'into'.

By analogy, regions which are associated with water are also frequently referenced with na-na-s. For example, the area around the Don river takes na-na-s in Russian and Ukrainian: Russ. на Дону, Ukr. на Дону 'in the Don region'. Юрий Алексеевич Жуктенко et al. (1978) also cite the Ukrainian construction на Донбас 'in the Donbas (a coal-mining region in the eastern Ukraine)'. The name Донбас is actually a portmanteau constructed from Донецкий угольный бассейн 'Donec (River) coal basin'; consequently, it is this association with the Donec River which compels the choice of the prepositions na-na-s.

Regions associated with water do not always take na-na-s, however. The Slovenian region of Primorje (meaning, literally, 'by/near the sea') takes ν-ν-из in Slovene: ν Primorju 'in Primorje'.

III.1.5 Expanses

The final semantic division of geographical features—expanses—is a category
which takes in those features which are characterized by being broad, flat and open. These range from very large areas, such as a plain, to relatively small areas, such as a garden. Such features tend to be referenced with the prepositions na-na-
s because they are essentially two-dimensional surfaces, without any kind of interior.

Perhaps the largest imaginable plain is the earth itself, and all of the Slavic languages invariably reference the earth with na-na-s: cf. Slv. na zemlji, LSrb. na zemi, Kash. na zemi, Plb. no žime 'on earth'. The social conception of the earth, the 'world', is likewise referenced with na-na-s (this, of course, in contrast to the English opposition on earth, but in the world): cf. Bul. на земята, Sc. na svetu, Russ. на светe, Pol. na świecie, Slk. na svete, Kash. na swiece, Plb. no svēte.9

As the size of the expanse gets smaller, however, various Slavic languages begin to reference the expanse with v-v-iz rather than na-na-s. Fields and pastures--admittedly, the distinctions between these are somewhat blurred--are generally referenced with na-na-s, although v-v-iz is occasionally seen.

Since the Slavs are, or were, a predominantly agricultural people, it is not surprising that they have a variety of words for fields. The following examples from Slovene show that no matter which word is used, the choice of preposition remains na-na-s:

---
9Here, however, the Russian and Kashubian variants в мире, v svjat 'in the world' are to be noted.
(40a) Kdo kriči, kakor čednik na paši?
who shout-3SG like peasant on pasture-LOC

'Who is shouting like a peasant in the pasture?' (Cankar 1907:62)

(40b) ne na polju, ne na senožeti
not on field-LOC not on hayfield-LOC

'neither in the field, nor in the hayfield' (Cankar 1907:59)

However, in East and West Slavic there is variation between na-na-s and v-v-iz.

For example, alongside Russ. на поле, Ukr. на полі, Pol. na polu, Kash. na polu, Plb. no baně 'in the field' are Russ. в поле, Ukr. у полі, Pol. w polu, Kash. w polu, Plb. wā pūlai, also 'in the field', without any apparent difference in meaning. Russian, in fact, usually uses v-v-iz with 'field':

(41) Пришли в чистое поле.
arrived-3PL in clean field-ACC

'They arrived at the clean field.' (Афанасьевым 1961:138)

Wade (1983:18) notes the following distinctions between the use of na-na-s and v-v-iz with 'field'. First, v-v-iz is used when the focus is not necessarily on the field itself, but on differentiating it from a village or some other topographical feature.

For example:

(42) В деревне пусто, все в поле.
in village-LOC deserted everyone in field-LOC

'The village is deserted; everyone is in the field.'

In contrast, na-na-s is used when the focus is directed toward the field for
some reason; for example, when a particular plot is indicated:

(43) На поле стоял трактор.

on field stood tractor

'The tractor was in the field.' (Wade 1983:18)

when reference is made to a crop:

(44) на картофельном поле

on potato field-LOC

'in the potato field' (Wade 1983:18)

or for contexts of a military or athletic nature:

(45) на футбольном поле

on football field-LOC

'on a soccer field' (Miller 1991:14)

(46) на поле битвы

on field-LOC battle-GEN

'on a battle field' (Miller 1991:15)

Miller implies, additionally, that в or на may be used when indicating existence in a single field, but that на-na-s is required when more than one field is indicated, or when the motion is from the field: в/на поле 'in a field', but на полях 'in the fields', с поля/полей 'from the field(s)' (1991:15).

The older pattern for referencing fields seems to have been на-na-s. This is the pattern which is used invariably in Old Church Slavic:
(47) подобно... сокровищ... сокровенное на сель
similar treasure-DAT hide-DAT,PTP.PTC on field-LOC

'similar... to a treasure hidden in a field' (Mt 13.44)

Thus, the use of v-v-ż with 'field' seems to be an innovation which arose somewhere in the Polish-East Slavic area and has not spread outside of that sphere.

Despite this, na-na-s is retained when referring to place names which are fields. For example, in Polish we see:

(48) Po klęskach Serbów... na Kosowym polu
after defeats-LOC Serbs-GEN on Kosovo-LOC field-LOC

Turcy zajęli Macedonia-ę...

Turks occupy-PTA.PTC Macedonia-ACC

'After the defeats of the Serbs... at Kosovo Polje the Turks occupied Macedonia' (Kotarbiński X:458)

Likewise, in Russian:

(49) произошло 15 июня 1389 на Косовом поле
happened-е 15 June-GEN 1389 on Kosovo field-LOC

'it occurred on June 15th, 1389 at Kosovo Pole' (Bwedenский XXIII:116)

On the Croatian island of Cres, where a traditional occupation is herding sheep, there are many toponyms referring to fields. These are referenced with na-
na-s, in keeping with the pattern discussed above. For example, in a locative statement:
(50) On je bil na Verhas.

he be-3SG been on Verhas-UNDCL

'He was at Verhas [a field].’ (Houtzagers 1985:390)

Similarly, in what would correspond to a construction with the toponym in the accusative case:

(51) dofijaman na Batajini

just on Batajini-UNDCL

'right up to Batajini [a small sheep-tending settlement near Orlec]’

(Houtzagers 1985:233)

Houtzagers notes, in addition to the fact that these toponyms do not decline after prepositions, yet another peculiarity: they are often preceded by na in the nominative case (1985:390). For example:

(52) tan se zove na Veščerenka

there REFL call-3SG on Veščerenka

‘that is called Veščerenka [a field]’ (Houtzagers 1985:390)

In essence, what seems to have happened is that the preposition na has become such an integral part of these toponyms that it has become fused to the noun. Perhaps it would be appropriate characterize the pattern as one in which the toponym is never referenced with a preposition (and, hence, not declined) due to the appearance that a preposition is already there, albeit only in form and not in function.

Meadows, which may be viewed as small untitled fields, begin to show a
more frequent incidence of ν-ν-iz: cf. SC. u livadi, Ukr. г przyi, Kash. w łace 'in a meadow'. The pattern na-na-s is quite widespread as well, however. For example, in Slovene:

(53) Visoka je bila trava na senožeti.

tall be-3SG been-? grass on meadow-LOC

'The grass in the meadow was tall.' (Cankar 1907:90-91)

and in Lower Sorbian:

(54) Na łace zwęząności rosćo zelko węρnosti.

on meadow-LOC fidelity-GEN grow-3SG herb-DIM veracity-GEN

'The little herb of veracity grows in the meadow of fidelity.' (Nowak 1988:270)

Other examples with na-na-s are found in East Slavic (Russ. на яру, Ukr. на prii) and West Slavic (Pol. na łace, Slk. na láke, Kash. na rum-plätze). This last example from Kashubian denotes a communal meadow, in opposition to the more ordinary w łace, simply 'meadow'.

Reducing the size of the expanse further yet, ν-ν-iz becomes the preferred preposition. Nearly all of the Slavic languages use ν-ν-iz to reference gardens; for example, SC. u vrtu, u bażti, Russ. в саду10, в огороде, Ukr. у саду, γ садку, Pol. w ogrodzie, Slk. v záhrade, LSrb. w gumnje, Kash. v wogrodze, Plb. vå vågërd 'in a garden'. Nonetheless, the use of na-na-s with gardens is not unknown;

---

10 A public garden takes either preposition in Russian (в сквере, на сквере 'in a public garden') (Miller 1991:13).
Slovene exhibits this pattern:

(55) Na vrtu smo imeli solato...

on garden-LOC be-1PL have-PTA.PTC lettuce-ACC

'We had lettuce in the garden...' (Milena Ahlin, p.c.)

although the construction with v-v-iz occurs as well:

(56) V vrtu Alenka že okopava rožice...

in garden-LOC Alenka already hoe-3SG roses-DIM,ACC

'Alenka is already hoeing the small roses in the garden...' (Milena Ahlin, p.c.)

Likewise, in Bulgarian:

(57) Всички момичета работят на градината.

all girls.the work-3PL on garden.the

'All the girls are working in the garden.' (Бояджиев 1952:99)

This construction with na-na-s occurs in West Slavic as well, apparently as the prescribed form: cf. Cz. na zahrádě, US. na zardži 'in a garden'.

The use of na-na-s with gardens is an innovation from the original Slavic pattern; Old Church Slavic used v-v-iz to reference gardens:

(58) ...и вь вертъ гробъ новъ...

and in garden-LOC grave new

'...and a new grave in the garden...' (Jn 19.41)

Since the languages which reference gardens with na-na-s also invariably reference fields with na-na-s, this innovation is presumably based on the metaphor of
viewing the garden as a small cultivated field.

Other metaphorical innovations involving a transition from *v-v-iz* to *na-na-s* with small, frequently enclosed, expanses are seen in the Slovene-West Slavic area. For example, Slovene is the only language in the South Slavic group to regularly reference a yard with *na-na-s* (i.e., *na dvorišču*). The others use *v-v-iz*: (cf. SC. *u dvorištu*, Mac. во двор 'in a yard'). However, West Slavic is replete with references to yards with *na-na-s*: Pol. *na podwórzu*, Slk. *na dvore*, LSrb. *na dworje*, USrb. *na dworje*, Kash. *na plėdvlezi* 'in a yard'.

Russian, according to Wade (1983:13) can take either preposition, depending on the size of the yard. He gives the following examples to illustrate this:

(59a) На широком дворе
   on broad-LOC yard-LOC
   'in a broad yard'

(59b) В крохотном дворике
   in tiny-LOC yard-DIM,LOC
   'in a tiny little yard'

Астафьева takes a slightly different approach, saying that *на дворе* 'in a yard' simply implies the territory outside, surrounding the house, while *в дворе* 'in a yard' denotes a space enclosed with a fence or buildings. She contends that the original pattern was that with *v-v-iz*, because 'yards in northern and eastern Russia were not only encircled by tall and solidly built fences and sheds, but they were covered, like a room' (1974:27).
Old Church Slavic provides additional evidence that the original pattern in Slavic was that with *v-v-iz*:

(60) ...и вниде... во дворъ архіеревъ.

and in.go-3SG,AOR in (court)yard-ACC high.priest's-ACC

'...and went... into the courtyard of the high priest' (Jn 18.15)

These patterns of innovative use of *v-v-iz* or *na-na-s* to reference areas originally referenced with the opposite pattern (*v-v-iz* for fields in Polish-East Slavic, *na-na-s* for gardens and yards in Slovene-West Slavic) would seem to imply some sort of West Slavic core out of which the change has eminated. The non-West Slavic languages which show the innovations are generally on the geographic periphery of their subgroup, and border on the West Slavic languages.

On the other hand, it would be inappropriate to assign too much weight to this hypothesis. Many geographical entities of this sort are, after all, uniform across the Slavic languages regarding their choice of preposition (e.g., SC. *u parku*, Ukr. *у парку*, Pol. *w parku* 'in a park'). Still others show fluctuation in one or two languages, but are constant elsewhere, including West Slavic (e.g., Russ. *в деревне*, Ukr. *в краї*, but SC. *на селу*, Mac. *на село*, Russ. *на дворе*, Pol. *na wsi, Cz. na venkově, Slk. na vidieku* 'in the countryside'). Nonetheless, it is intriguing to speculate on the motivations for the possible West Slavic, perhaps Polish, origins of some of these changes.
III.2 Political Features

Named political entities fall into four broad groups. First, there are countries; that is, fully autonomous, well-defined units. Regions may be subdivisions within these countries (e.g. Bavaria), or be divided between more than one country (e.g. Carinthia), and may or may not be strictly defined. Cities are just that, as they are commonly understood, and suburbs refers to subdivisions and outlying areas of cities.

III.2.1 Countries

The names of countries in the Slavic languages present a special problem because of the various parts of speech out of which they are constructed. In Slovenian, for example, the name of a country may be a noun of any gender, and/or an adjective of either feminine and/or neuter gender. 'China', for example, can be expressed in Slovene as Kina (a feminine noun), Kitajsko (a neuter adjective) or Kitajska (a feminine adjective). The forms expressing 'in China' are, respectively, v Kini, na Kitajskem and v Kitajski. However, since all such neuter adjectives take na-na-s, and all such feminine adjectives take v-v-ž, it seems best to regard the choice of preposition in these cases as entirely grammatically determined. This being the case, only the noun forms will be considered for Slovene. Consequently, a number of countries, like Poland (Polsko/Polska 'Poland', na Poljskem/v Poljski 'in Poland'), which do not have noun-forms by which they are represented, cannot be considered in Slovene.
Slovak, however, which also has both noun-forms (*Kanada, v Kanadi 'Canada, in Canada*) and adjective-forms (*Nemecko, v Nemecku 'Germany, in Germany*) for countries shows variation between *v-v-iz* and *na-na-s*. For example:

(61a) Zajtra som v Česko-Slovensku.

tomorrow be-1SG in Czecho-slovakia-LOC

'Tomorrow I will be in Czechoslovakia.'

(61b) Zajtra som na Slovensku.

tomorrow be-1SG on Slovakia-LOC

'Tomorrow I will be in Slovakia.'

The adjective forms are much more common than the noun forms, but they only occur in neuter form.

Serbocroatian, on the other hand, although it has both noun forms (*Italija, v Italiji 'Italy, in Italy*) and adjective forms (*Hrvatska, v Hrvatski 'Croatia, in Croatia*) for names of countries (these last, though equally frequent with the noun forms, only occur in the feminine), appears to always reference them with *v-v-iz*.

Amid this wide variety, however, there are some definite patterns. All of the Slavic languages refer to nearly all countries with *v-v-iz*. Those nations which are referred to with *na-na-s* are fairly few in number, and surprisingly consistent from language to language. It remains, then, to determine whether these countries referenced with *na-na-s* are so referenced because of an inherited pattern, or because of some feature common to them all.

Looking at the earliest Old Church Slavic texts, there is necessarily a lack
of many modern place names, either because they did not yet exist, or because no
early records exhibit them, if they were ever recorded at all. In general, however,
countries are referenced with ν-ν-izu. Consequently, the pattern of referring to
some countries with na-na-s does not seem to be one inherited from common
Slavic. Rather, it seems that the countries which are referenced with na-na-s
share some semantic similarities.

As far as I am aware, Russian usually refers to only one nation, Ukraine,
with the prepositions na-na-s.\textsuperscript{11}

(62) Вотъ откуда разливается воля и козачество
indeed hence flow-3SG freedom and Cossackness
на всю Украину!
on all Ukraine-ACC
'From here freedom and Cossackness flow to the entire Ukraine!'

(Гоголь 1835:362)

Although this passage was written well before the Russian Revolution, the
Ukraine was even thereafter (when it was at least nominally a separate republic
and not a part of Russia) referred to with na-na-s, and today, as a fully independ-
dent nation, continues to be referred to with na-na-s.\textsuperscript{12}

---

\textsuperscript{11}Miller (1991:16) notes also на Руси 'in Russia', but в старой Руси 'in old
Russia'. This form, Русь, is an old, rarely-encountered poetic form for the more
modern Россия 'Russia'.

\textsuperscript{12}Interestingly, Subcarpathian Ukraine is referenced with ν-ν-izu in Russian: в
Закарпатской Украине 'in Subcarpathian Ukraine'. Likewise, there is variation
between в/на Западной Украине 'in western Ukraine' (Miller 1991:16).
Астафьева (1974:29) claims that this use of *na* in Russian is actually borrowed from Ukrainian (cited in Cienki 1989:81). Similar Russian expressions with *na-na-s*, such as на Псковщине 'in the Pskov region', на Смоленщине 'in the Smolensk region' occur in and around the Pskov oblast, but not outside of these extreme western areas of Russia (Астафьева 1974:29-30). Ukrainian borrowings in Russian are certainly not uncommon; Wade (1982:24) notes the use of с 'off of' in place of из 'out of' (e.g., с Белорусси 'from Belarus', с магазина 'from a store') as a Ukrainianism. Ukrainian, like Russian, uses *na-na-s* when referring to Ukraine:

(63) Я живу на Україні.

I live-1SG on Ukraine-LOC

'I live in Ukraine' (Жуктенко et al. 1978:129)

in contrast to *v-v-із*, used for other countries:

(64) Я живу в Канаді.

I live-1SG in Canada-LOC

'I live in Canada' (Жуктенко et al. 1978:129)

However, *v-v-із* is also sometimes used in Ukrainian when referring to Ukraine. George Y. Shevelov (1963:197) comments: 'Both these constructions [на Україні, в Україні 'in Ukraine'] are used side by side..., and this parallelism has been preserved until today, with, perhaps, a slight predominance of the construction with *na*.'

It is often suggested that the use of *na-na-s* with Ukraine stems from the
element *kraj* 'edge' in its name, the idea being that Ukraine was on the edge of the Russian Empire. In Russian and Ukrainian, 'edge' is referenced with *na-na-s* (cf. Russ. на краю 'on the edge'). This theory is advocated by Sullivan (1984:206), who suggests that the choice of preposition stems from 'native speaker intuition' and 'extra-language prejudice'. Rather than exploring it further, however, he dismisses it by claiming that it 'is not a significant exception' (1984:206).

Астафьева traces the source of preposition choice, as well as the etymology of *Ukraine* itself, to the expression на окраине 'in the outskirts' (1974:29). This corresponds to another meaning for *kraj*, namely 'region' (cf. Ru. в краю, Uk. в краю 'in a region'). This concept is referenced with *v-v-iz*, as is seen in the name *Ukraine* itself. Consequently, the reason for the use of *na-na-s* with *Ukraine* must lie outside the name and in the nature of the place itself.

An interesting perspective is gained from examining data of this sort in Polish. While Ukraine seems to be the only nation referenced with *na-na-s* in Russian and Ukrainian, Polish uses *na-na-s* with not only Ukraine, but Lithuania, Hungary and Belarus as well.\(^\text{13}\)

Frank Y. Gladney (1983:36) says that Polish uses *na-na-s* for Lithuania and Hungary because these two nations are 'traditionally regarded as outlying areas'. Portions of ethnic Lithuanian and Ukrainian territory were included both in the

\(^{13}\) Пo. на Україні 'in Ukraine', на Літві 'in Lithuania', на В'єреч 'in Hungary', на Білорусі 'in Belarus'
interwar Polish republic and before the partitions of 1772-1795. Parts of modern Belarus were under Polish control both before 1795 and during the interwar period. However, in order to include Hungarian territory in the Polish state, one has to go back to the 15th and 16th centuries. The Polish King Władysław III became king of Hungary in 1440. This did not last long, however, and by 1526 Hungary was divided between Ottoman and Habsburg control.

Hence, any notion of Hungary as an historical region of Poland must be only the faint echo of a brief historical period. If, however, this is the reason why Hungary is referenced with na-na-s, one must ask why Latvia, which formed part of the Polish state before 1795, is referenced in modern Polish with n-ν-iz rather than na-na-s.

Henri Grappin (1949:121) states that 'depuis la constitution de l'État lituanien indépendant, on dit normalement w Litwie «en Lituanie», mais l'ancien na Litwie n'est pas tout à fait sorti d'usage'. Perhaps this change was some sort of government decree rather than an actual change in popular speech habit. Regarding Hungary, Grappin (1949:121) says only that 'la tournure na Węgrzech «en Hongrie» s'est maintenue', but Wenzel Vondrák (1928:305) notes the construction we Węgrzech. If Poles did start saying w Litwie and we Węgrzech after the first World War, half a century later the commonest forms are still those with na-na-s.

---

14 Lithuania united with Poland in 1386.

15 Maria Zagórksa Brooks (1973:343) also notes the use of w Ukrainie 'in Ukraine', but states that only na-na-s is used with Hungary.
The commonality among these views seems to be an idea that the countries referenced with *na-na-s* are somehow, oftentimes because of historical reasons, viewed as less than fully autonomous entities. In effect, the use of *na-na-s* reduces these countries from the level of nation (conceptually, at least) to that of region.

Czech and Slovak also use *na-na-s* for at least one country; namely, Slovakia. In Slovak we see:

(65a) Zajtra som na Slovensku.

tomorrow be-1SG on Slovakia-LOC

'Tomorrow I will be in Slovakia.'

(65b) Zajtra som v Česko-Slovensku.

tomorrow be-1SG in Czechoslovakia-LOC

'Tomorrow I will be in Czechoslovakia.'

Similarly, in Czech:

(66a) Peter je na Slovensku.

Peter be-1SG on Slovakia-LOC

'Peter is in Slovakia.'

(66b) Peter je v Československu.

Peter be-1SG in Czechoslovakia-LOC

'Peter is in Czechoslovakia.'

Again, the idea seems to be that Slovakia is more a region of a greater entity than an autonomous political unit. Slovakia has, of course, been just that for most of its history. Except for a brief period of independence during the second
World War, Slovakia’s entire existence had been as a province of either Hungary or the Czechoslovak state before January 1, 1993.

The South Slavic languages do not share in this pattern of designating some countries with *na-na-s* (except, of course, in Slovene where the prepositions are grammatically determined). 'In Ukraine', for example, is expressed by Slv. *v Ukrajini*, SC. *u Ukrajini*, Bul. *в Украина*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>ᴄ Adjective</th>
<th>ᵃ Adjective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bul.</td>
<td>в Украина</td>
<td>в Хрватскo**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC.</td>
<td>u Italiji</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slv.</td>
<td>v Kini na Kubi</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac.</td>
<td>во Македонијa</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol.</td>
<td>w Anglii na Węgrzech</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz.</td>
<td>v Kanadi na Kubě</td>
<td>v Německu na Slovensku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slk.</td>
<td>v Kanadi na Kubě</td>
<td>v Nemecku na Slovensku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kash.</td>
<td>w Austriji</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ.</td>
<td>в России на Украине</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukr.</td>
<td>в Канадi на Украинi</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bel.</td>
<td>у Беларусi на Беларусi</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Prepositional Usage, Grammatical Categories and Examples of Names of Nations in the Slavic Languages

* no such form known ** rare
III.2.2 Regions

This leads directly to the treatment of named regions in the Slavic languages; if some countries which were historically viewed as regions are referenced today with *na-na-s*, notwithstanding current political circumstances, the concept of *region* may be at the root of the usage pattern.

In Old Church Slavic, regions are referenced with *v-v-iz*. For example, in John 7.1 we read:

(67) И хождаше Ἰςυς по сих в в Галилей…
and walk-3SG,IMPF Jesus after these-LOC in Galilee-LOC

'And Jesus walked in Galilee after these things…'

Similarly, in John 11.7:

(68) ...идемъ во Йудею паки.
    go-1PL,IMP in Judea-ACC again

'... let us go into Judea again.'

The contemporary use of *na-na-s* for regions seems to be most characteristic of the West Slavic languages; the South and East Slavic languages use *na-na-s* sparingly when making reference to regions, and tend to limit this pattern to regions within their own political spheres.

Slovene has both adjectives and nouns which are used as names for regions. As with the names of countries (see page 38), those names which are adjectives have their preposition grammatically determined (e.g., *na Bavarskem* 'in Bavaria', *v Koroški* 'in Carinthia'). Of those names which are nouns, most are feminine in
gender, although there does exist a limited number of neuter nouns used for regions; these end in the neuter collective suffix -je (Slovenska... 1962:42). Most of these take v-v-iz (e.g., v Moravčah 'in Moravia', v Dalmaciji 'in Dalmatia'), but a limited number appear with na-na-s (e.g., na Krasu 'in the Karst [a limestone region] na Barju 'in the Barje [a moor region]') (Slovanska... 1962:42). This last example (and perhaps the former for similar reason) is given na-na-s due to association with barje 'swamp, moor', because one says na barju 'in the swamp, on the moor' in Slovene. In any case, I am not aware of any extra-Slovenian region names which take na-na-s in Slovene.

Region names of this type (i.e., those which take na-na-s because of analogy with geographical features which also take na-na-s) will not be considered in this section, as they have already been addressed in the material dealing with geographical features (mountains, islands, etc.) (see page 14 ff.).

The pattern for referencing region names in Serbo-Croat is likewise v-v-iz. For example: u Moraviji 'in Moravia', u Slavoniji 'in Slavonia'. Likewise, in Bulgarian, regions both within and without the country are referenced with v-v-iz: в Добруджа 'in Dobruja', в Далмация 'in Dalmatia'.

In East Slavic, na-na-s is used sparingly (if at all) with reference to regions. We have already seen that Russian makes reference to Ukraine with na-na-s, but whether it is conceived of as a region or not, this has been analyzed as a Ukraini-

---

16Miklosich (1868-1874:662) cites several antiquated examples of regions in Serbo-Croat referenced with na-na-s; for example на Valsehь 'in Wallachia' and на Hercegovini 'in Herzegovina'.
anism.\textsuperscript{17} Regions both internal and external to Russia are otherwise usually referenced in Russian with \textit{v-n-iz}: в Сибири 'in Siberia', в Моравии 'in Moravia', etc., although \textit{na-na-s} is observed as well:

\begin{quote}
(69) Не можно ни в Туречину ни на Тартарву.  \\
\textit{we able-1PL not in Turkey-ACC not on Tartary-ACC}  \\
'We can neither go to Turkey nor to Tartary.' (Гоголь 1835:367)
\end{quote}

Turning to West Slavic, however, the picture is considerably different. Here, \textit{na-na-s} is the standard pattern for referring to regions. In Polish, for example, \textit{na-na-s} is used for major named areas of countries (Karolak and Wasilewska 1986:251). Grappin (1949:120-21) says that Polish uses 'locatif avec \textit{na quand s’agit d’espaces non définis ou constituant des parties d’un tout, comme une région'. Consequently, in Polish we read \textit{na Słasku} 'in Silesia', \textit{na Morawach} 'in Moravia', \textit{na Syberii} 'in Siberia'.

Brooks (1975:343) does mention a pair of exceptions to this pattern in Polish. One says \textit{w Poznańskim} 'in Poznań district' and \textit{w Kieleckim} 'in Kielce district', for example.

Czech and Slovak tend to use \textit{na-na-s} for internal regions; for example, Cz. \textit{na Moravě} 'in Moravia'. However, \textit{v-n-iz} can be used as well: \textit{v Čechách} 'in Bohemia' (Poldauf and Šprunk 1968:264). Vondrák (1928:305), believes that the use of \textit{na-na-s} for Moravia is originally derived from reference to the Morava river

\textsuperscript{17}Interestingly, Belarussian refers to Belarus with either \textit{v-n-iz} or \textit{na-na-s}: на Беларусі, в Беларусі 'in Belarus'. Russian, nonetheless, references Belarus with \textit{v-n-iz}: в Белорусии.
(cf. page 28).

In Kashubian na-na-s is sometimes used for regions; for example, na

_Pomorsci, na Pomorzu 'im Pomerania'. This example may, however, be influenced
by the element mor 'sea' in the name. Reference to the area inhabited by the
Kashubians, although it is more of a conceptual, ethnically-defined region than a
political entity, can be made with na-na-s:

(70)  Ciej u naju na Kaszubach dzecko zaniemoże...
    if at us-GEN on Kashubia-LOC child become.ill-3SG

'If a child among us in Kashubia should become sick...' (Neureiter
1973:46)

However, v-v-iz can also be used:

(71)  ...bo Judősza nji mō v Kaszēbjech
    for Judas-GEN not have-3SG in Kashubia-LOC

'...for there is no Judas in Kashubia.' (Neureiter 1973:126)

Similar variation is exhibited in Upper Sorbian: _na Serskim_ (Jentsch 1980),

_w Serbach_ (Śewc 1968) 'in Sorbia'; this alternation, however, may be that same
variation seen in Slovene between noun and adjective forms (see page 38). Other
regions are frequently referenced with v-v-iz: LSrb. _we Lužicy, USrb. we Lužicy 'in
Lusatia'.

It seems then, that there is a tendency among the West Slavic languages—
especially Polish—to use na-na-s with reference to regions. This pattern is unparal-
leled in the South and East Slavic groups, although traces are seen in East Slavic,
perhaps as a result of influence from Polish. Polish influence was especially strong in Belarus, where Polish hegemony was achieved in 1386 and the Polish language had considerable effect on the Belarussian language (Entwistle and Morison 1949:281). Ukrainian underwent similar influence from Polish (Entwistle and Morison 1949:283).

III.2.3 Cities

Cities are almost always referenced with ν-ν-ιζ in the Slavic languages. This was true in Old Church Slavic as well:

(72) Ἡ πρύδε ἐν Ναζαρέτ...  
and come-3SG,AOR in Nazareth-ACC  
'And he came to Nazareth...' (Jn 4.16)

Even the city of Tyre, which was located on a peninsula, was referenced with ν-ν-ιζ:

(73) υπκω αὗτη ἐν Τύρῳ καὶ Σίδωνι...  
even if in Tyre-LOC and Sidon-LOC  
'Even if in Tyre and Sidon...' (Mt 11.21)

Gladney (1983:36) connects this usage with the historical idea of the walled city, and explains the use of ν-ν-ιζ as a reflection of this now-forgotten idea of the city as a walled container. Be this as it may, it seems more likely that cities are referenced with ν-ν-ιζ simply because there never was any motivation to mark them through reference with na-na-s.
In any case, one language which takes exception to this otherwise nearly universal rule is Slovene. In Slovene, most cities are referenced with \( v \), but others are referenced with \( na-na-s \), as in this proverb:

(74) Če greš na Dunaj, pusti trebuh zunaj.

if go-2SG on Vienna-ACC let-2SG belly outside

'If you go to Vienna, give your stomach free rein.'

or even with \( k-pri-ot \):

(75) Mi smo bili pri Lenartu.

we be-3PL been at Lenart-DAT

'We were in Lenart.'

This last case, those city names which are referenced with \( k-pri-ot \), can be explained fairly easily. According to the *Slovenski Pravopis*, city names which are derived from personal names are referenced with the prepositions \( k-pri-ot \).\(^{18}\) This includes also cities prefixed by *Sveti/Sveta* 'Saint', such as *Sveti Ivan*, of which there are some twenty in Slovenia proper.

In Slovene, as in many other Slavic languages, the prepositions \( k-pri-ot \) are used in place of \( v-v-iz \) and \( na-na-s \) with reference to persons; for example:

(76) Gostje gredo k receptorju.

guests go-3PL to receptionist-DAT

'The guests are going to the receptionist.' (Kranjec 1990:55)

\(^{18}\) However, the village of *Lovrenc na Pohorju*, though derived from the personal name *Lovrenc* 'Lawrence', takes \( v-v-iz \).
However, those cities prefixed by Šent- (also 'Saint'), such as Šentjakob, have apparently become depersonalized and do not take k-pri-ot. Nonetheless, the preposition which accompanies them is not predictable, as they may take either v-v-iz (e.g., v Šentjakobu) or na-na-s (e.g., na Šentjoštěu).

While the cities which are referenced with k-pri-ot are numerically quite few, those with na-na-s are rather common. This occurs not only in the literary language, but in the dialects as well; for example, na Sulbico 'to Stolvizza' in the Resian dialect of northeastern Italy (Steenwijk 1992). They are so common, in fact, that when Ivan Cankar set his 1907 novel Hlapec Jernej in njegova pravica in the fictional town of Betajnova, he chose to make it a na-na-s town:

(77) Obstrmeli so ljude na Betajnovi.

astonished arc-3PL people on Betajnova-LOC

'The people in Betajnova were astonished.' (Cankar 1907:1)

At first, it seems impossible to find any pattern in the distribution the prepositions v-v-iz and na-na-s with Slovenian city names. Gradually, however, some patterns begin to emerge.

First, there are certain towns which take na-na-s and are physically located in a high or elevated location, such as Areh and Pesek, two settlements located at elevations well over 1000 meters near the crest of the Pohorje mountain range.

Second, there are towns which take na-na-s and are somehow associated with mountains or other features which also take na-na-s. Among these are Poljane (cf. polje 'field'), Brdo (cf. brdo 'hill') and Vrhnika (cf. vrh 'summit'). This
last town is at an elevation of only 293 meters.

An extension of this may be towns which are named after rivers, since rivers are referenced with *na-na-s* in Slovene. Hence, the towns of *Reka* (SC. Rijeka—cf. Slv. *reka* 'river'), *Pivka* (on the Pivka River), *Mima* (on the Mirna River) and *Dunaj* (Eng. Vienna—cf. Slv. *Donava* 'Danube') take *na-na-s* (cf. page 28).

However, neither of these measures is completely satisfactory. The town of *Kranjska gora* (located at a high elevation of 810 meters and containing the element *gora* 'mountain') and *Gorica* (literally 'little mountain', It. Gorizia) both take the prepositions *v-v-iz*. *Dravograd* and *Vipava*, located on the Drava and Vipava Rivers, respectively, both take *v-v-iz*.

The reasons for referencing many cities with *na-na-s* remains unclear. The *Pravopis* itself states that 'here we do not have a firm footing' (Slovenska... 1962:42). Three towns containing a root meaning 'birch', *Brezje, Breznica* and *Brezovica*, take the prepositions *na-na-s*. The villages of *Dol* and *Dolsko*, both derived from a root meaning 'low'—leading us to expect *v-v-iz*—take either *v-v-iz* or *na-na-s*, the latter despite the fact that it is a neuter adjective in form.

Slovenes readily admit that, unless they are told which set of prepositions is commonly used with a city, they really have no idea whether to use *v-v-iz* or *na-na-s*. One example is the village of *Dobrova pri Ljubljani* (perhaps < *dobra* 'woodland') which properly takes the prepositions *na-na-s*, but was referred to with *v-v-iz* by a stranger to the area (Jera Rojko, p.c.). This is, of course a prob-
lem only with small villages; there is almost no confusion with well-known places which take na-na-s. Also, there are towns which vary (like the aforementioned Dol and Dolsko) in which preposition set they take. The well-known city of Ptuju is referred to by its natives of the city with na-na-s, but by other Slovenes with v-v-iz. Perhaps there is some association of the town with the old fortress located there, dating back to the time of Trajan; cf.:

(78) arheološka izkopovanja na Ptujskem gradu
archaeological excavation on Ptuj-LOC,SG castle-LOC
'archaeological excavation at Ptuj castle' (Slovenska... 1962:263)

Similarly, Šentilj takes v-v-iz according to the Slovenski Pravopis (1962:862), but in Bojan Bauman et al. (1991:43-44) we read:

(79) Ob štirih popoldne se je na Šentilju
at four-GEN afternoon REFL be-3SG on Šentilj-LOC
predalo še zadnjih 18 članov posadke.
surrendered-¢SG yet last 18 member-GEN,PL garrison-GEN
'The last 18 members of the garrison surrendered at Šentilj at four o’clock in the afternoon.'

Finally, it seems that there are circumstances under which even cities which always take na-na-s in the literary language may also take v-v-iz. In literature we can read:
(80) V cesarsko mesto, v cesarski Dunaj, narovnost do in imperial city-ACC in imperial Vienna-ACC direct to cesarja!
emperor-GEN
'To the imperial city, to imperial Vienna, straight to the emperor!'
(Cankar 1907:80)

Here Dunaj, which normally takes na-na-s, has v-v-iz instead. It is not an idiosyn-
crasy of the author, for a few pages later we see:

(81) Odkod si in kaj pošneš na Dunaju?
whither be-2SG and what do-2SG on Vienna-LOC

'Where are you from and what are you doing in Vienna?' (Cankar
1907:86)

Rather, it seems that adjective cesarsko 'imperial', inserted between the preposi-
tion and the city name, has changed the construction, so that it no longer refers to
Vienna qua Vienna, but a more abstract notion which is somehow removed from
the actual Vienna and thus no longer requires na-na-s. This principle may be at
play in Russ. в старой Руси 'in old Russia', в Западной Украине 'in western
Ukraine' (see page 40 note 11, page 40 note 12).

Vera Javarek and Miroslava Sudjić (1963:185) state that in Serbo-Croat 'na
is used with many names of places associated with lakes, rivers, etc.' This does not
usually seem to be the case, and was denied by a native speaker from Zagreb. The
only place names with which I have found this to be generally true is with Sloven-
ian cities which take *na-na-s*. For example:

(82) Na Vršiču ima nekoliko turističkih i planinarskih hostels.

on Vršič-LOC have-3SG several tourist and mountain domova.

hostels-GEN

'At Vršič there are several tourist and mountain hostels.' (Krlježa VIII:546)

Although several other cities which take *na-na-s* in Slovene also take *na-na-s* in Serbo-Croat (e.g., *Bled, Vrhnika*), many others do not. For example:

(83) U Jesenicama se osjeća nedostatak prostora.

in Jesenice-LOC REFL feel-3SG deficiency space-GEN

'There seems to be a lack of space in Jesenice.' (Krlježa IV:488)

*Pivka*, which also takes *na-na-s* in Slovene, is referenced with *υ-υ-ιζ* in Serbo-Croat.

Cities we might expect to find referenced with *na-na-s* in Serbo-Croat according to Javarek and Subić, but do not, are those associated with rivers (e.g. *Krapina, u Krapini*—on the Krapina River; *Niš, u Nišu*—on the Nišava River) and lakes (e.g. *Skadar, u Skadaru*—on Lake Skadar; *Ohrid, u Ohridu*—on Lake Ohrid).

One village in the southern part of the Serbo-Croat language area, Kosovo, may have once been referenced with *na-na-s* in Serbo-Croat:

(84) погинуо на Косову

perish-PTA.PTC on Kosovo-LOC

'he perished at Kosovo' (Караџић 1852:390)
However, Бук Стевановић Караџић may be referring to the field rather than the settlement in this example, even though the usual form Косово поле 'Kosovo field' is not used. Modern speakers of Serbo-Croat use na-na-s to refer to the field (na Kosovu 'in the field of Kosovo') but v-n-iz to refer to the settlement there (u Kosovu 'in the village of Kosovo') (Dubravka Milas, p.c.). Predictably, perhaps, Slovene uses na-na-s not only for the field (na Kosovem Polju 'in the field of Kosovo'), but also for the village (na Kosovu 'in the village of Kosovo') (cf. this in Polish, page 32).

On the other hand, Михаило Стевановић cites several place names, including Cetinje and Rijeka, as taking na-na-s. (1973:490, 1980:391). He says that 'only those who do not know how one speaks when mentioning places are able to err in the use of these prepositions.' He even says that only a foreigner would say

(85) Кал смо били у Цетињу...

when be-1PL been in Cetinje-LOC

'When we were in Cetinje...’ (Стевановић 1973:490)

While Cetinje does take na-na-s throughout Serbo-Croat, Rijeka is definitely referenced with v-n-iz in Croatian. The only conclusion seems to be that the use of prepositions with cities varies by dialect in Serbo-Croat.

It seems safe to conclude, then, that no Slavic language besides Slovene regularly references cities with the prepositions na-na-s. The use of these

19 W.A.L. Stokhof (1973:3) reeports Kash. na Bólnicy 'in Boleniec', but aside from this solitary examples, all other cities in Kashubian are referenced with v-n-iz (e.g., ve Varšavje 'in Warsaw', v Mjérvxovje 'in Mirachowo'). Similarly, Vera Bojić
prepositions in Slovene is quite consistent, although the reasons behind their use are not entirely clear.

III.2.4 Suburbs

Subdivisions of cities themselves, however, are another matter. In Polish, *na-na-s* is used invariably for such areas (e.g., *na Mokotowie, na Bielanach* 'in Mokotów, in Bielany [suburbs of Warsaw]'). Gladney (1983:36) feels that this derives from viewing the suburb as an open, unbounded area, in contrast to the walled city. This is also the pattern in Czech, in which one says *na Smíchově, na Hradčanech* 'in Smíchov, in Hradčany [sections of Prague]' (Poldauf and Šprunk 1968:264).

However, this is not true in all of the Slavic languages. In Russian, for example, Bielany is referred to with *в Белянах*. In Bulgarian suburbs are also referred to with *в-в-из*:

---

and Wolf Oschlies (1984:13) report the use of *на* in Мак. на Струга 'in Struga' in a folk song, but they later (p. 128) state that geographical names take *в-в-из* in Macedonian (e.g. во Скопје 'in Skopje'). Similarly, Блаже Конески (1954:232) cites на града Стамбула 'to the city of Istanbul', again from a folk song.
(86) Въ Царевецъ, освенъ царь, жилъ и
in Carevec besides tsar.the lived also
патриархъ.
patriarch.the

'Besides the tsar, the patriarch also lived in Carevec [a section of Veliko Tarnovo].' (Данчовъ и Данчовъ 1936:1663).

In Slovene, the choice of preposition used to refer to named sections of cities is just as varied as that used for referencing cities themselves. In a sample of over one hundred such names of the sections and outlying areas of Ljubljana, the pattern v-v-iz is the predominant one, used for some two-thirds of the names; for example, v Savljah, v Šentjakobu, v Šiški 'in Savlje, in Šentjakob, in Šiška'. Nearly one-third, though, take the pattern na-na-s; for example, na Poljanah, na Trai, na Pšati 'in Poljane, in Trata, in Pšata'. Of the remainder, some can take either v-v-iz or na-na-s depending on the speaker (v or na Pržanju 'in Pržanj', v or na Vevčah 'in Vevče'. Finally, there is a small number which take za-za-iz; literally, 'behind' and 'out of'. Among these are za Bežigradom 'in Bežigrad' and za Dvorom 'in Dvor.'

Taking the v-v-iz pattern as the basic pattern, some of the 'aberrant' patterns can be explained through analogy. Trata, for example, literally means 'lawn', and since one is na trati 'on a lawn' in Slovene, one is na Trati 'in Trata': as well. Likewise, poljane literally means 'large fields' and, as one is na polju 'in a field' in Slovene, one is likewise na Poljanah 'in Poljane'.
However, the reasoning behind many of the na-na-s names is not clear at all, although some patterns can be seen. For example, there are several na-na-s places which have names of trees: Dbnice 'a variety of apple', Bokalce 'a variety of plum', Brinje 'juniper' and Rakova Jelša 'alder'—this is reminiscent of the city names in na-na-s which contain the root 'birch' (see page 53).

Of those names which exhibit za-za-iz, it is possible that Dvr is so marked because it lies at the foot of Dvorski hrib, a small (465 m) hill some 750 meters to the west-southwest. This can be compared to the village of Zagraše, some 100 meters to the northeast of Gradišče, another small (461 m) hill. Unlike Zagraše, however, from the perspective of the inhabited surroundings Dvr lies before, rather than behind, its associated hill, and the name Dvorski hrib suggests that the hill was named after the settlement rather than vice-versa. Of further interest is the fact that the noun dvor 'courtyard' (presumably the root of Dvr) takes na-na-s.

Bežigrad is equally puzzling. It is a rather large district in central Ljubljana, north of the Ljubljanica River, but its etymology is uncertain. The element grad 'castle' takes na-na-s (probably because of the usual location of a castle on top of a hill). Bežigrad could be conceived of as being behind the old castle in Ljubljana, but it is not particularly close to the castle (one must at least descend the hill and cross the river to get there), so this does not explain the pattern za-za-iz.

While the use of na-na-s for suburbs in Polish may reflect a contemporary perspective on the spatial orientation of a suburb as opposed to a city, it seems
unlikely that this use of *na-na*-s in Polish is derived from some common Slavic pattern, since the other Slavic languages usually (despite the wide variation found in Slovene) employ *v-v-iz* to express location in a suburb.

III.3 Social Features

There are three areas of social features between which *na-na*-s and *v-v-iz* are distributed in the Slavic languages. First, there are institutions, referring to physical, man-made structures such as airports and banks. Second, there are audience events, such as ballets and weddings. These events generally do not demand the active participation of most people present at them, and are not overtly related to any particular physical structure. Finally, there are activities, such as parties and trials. Most, if not all, of the people in attendance at these events are actively involved in some way.

III.3.1 Institutions

Of these three types of social features, the first is the most concretely spatial. Nonetheless, some locations which are included in this category are not necessarily any more 'real' than those in the other two categories. For example, although a school is a physical structure with an exact location, it can become in some statements quite an indefinite place (e.g., 'Many children eat lunch at school.'). The other two categories, audience events and activities, are not necessarily bound to any particular location (though we may typically conceive of
weddings taking place in churches and trials in courtrooms), but they are treated as places in the Slavic languages in much the same way that English may treat them as places (i.e., 'I was at the wedding.', 'Did you go to the trial?').

Charles E. Townsend (1980:76) states that in Russian the 'most persistent trouble spot in the realm of unbound prepositional usage'—i.e., when the choice of preposition is not automatically determined by the verb—'is whether one assigns на or в to large and spacious objects, rooms, buildings, establishments...'. In Russian, as in the other Slavic languages, there is a bewildering array of seemingly unrelated structures which, despite the fact that one is usually literally inside of them, are nonetheless referenced with the prepositions на-na-s.

For example, in Lower Lusatian:

(87) Wona jo dważasća lét na grože služyla.

she be-3SG twenty year-GEN,PL on castle-LOC served-?

'She served in the castle for twenty years.' (Nowak 1988:141)

and similarly, in Slovak:

(88) Bola dva razy na pošte.

been-? two time-GEN on post.office-LOC

'She was twice at the post office' (Konuš 1969:529)

we observe physical, container-like enclosures into which people go, but which are referenced with на-na-s.

Also, certain physical structures which are not necessarily containers—that is, they need not physically enclose any area—are referenced with на-na-s even
when English and many other European languages would never admit the possibility of referring to them with 'on' or its equivalent. For example, in Slovak:

(89) Íšiel d’alej na vel’kú stanicu.

went-3SG further on big-ACC station-ACC

‘He continued to a big railway station.’ (Bázlik 1985:14)

III.3.1.1 Metaphors of Elevation

A number of these institutions which take na-na-s can be explained by considering the treatment of geographical features in Slavic. For example, there is a wide range of traditionally elevated areas which are frequently referenced with na-na-s in the Slavic languages. Among these are castles (Slv. na gradu, Cz. na hradu, LSrb. na grože, Plb. no gárde 'in a castle'), lofts (SlvR. ta-na liwu, LSrb. na najšpje, Plb. no baně 'in a loft'), belltowers (Russ. на колокольне 'in a belltower'), and pulpits (Plb. no průstōra 'in a pulpit'). All of these can be metaphorically viewed as hills.

Less obvious, perhaps, but probably related to the idea of elevation are roadways. Roads were originally, of course, built upon higher ground in order to better preserve them during bad weather. Roads are referenced with na-na-s in Slavic, as seen in the following example from Slovene:
(90) Poteuham je bil, kakor bi ga človek vagabond be-3SG been-3 like be-3SG,cond he-GEN fellow ne srečal rad na cesti.
not met-3 happily on road-LOC

'He was a vagabond, such as a man would not want to meet on the road' (Cankar 1907:66)

In addition, we find Russ. на дороге, на пути, Ukr. на дорозі, Pol. na drodze, LSrb. na drose, Plb. no pot'ě 'on a road'. The notion of height is still seen in the English word highway, and highways also take na-na-s in Slavic (e.g., Pol. na szosie 'on the highway').

Similarly, streets are referenced with na-na-s both in the generic sense (Bul. на улица, SC. na ulici, Russ. на улице, Ukr. на булиці, Pol. na ulicy, Kash. na drodze 'in the street') and in the specific sense (in this example from Slovak):

(91) Na Baker Street som prišiel metrom.

on Baker Street be-1SG arrived-3 subway-INST

'I came to Baker Street on the underground.' (Bážlik 1985:14)

This pattern, preserved in all of the Slavic languages, was evident in common Slavic, as can be seen from Old Church Slavic texts. For example:
(92) и́дите скоро на ра́споути́а и ствоги
out.go-2SG,IMP quickly on streets-ACC and alleys-ACC
gрады
city-GEN
'go out quickly into the streets and alleys of the city' (Lk 14.21)
and:

(93) и́дите на паути
out.go-2SG,IMP on roads-ACC
'go out in the roads' (Lk 14.23)

However, Polish has developed an alternative to using na-na-s with streets. B.W. Mazur (1983:108) says: 'Although you don't live, literally, on a/the street but, as Polish logically enough insists, in a house by, alongside it, common usage tolerates the inaccuracy.' He then gives the following pair, apparently equivalent in Polish:

(94a) Na któ́rej ulicy meszkasz?
on which street-LOC dwell-2SG
'On which street do you live?'

(94b) Przy któ́rej ulicy meszkasz?
at which street-LOC dwell-2SG
'On which street do you live?'

Additionally, Аста́фьева notes that in 19th century Russian there was really no fixed formula for making refernced to named streets as there is now.
Whereas named streets in modern Russian are referenced with *na-na-s* and named alleys or lanes with *v-v-ž*, either preposition could appear with streets (1974:30).

III.3.1.2 Metaphors of Water

Just as political units associated with water frequently take *na-na-s*, so do many social institutions. Although these do not always take *na-na-s* in all of the Slavic languages, this is their most frequent prepositional pattern. For example, *na-na-s* is seen with skating rinks (Russ. на катке, Pol. *na lodowisku* 'at a skating rink'), spas (Russ. на курорте, but Pol. *w uzdrowisku* 'at a spa'), public baths (Mac. на каньне, but Slv. *v kopališču* 'at a public bath'), and swimming pools (Slv. *na kopališču*,20 Pol. *na basenie, na pływalni*, but Russ. в бассейне 'at a swimming pool'). One of the districts of Ljubljana which is referenced with *na-na-s*, Kolezija, was said by an informant to be so referenced because a swimming pool is located there (Vinko Ahlin, p.c.).

Another district of Ljubljana, Studenec, may be referenced with *na-na-s* for similar reasons. Going back to a root *studen*, meaning 'cold', the word *studenec* denotes 'well' or 'spring'. Wells, as a sphere of location, are referenced with *na-na-s* in Old Church Slavic:

---

20 The non-mutual exclusivity of these categories (baths, spas, etc.) is highlighted by the Slovene word *kopališče*, meaning both 'swimming pool' and 'public bath', differentiated only by the choice of preposition.
(95) Иисус съездне тако на источниць.

Jesus sit-3SG,IMPF thus on well-LOC

'Jesus... was sitting by the well.' (Jn 4.6)

III.3.1.3 Metaphors of Expanse

Another geographical division, that of expanses, comes to play when assigning prepositions to some other social institutions. We have seen that broad expanses, like fields, are generally referenced with na-na-s (see page 28). In similar fashion, man-made features which have a broad surface area and, frequently, lack an interior, are referenced with na-na-s. Some of these are shared with English in their reference with 'on'; for example, stages and building floors: (cf. SC. na stupanju, Russ. на сцене 'on a stage'; SC. na katu, Russ. на этаже, Ukr. на поверхні 'on a floor'). Others, however, seem more obscure.

Marketplaces, for example, are almost always referenced with na-na-s. This is likewise the case in Old Church Slavic:

(96) И цъловани на торжишахь...

and greetings on marketplaces-LOC

'And greetings in the marketplaces...' (Mt 23.7)

Additionally, in the modern Slavic languages, we see Bul. на пазар, SC. na placu, Slv. na trgu, Mac. на пазар, Russ. на рынке, на рынке, на базаре, Ukr. на bazari, Pol. na rynku, LSrb. na marku, Kash. na renku, na torgu, na jomarku, Plb.
no maisku 'at the marketplace'.

Obviously, since marketplaces are broad, open, flat areas they are conceived of as field-like entities; before the advent of literal wall-to-wall asphalt and concrete in cities, markets were simply held in vacant fields. The same principle is at work in the case of town squares (SC. na trgu, Slv. na trgu, Russ. на площади, Ukr. на площа, Pol. na placu,22 Cz. na náměstí), parking lots (Pol. na parkingu), playgrounds (Slov. na igrišče), stadiums (Russ. на стадионе, Ukr. на стадіоні, Pol. na stadionie), airports (SC. na aerodromu, Slv. na letališče, Russ. на аэродроме,23 Pol. na lotnisku, Cz. na letišti, Srb. на летишић), farms (SC. na selu, na farmu, Russ. на ферме, на хуторе, Pol. na farmie),24 and cemeteries (Slov. na pokopališče, Russ. на кладбище, Pol. na cmentarzu, Kash. на smětőru, Plb. no cart'ěv).

Miller (1991:14) identifies a category of nouns in Russian which denote an open area for sports or play and combine with на-na-s. These all fall into the category of metaphors of expanse. However, he lists the word бассейн 'pool' as

21The Polish and Kashubian variants w rynku, w renku 'at the marketplace' exist with the preposition в. Additionally, Polish forms w rynku 'in the marketplace' when referring to buildings located therein (Karolak and Danuta 1986:194)

22Polish here admits the alternate przy placu, literally 'at the square' (cf. Pol. przy ulicy 'at the street').

23Cienki (1989:83) feels that the use of в в аэропорту 'at the airport' is due to the use of в в порту 'in a port', on which it is modelled.

24Collective farms, however, take в в: Russ. в колхозе, Ukr. у колгоспи, Slk. в družstve.
an exception, since it combines with \( v-v-iz \). The stipulation 'for sports or play' is really unnecessary, although accurate, since open areas receive \( na-na-s \) without any further qualification. When the pool is viewed as a water-filled depression, \( v-v-iz \) comes naturally to it (see page 71).

There is some evidence that the use of \( na-na-s \) with some of these features may be more of an inherited word-specific pattern of usage rather than a semantically triggered response. For example, although standard Slovene uses \( na-na-s \) with cemeteries (Slv. \( na \) pokopališču 'in the cemetery'), the Resian dialect of Slovene uses \( v-v-iz: w \) satničeru 'in the cemetery' (Steenwijk 1992). This word appears to have been borrowed from Italian at some stage (cf. It. cimitero 'cemetery') and, having supplanted the native word, does not require the \( na-na-s \) pattern which was mandatory with pokopališče 'cemetery'.

Another word which is in common use in Slovene and denotes 'cemetery' is Britof. A secondary meaning for the word is 'enclosed area' (Slovenska... 1962:149). Britof is a borrowing from the German word Friedhof 'cemetery'. Unlike the Resian word, however, this word does take \( na-na-s \) (\( na \) Britofu 'in the cemetery'). There is also a village by the name of Britof outside of Kranj, in northwestern Slovenia. Predictably, this place name takes \( na-na-s: na \) Britofu 'in Britof' via association with the concept 'cemetery'.

III.3.1.4 Differentiation

Finally, one factor which often compels the use of \( na-na-s \) with a location
stems from the simple necessity of differentiating between location *in* the specific feature named versus location *at* the institution or area which contains that feature. This distinction can be seen in the following examples from Kashubian:

(97a) LegI ce ojc z mieczem w ręku... w lay-3SG REFL? father with sword-INST in hand-LOC in grobie.
grobie-

grave-LOC

'The father lay with sword in hand... in his grave.' (Majkowski 1905:52)

(97b) Ciej syn sławe na twym grobie klęknie...

if son Slav-GEN on your grave-LOC kneel-3SG

'If a Slavic son kneels at thy grave...' (Derdowski 1881:47)

In the first example, the sphere of location is literally *in* the grave, while in the second, the activity takes place at the site of the grave.

In similar fashion, the Slavic languages use *na-na-s* (as English uses *on*) to indicate position on a street corner (SC. *na ugli*, Russ. *на углу*, Ukr. *на рози* 'on the corner') as opposed to the corner of a room (Slov. *v konu*, Russ. *в углу*, Pol. *w rogu*, LSerb. *w nugušku* 'in the corner'). Likewise, the prepositions *v-v-iz* are used with mines to indicate position underground, in the shafts (Ru. *в шахте*, Pol. *w kopalni* 'in a mine'), while *na-na-s* is used to indicate position in the buildings and offices associated with said mine (Russ. *на шахте*, Pol. *na kopalni*).

The places associated with water (see pages 26, 66) may be referenced with
na-na-s as much for reasons of differentiation as for the presence of water per se. For example, in Slovene one uses na when going to a pool or doing something other than swimming at a pool:

(98a) Moja mačka je hodila na kopališče.

my cat be-3SG,FUT walked-Ø on pool-ACC

'My cat walked to the pool.'

(98b) Tvoj pes je bil na kopališču.

your dog be-1SG been-Ø on pool-LOC

'Your dog was at the pool.'

On the other hand, v must be used when one is going into a pool or something occurs in the water of the pool:

(99a) Moja mačka je padla v kopališče.

my cat be-3SG fallen-Ø in pool-ACC

'My cat fell into the pool.'

(99b) Pes je videl mačko v kopališču.

dog be-3SG saw-Ø cat-ACC in pool-LOC

'The dog saw the cat in the pool.'

III.3.1.5 Places as Events

There are a number of places which are referenced with na-na-s in which the essential factor is that their identity as places is less important than what occurs at these places. William E. Harkins (1953:57), speaking of Czech, says that
these places 'are considered for the moment as events or activities, rather than places'. These include institutions, places of work, places of gathering and performances.\(^{25}\)

III.3.1.5.1 Institutions

Institutions need not be specifically associated with buildings. For example, a telegraph office can be located inside of another institution rather than being a separate physical structure, and a department even more so. They thus become a label for the activity carried out rather than a concrete physical location. As such, they are referenced with *na-na-s* (Russ. на телегра́фе 'at the telegraph office'; SC. *na fakultetu*, Slv. *na fakulteti*, Mac. на факульте́т, Russ. на кафедре, на факультете, Pol. *na wydziale*,\(^{26}\) Cz. *na katedře, na fakultě* 'at the [university] department').

Still other institutions are defined mainly by their purpose, rather than their location or configuration. These are frequently, but less regularly, referenced with *na-na-s*. A dormitory is (or was) used primarily for sleep--other activities (meals, classes, studying) took place elsewhere. This probably accounts for the Czech *na koleji* 'in a dormitory'. Serbo-Croat, however, uses *u-v-iz: u domu* 'in a dormitory'. A university is, supposedly, a place dedicated solely to learning, hence we have

---

\(^{25}\) Again, the divisions between these are not entirely neat. Obviously, many people work at institutions, people gather at performances, etc.

\(^{26}\) Note, however, Pol. *w katedrze* 'at the [university] department'.
SC. na univerzitetu, na sveučilištu, Pol. na uniwersytecie, Cz. na universitě, Slk. na vysokej škole 'at a university', and LSrb. na fachowej šuli, USrb. na fachowej šuli 'in a technical college'. Nonetheless, East Slavic uses v-v-iz: Russ. в университете, Ukr. в університеті 'at a university'. Similarly, schools are frequently referenced with na-na-s: Bul. на училище, Mac. на училиште, Pol. на uczelni.

Nonetheless, even more languages, including all of the West and East Slavic languages, reference schools with v-v-iz: SC. у школі, Siv. в шкілі, Russ. в школе, в вузі, Ukr. в школі, Pol. w szkole, Cz. ve škole, Slk. v škole, LSrb. w šuli, Kash. w szkole 'at school'.

A distinction based on the use of the institution can often be made through the choice of preposition. For example, in Polish we can contrast the following two sentences:

(100a) Idę do uniwersytetu.

'go-1SG to university-GEN

'I'm going to the university (the building).' (Mazur 1983:56)

(100b) Idę na uniwersytet.

'go-1SG on university-ACC

'I'm going to the university (I've been offered a place there).'

(Mazur 1983:56)

In the first sentence, the speaker could be someone not generally associated with universities (e.g., an electrician gone to repair some wiring). In the second example, the speaker has the intention of undertaking activity which is characteristic of
that activity performed at universities (i.e., studying).

Churches are generally referenced with н-н-з (SC. u crkvi, Kash. н koscele, Plb. н м цркве 'in a church'), but can occur with на-na-s as well (e.g., Bul. на церква 'in a church'). Polish is capable of making a fine distinction through the use of н-н-з or na-na-s. The construction w kościele refers to location within the church building, while na kościele refers to location on the floor of the church (cf. Sysak-Borońska’s remark on page 13).

The use of na-na-s for places of worship is quite old in Slavic. In Old Church Slavic we find:

(101) бо… на соборицахъ ихъ биютъ васъ.

for on synagogues-LOC their beat-INF you-ACC

‘for… they will beat you in their synagogues.’ (Mt 10.17)

One institution, the post office, merits special attention due to the frequency with which it is encountered in grammars. Sullivan dismisses ‘post office’ in his analysis of the Russian locative as a place not requiring a building, like станция 'train station' and вокзал 'station building [!]'. Instead, he claims, ‘the building we call a post office is actually a постамт, and it occurs with б’ (1984:204). This word, borrowed from Ger. Postamt ‘post office’, actually means ‘head post office’.

If Sullivan is correct in any way at all, it is only in the etymological sense. Астафьева (cited in Cienki 1989:82) states that Russ. почта is borrowed from Pol. poczta, borrowed in turn from It. posta, 'a stop or station where horses were changed. The word apparently retained this meaning for some time in Russia, and
so na referred to location in this area rather than in a specific building as it does now' (1974:28).

In a diachronic sense, the universal use of na-na-s with post offices in the Slavic languages (SC. na pošti, Slv. na pošti, Russ. на посте, Pol. na poczcie, Cz. na poště, Slk. na pošte 'at the post office’) may be derived from the older meaning of the word. Since all modern post offices are buildings, the synchronic use of na-na-s may be maintained by the perspective of defining the post office by its function.

Evidence for this is exhibited in Polish in the following two sentences:

(102a) Idę do poczty.
    go-1SG to post.office-GEN
    'I'm going as far as the post office.’ (Mazur 1983:56)

(102b) Idę na pocztę.
    go-1SG to post.office-GEN
    'I'm going to the post office.’ (Mazur 1983:56)

In the first example, the speaker does not even intend to enter the post office. From the Polish perspective, it is inconceivable that anyone would normally go to the post office except to carry out postal affairs. The second example conveys the intent of entering the building and engaging in some kind of postal business, such as mailing a letter.
III.3.1.5.2 Places of Work

Places of work are frequently, but certainly not always, referenced with na-na-s in the Slavic languages. This may be an pattern which is growing; Maria G. Sysak-Borońska (cited in Cienki 1989:111) says that there has been a general tendency in Polish since the 1960's to use na-na-s for stating general location, especially for places of work (1980:70). Ultimately, this may be derived from the general Slavic pattern of referencing work itself with na-na-s (see page 89).

The following pair of sentences in Russian illustrate the difference between viewing an institution as the institution per se and as a place of work:

(103a) Я ходил в театр.
I gone-ṣ in theater-ACC
'I went to the theater.'

(103b) Он работает на театре.
he work-3SG on theater-LOC
'He works at the theater' (Wade 1983:47)

A theater is normally referenced with в-в-из in Russian, but when it becomes a place of work (i.e., not a place where one sees a film), then it takes the prepositions na-na-s.

Астафьева, however, says that constructions like this are either antiquated or limited to professional groups. Regarding the use of the preposition na with theaters, she states that it is a relic from the 19th century, when the word театр 'theater' was synonymous with the word сцена 'stage'. As a result, actors refer-
enced theaters with *na-na-s*.

The workplace analogy may be at work in the case of mills and kitchens. Although mills were referenced with *v-v-iz* in Old Church Slavic:

(104) Двє мельницє в щерновахь
two-♀ grind-PRA.PTC,DU,♀ in mills-LOC

'two women will be grinding at the mill' (Mt 24.41)

and continue to be so referenced in many Slavic languages (Slov. *mline*, Cz. *v mlíne*, Plb. *vá malnáice 'at the mill'), Serbo-Croat references mills with *na-na-s* (*na mlínu 'at the mill') and Russian can use either *v-v-iz* or *na-na-s*: (в мельнице, на мельнице 'at the mill').

Similarly, Russian can use *v-v-iz* or *na-na-s* to reference kitchens (в кухне, на кухне 'in the kitchen'). Астафьева explains the difference between the two expressions as one of perspective; in the first case, the kitchen is simply viewed as another room of the house where one happens to prepare food. In the second, the kitchen is seen as some kind of subsidiary territory containing a stove and other appliances (1974:29)—in other words, a workplace. Others explain the use of *na-na-s* with kitchens as an historical relic, from a time when food preparation was done outside, rather than in the house. Sullivan (1984:204) suggests a variant of the relic hypothesis, saying that кухня originally had the meaning 'hearth'.

The current Russian word for 'kitchen', кухня, is actually a borrowing which supplanted the older word for 'kitchen', поварня. Кухня made its way into Russian in the early 18th century from Ukrainian, which borrowed the word
from OHG. *kuchina* 'kitchen' through either Czech or Polish. The German word was, in turn, a borrowing from Lat. *coquiña* 'kitchen' (Vasmer I:708). I find no indication of the meaning 'hearth' for this word, and its recent borrowing casts doubt on its status as an historical relic.

Even so, there is evidence that the two patterns (в кухне, на кухне 'in the kitchen') may be in free variation in modern Russian. Townsend says that a 'number of common words, mostly enclosures, may take both в and на according to usage and, in some cases, depending on the speaker' (1980:76). Among these words he includes кухня 'kitchen'. Розенталь reports the following exchange:

(105) - Эти разговоры вы слышали в кухне?

those conversations you heard-PL in kitchen-LOC

- Да, на кухне.

yes on kitchen


Probably the most often cited place of work which takes *na-na-s*, due to its prevalence in pedagogical grammars, is the factory. Russian and Ukrainian have several words for factory, all of which are referenced with *na-na-s*: Russ. на заводе, на фабрике, Ukr. на заводі, на фабриці, на підприємстві.

Sullivan, looking at the Russian words for factory, says that "...there is no neat way of dealing with them. But since they are only two and nearly synonymous, I ignore them in the general description" (1984:204). Nonetheless, there are three basic
perspectives on why factories are so referenced.

The first perspective is the etymological perspective. This holds that the word for factory originally designated a workplace along the side of a river (which would, by association with water, take na-na-s). The denotation of Russ. завод 'factory' is 'a large-scale institution for the mechanical or chemical procurement, processing or manufacture of some kind of product' (Антонович II:830). These establishments can be associated with the fishing industry, but no express link is implied.

Sometimes, the word завод 'inlet' is cited in order to explain завод 'factory' (these two words differ only by the hard/soft contrast of the final consonants). Specifically, завод is 'a general designation for a place of more or less delayed flow near the bank of a river or lake, at which the greatest delay depends on either a natural deflection of the line of the bank or (in the fishing industry) artificial fishing installations' (Антонович II:830-31). In other words, it was a place on a bank associated with work. However, this word is always referenced with n-n-iz.

It seems more likely that завод 'inlet' is completely unrelated to завод 'factory', the former simply coming from за 'behind' + вода 'water'. The earlier meaning of the latter is likely reflected in the verb заводить 'establish', which, in turn, clarifies the relationship between the denotation 'factory' and a secondary denotation, 'custom', e.g.:
(106) Час они не пили и не содержали въ заводе.

tea-GEN they not drank-PL and not kept-PL in custom-LOC

'They did not drink tea, nor did they generally keep it.' (Антонович II:830-31)

Hence, the Russian word for factory simply meant 'establishment' in an earlier sense.

The fact that the other Russian word for 'factory', фабрика (borrowed from Ger. Fabrik 'factory'), also takes na-na-s weakens the etymological hypothesis. If na-na-s were associated with завода as a historical relic, rather than from an active semantic process, there would be little motivation to reference the newer, borrowed word with the same preposition.

The second perspective is essentially the same as that used to explain the use of na-na-s with mines (see page 70); namely, that the use of na-na-s refers to the entire territory on which the factory is located, including all of the buildings, and does not limit the sphere of action to any particular building, or to the interior of a building at all. This is the perspective advocated by Астафьева (1974:27), and is supported by evidence from Polish. In Polish, the speaker has the choice of saying w fabryce or na fabryce,\(^\text{27}\) depending on whether he wishes to

\(^{27}\)However, Gladney (1983:36) says that na is never used with factories in Polish.
refer to the inside of a factory building or the entire territory of the factory.

Similarly, Miller includes factories in his list of words that take *na-na-s* because a factory is 'a place of work consisting of both buildings and an outdoor work area' (1991:14).

Finally, the last perspective holds that factories are referenced with *na-na-s* because they are merely settings for the event which takes place there; namely, work. The factory has been the primary workplace since the industrial revolution.

Probably all three of these reasons underlie the use of *na-na-s* with factories in Russian and Ukrainian. The etymological factor in particular cannot be dis- counted, although we have seen that it certainly does not prevent the prepositional usage from changing when the semantics of the situation have changed—cf. Russ. в дворе, на дворе 'in the yard' (page 36). The degree to which these factors are responsible for prepositional choice with factories probably even varies from speaker to speaker.

III.3.1.5.3 Gathering Places

Gathering places—any place where large groups of people habitually congregate—are frequently referenced with *na-na-s* in Slavic. Although some of these places could conceivably be viewed as places of work or institutions, such as a barbershop (cf. Mac. на бербер 'at the barber'), most are not. Good examples of these include stations (cf. SC. *na stanici, na kolodvoru, na postaji*, Russ. на вокзале, Pol. na stacji, na dworcu, Cz. na nádraží, Slk. *na stanici*, USrb. *на dwor-
nišču 'at the station') and bus stops (cf. SC. *na autobuskoj stanici*, Russ. на остановке, Pol. *na przystanku* 'at the bus stop'). These places seem more prototypically gathering places than anything else. While most of the people at a factory are generally working there, relatively few are working at a barber shop or a station. Similarly, these places are not characterized by any particular directed activity, except perhaps waiting. Gladney (1983:36) would include among these gathering places post offices, meetings, and universities, but I feel that these are better treated as manifestations of other semantic categories (i.e., institutions and events as places). Thomas F. Magner (1991:254) also puts an event, dances (SC. *na igranci* 'at the dance'), in this category.

Overgeneralization of these categories by cutting across too many semantic fields can produce seemingly inexplicable exceptions. It is probably this overloading of a single category which led Magner to conclude that 'this latter category [places where people assemble] is not very exact', and that it was easier to identify words with *na-na-s* 'without worrying about the logic of the situation' (1991:254).

Sysak-Borońska (1980) and Klemensiewicz (1951) (both cited in Cienki 1989:82) have observed that Polish uses *na-na-s* to refer to buildings with scattered functions (i.e., a post office because it can combine telegraph, money and mail service; train stations because they can combine ticket sales, bars, passages and waiting rooms, etc.). While this may be true, it has been shown that post offices and train stations inevitably take *na-na-s* when they are viewed as these things (cf. page 75) anyhow, regardless of how many features they might combine. Rather, it
would seem fair to say that institutions and gathering places frequently have widely varied functions, but that these may not directly relate to the choice of preposition.

### III.3.1.5.4 Performances

In the same vein, places of performance are frequently spoken of as though they were the performance themselves. This is common enough in English as well; when we speak of enjoying the theater, we are not referring to an appreciation of architecture. Rather, we are referring to the events which take place at the theater. Townsend mentions this in his grammar of Russian: 'note that... spectacles, performances, or things that are going on are usually на words' (1980:76).

Similarly, Milan Šára et al. (1969:237) note in their grammar of Czech that na-na-s is used for 'a performance or amusement'.

In the Slavic languages, theaters and operas are frequently, but not always, referenced with na-na-s (e.g., SC. на pozorištu, na pozornici, but Slv. v gledališču, Russ. в театре, Ukr. в театрі, Pol. w teatrze 'at the theater', SC. na operi, Pol. na operze, but Russ. в опере 'at the opera'). Bulgarian, which is able to use either set of prepositions with operas, makes a semantic distinction of intent which is directly dependent on the preposition chosen:
(107a) Отываем на оперу (для слушать музыку).
  go-1SG on opera that listen-1SG music
  'I am going to the opera (to listen to music).’ (Гинина et al.
  1965:56)

(107b) Отываем в операту (в сградата).
  go-1SG in opera.the in building.the
  'I am going into the opera (into the building).’ (Гинина et al.
  1965:56)

In the first example, the opera is viewed as an event—the purpose of the trip is to see the performance that will take place there. In the second example, the opera is merely a building; the reason for going into the building is not known.

A similar, but somewhat finer, distinction takes place in Russian. Ben T. Clark writes that 'most Russians say:

(108) Я иду в оперу.
  I go-1SG in opera-ACC
  'I am going to the opera.'

however, на is used when the name of the opera is given:

(109) Я иду на оперу «Борис Годунов».
  I go-1SG on opera-ACC Boris Godunov-UNDCL
  'I am going to the opera Boris Godunov.’ (1983:211)

Polish, which uses na-na-s with operas to begin with, also uses na-na-s when referring to named operas: na «Fauście» 'to Faust'.
In Russian, *na-na-s* becomes obligatory when the unavoidable impression is that the intent is to view a performance.\(^{28}\) The use of *na-na-s* actually transforms the place into an event (опера denotes both *opera performance* and *opera house* in Russian). In the first example above, it is remotely possible that the speaker is going to the opera to wash the floors, but this interpretation is impossible in the second example.

The above analysis does not fully explain all of the underlying reasons motivating the use of *na-na-s* with institutions. For example, vacation houses are referenced with *na-na-s* (SC. *na vikandici*, Russ. на даче, Ukr. на дачі 'in a vacation house'). The Russian word, дача, can also mean 'giving', 'portion' or 'piece of woodland'. The idea of 'giving' is probably the oldest, originally connected with the verb дать 'give'. The word originally referred to a piece of granted land (hence *na-na-s*, built on the metaphor of expanse) upon which a cottage was built.

More puzzling is the fact that stables are not infrequently referenced with *na-na-s*, as in this example from Slovene:

\[(110) \text{ Šel je na hlev in je legel v seno.} \]

\[\text{went-š be-3SG on stable-ACC and be-3SG lain-š in hay-ACC} \]

\['He went into the stable and lay down in the hay' (Cankar 1907:91)\]

In other examples in Slovene, the construction \(v\ hlevu\ 'in the stable' is not

\(^{28}\) Miller (1991:13) implies that в опере 'at the opera' is used only when viewing the performance is explicitly not the intent (e.g., петь в опере 'sing in the opera'), and that на опере 'at the opera' is used in other contexts.
unknown, and this is apparently the norm in the Resian dialect of Slovene: *tu-w livu* 'in the stable' (Steenwijk 1992). Yet, the construction with *na-na-s* appears in Russian: на конюшне29 'in the stable'. Since this parallel occurs in widely separated Slavic languages—there is little chance that Slovene borrowed the expression from Russian or vice versa—and since the construction appears with different roots (i.e., the construction is not a relic of some kind), it seems that the construction must be semantically motivated. If this is the case, however, the semantics behind the motivation are not at all clear.

Finally, Russian references warehouses with *na-na-s*: на складе 'at the warehouse'. Although a warehouse is an institution, it is integrally characterized neither by elevation, water nor expanse. Nor is it a place characterized by work, gathering of people, or any other kind of event. Analysis of the word itself only serves to confound the problem further; the root appears to be клад meaning 'put, place', and associated with words like клад 'buried treasure', кладбище 'cemetery' and кладовая 'pantry'. If anything, these suggest the concept 'in' rather than 'on'.

### III.3.2 Activities and Audience Events

The opposite of viewing a place as an event is, of course, viewing an event as a place. Whereas one can readily conceive of school, a factory, and the opera

---

29Wade notes that конюшня 'stable' can be referenced with either *na-na-s* or *n-*iz. (1983:14).
as literal places, it is much more difficult to do so with notions like a wedding or a trial. Nonetheless, these events are frequently referred to as places in English as well as Slavic (see page 62).

III.3.2.1 Events as Places

Many researchers have noticed that when an event is viewed as a place there is a tendency for it to be referenced with *na-na-s*. In Polish, Mazur says that *na-na-s* is 'always used with functions, events (*na koncert, na kolację*: to a concert, to dinner)' (1983:102). In Czech, Harkins (1953:57) observes that *na-na-s* is used with 'events and activities considered as places'. Russian observations include: 'The preposition на, in addition to its primary meaning, is also used with nouns denoting activities or events one attends rather than actual places' (Stilman and Harkins 1964:61), 'These words [with на] usually *stand* for a place rather than actually being the name of a place' (Semeonoff 1941:60), 'when attendance at a function is meant and actual location is irrelevant, then на is used' (Davis and Oprendek 1973:281), and 'Nouns denoting the form of entertainment attended by an audience usually combine with на' (Miller 1991:13).

The following example from Slovene illustrates the treatment of an event as a place:
(111) Lepo si se napil na pogrebščini svojega

pretty be-2SG REFL gotten.drunk-3 on funeral-LOC your-GEN

očeta.

father-GEN

'You got good and drunk at your father’s funeral.’ (Cankar 1907:7)

Additionally, funerals are referenced with na-na-s in Bulgarian: на погребение,
Serbo-Croat: na pogrebu, na sahrani and Russian: на похоронах ’at a funeral’.

As in other cases, this use of na-na-s with events viewed as places is seen in

Old Church Slavic as well:

(112) приидите на браки

come-2PL,IMP on wedding-ACC

'come to the wedding’ (Mt 22:4)

This pattern holds for all of the Slavic languages, without exception (Bul. на
свадба, SC. na svadbi, na vencanju, SCC. na piru, Russ. на свадьбе, Kash. na
veseliku ’at a wedding’, LS. na swajžbach ’at weddings’, na swajžbarskem dnju ’on
the wedding day’).

In fact, the category of events viewed as places is remarkably consistent
throughout all of the Slavic languages in their use of the prepositions na-na-s. In a
sample of 16 audience events, only one event in one language was found to use v-
v-iz. The category of activities is only slightly less regular; in a sample of 32

30 The events were ballets, baptisms, circuses, competitions, concerts, congress-
eses, exhibitions, films, funerals, lectures, masses, performances, plays, soccer games,
trials and weddings. The exception was Ru. в цирке ’at the circus’, which may
activities viewed as places, only 12 exhibited the use of \(v-v\text{-}iz\) anywhere, and this generally in only one language in the sample. Many activities, such as dances (SC. *na plesu, na igranci*, Slv. *na plesu*, Mac. на оро 'at a dance'; LSrb. *na reje* 'to a dance'), examinations (SC. *na ispitu*, Mac. на испит, Russ. на экзамене, Pol. *na egzaminie*) and meetings (SC. *na sednici, na sastanku*, Russ. на съезде, Ukr. на зборах, Pol. *na zebraniu*, Cz. *na schůzi* 'at a meeting'; Slk. *na schôdzku* 'to a meeting') were completely consistent in the use of *na-na-s*.

One of the more consistent activities viewed as places is 'work'. So far as I know, only Slovak references work with *v-v*-*iz* (*v robote* 'at work'); the rest of the Slavic languages use *na-na-s*: (SC. *na poslu, na radu*, Mac. на работа, Russ. на работе, Plb. *no d'olů* 'at work'; LSrb. *na želo*, USrb. *na dželo* 'to work'). This may be the underlying reason for places of work (see page 76 and following) being referenced with *na-na-s*.

Of course, when a verb requiring the preposition *v-v*-*iz* is used with any of these concepts, the verb-determined preposition takes precedence over that customarily used with the noun. For example, in Russian:

\[(113a) \text{разочаровывать в работе} \]

\[\text{be.disappointed in work-LOC} \]

'to be disappointed in (one's) work' (Pulkina 1964:175)

---

actually be a place viewed as an event.
(113b) соревноваться в работе

compete in work-LOC

'to compete in work' (Pulkina 1964:175)

It can sometimes seem that there are contradictory notions motivating the choice between *na-na-s* and *v-v-iz*. In Czech (as in the other Slavic languages—cf. SC. *u uredy*, Russ. *в кабинете*, Pol. *w biurze*, Slk. *v úřade* 'in an office') offices are normally referenced with *v-v-iz*:

(114) Jdu do úřadu.

go-1SG to office

'I am going to the office (where I work).’ (Harkins 1953:57)

However, *na-na-s* can be used when the office is one which is not usually gone to:

(115) Jdu na úřad.

go-1SG on office

'I am going to an office (on business).’ (Harkins 1953:57)

In the second example, the office itself is not as important as the business which is to be carried on in the office—the speaker is really going for the event which will take place there (interview, meeting, etc.), not because he is normally associated with that office.

This might seem to conflict with the notion of referencing places of work with *na-na-s* (see page 76), since an office is a place of work. However, as was already noted, although places of work are frequently referenced with *na-na-s*, this is certainly not always the case. Hence, the theater in example 103b, because it is
not usually viewed as a place of work, is referenced with *na-na-s* when it becomes a place of work. In contrast, the office in example 115, because it is usually viewed as a place, is referenced with *na-na-s* when it becomes an event. The pattern *na-na-s* simply marks change of perspective on the nature of these places from the ordinary to the extraordinary.

### III.3.2.2 Holidays

One subtype of events as places, holidays, deserves special treatment. This is because holidays begin to cross the divide from spatial phenomena to temporal phenomena. That is, although they are events rather than divisions of time (such as days or seconds), their location is defined in temporal terms. As events, they can be manipulated like spatial variables (cf. 'I met him at the factory' vs. 'I met him at Christmas').

Wade notes that Russian uses *na-na-s* used for certain holidays, such as Easter, Whitsun and Christmas (1983:61) (Ru. на пасху 'at Easter', на троицу 'at Whitsun', на рождество 'at Christmas'). This pattern extends beyond Russian; other Slavic languages reference Christmas with *na-na-s* (SC. на Божић, Po. на Боже Народzenie, Slk. na Vianoce 'at Christmas'). Other religious feasts are also referenced with *na-na-s*; for example, LSrb. на запуст 'on Shrove Tuesday' and Kash. на Матки Божи 'at the feast of the Virgin Mary'.

Furthermore, the holiday need not be an explicitly religious one. For example, Ukr. на Новий рік, Slk. na nový rok 'at New Year's', or Kash. *na*
*dëgusë* 'at Easter-switch whipping'. Ferdinand Neureiter relates that 'on Easter morning the boys go through the village and beat the maidens and young women with switches' (1973:222).

Even the word 'holiday' itself is referenced with *na-na-s* in most of the Slavic languages: Bul. на почи́вка, SC. *na odmoru, na zimovanju*, Ukr. на свято, Pol. *na urlopie, na wakacjach*, LSrb. *na dowol, na све́дjenjach*; but Russ. по празднику́м 'on holidays'.

This pattern of referencing holidays with *na-na-s* is quite old in Slavic, and is found in Old Church Slavic texts. For example, in John 18.39:

(116) Есть же обычай вамъ да единаго вамъ
    be-3SG but custom you-DAT that one-GEN you-DAT
    отпрацишь вамъ на пасху.
    release-1SG on Passover-LOC

'But it is a custom among you that I should release one to you at the Passover'

**III.4 Directions**

The compass directions in the Slavic languages are always referenced with *na-na-s*, whether they indicate movement toward that direction, as in this example from the Dihovo dialect of Macedonian:

---

31 Translated by Neureiter as *Osterruten-Peischen* (1973:222).
(117) tie ójdoa na séver
they away.go-3PL.AOR on north
'They went to the north.' (Groen 1977:191)

or location in that direction, as in the following example from Slovene:

(118) Moj brat stanuje na severu.
my brother dwell-3SG on north-LOC
'My brother lives in the north.'

This occurs in all of the Slavic languages without exception: Bul. на север, SC. 
na severu, Mac. на север, Russ. на севере, Pol. na północy, Cz. na severu 'in 
the north'; Bul. на юг, SC. na jugu, SCC. на jugu, Siv. na jugu, Mac. на југ, 
Russ. на југе, Pol. na południu, Cz. na jihu, Slk. na juhu 'in the south'; SC. на 
istoku, Siv. na vzhodu, Mac. на исток, SCC. на буре, Russ. на востоке, Pol. на 
wschódzie, Cz. na východě, 'in the east', Slk. na východ 'to the east'; Bul. на 
запад, SC. на западу, SCC. на гербину, Siv. на западу, Mac. на запад, Russ. 
на западе, Pol. на zachodzie, Cz. na západe, Kash. на zachuedze 'in the west'.

This is a pattern which is also extant as far back as Old Church Slavic:

(119) виђахомь бо свєздьогь егь на востоцье
see-1PL.AOR for star-ACC his on east-LOC
'for we have seen his star in the east' (Mt 2.2)

Miller points out that place names whose final element is a point of the 
compass also take na-na-s (1991:14). For example, we have SC. на Dalekom 
Istoku, Russ. на Дальнем Востоке, Pol. na Dalekim Wschodzie 'in the Far East',

Other directions are frequently, but not always, referenced with *na-na-s* is Slavic. The notions 'right' and 'left', for example, are generally referenced with *na-na-s*: (SC. *nadesno*, Slv. *na desni*, Russ. нАПраво, Plb. *no prvodj* 'on the right'; SC. *nalevo*, SCC. *na levo*, Slv. *na levo*, Russ. налево, Plb. *no levдj, no lovдj* 'on the left'). In many cases, the preposition has become fixed to the word indicating 'right' or 'left', and the common adverbial ending -о has been acquired, in contrast to an earlier locative ending, seen in the Slovene example *na desni* 'on the right'.

In more extreme cases, the preposition has been lost entirely, and only the adverbial form of the original word remains (SC. *desno, levo* 'right, left'). In still other cases an alternate form is used. Slovene has an alternate form of these expressions with the preposition *po*, while Polish requires the use of this preposition: Slv. *po desni*, Pol. *po prawej* 'on the right'; Slv. *po levo*, Pol. *po lewej* 'on the left'.

Old Church Slavic used yet another preposition, *o(b)*, to reference the concepts 'right' and 'left':

(120) еди́нъ щепесную тебя, и еди́нъ щепу́ю тебя

one right-ACC you-GEN and one left-ACC you-GEN

'one to your right and the other to your left' (Mt 20.21)

In contrast to the concepts 'left' and 'right', centers are generally referenced with *v-v-iz*: Slv. *v sredini*, Russ. в середине, Pol. *w środku* 'in the center'. 
This is probably because centers are, logically, very strongly connected with an interior location.
IV Conclusions

As is the case in most investigations, this study raised a number of questions which I had not considered before its undertaking. In fact, although I believe it has clarified many of the cases in which *na-na*-s is used with spatial phenomena without the obvious meaning 'on', this study may have engendered a greater number of puzzles than those that motivated its pursuit. Nonetheless, three areas of thought have emerged from this study.

First and most obvious is that of language change. Two such changes, the change in usage from *v*-v-*iz* to *na-na*-s (and vice versa) in some words, and the replacement of *v* + ACC by *do* + GEN in West Slavic, have been discussed in various places in the text. Three other changes are discussed below.

Second, a number of thoughts regarding pedagogical methods in the teaching of the use of *v*-v-*iz* and *na-na*-s to second language learners emerged. I had ample time to contemplate these pedagogical issues since much of my research time was spent combing through grammars and readers of the Slavic languages for material.

Finally, this study has underscored the need for continued study of prepositional usage with spatial phenomena in Slavic. Far too many questions remain unanswered, and too many answers offered remain opaque. Further diachronic research would be of special value.
IV.1 Trends

Three trends, in addition to those discussed above, are of special note in their bearing on the problem of prepositional usage with spatial phenomena in Slavic. The first is the increasing frequency of the omission of \(v\) in accusative and locative phrases, the other two involve semantic changes in the denotation of the prepositions \(v\) and \(na\).

IV.1.1 Omission of \(v\)

One of the most interesting trends to have developed regarding the spatial use of the prepositions \(na\) and \(v\) in the Slavic languages is the frequent omission of the preposition \(v\) in both accusative and locative constructions. This omission appears to be geographically limited, although I do not know if the patterns are contiguous.

Speaking of this phenomenon in Slovak, Bážlik reasons that '...the case form by itself is sufficient... Due to this, some speakers even omit the preposition completely, especially the preposition \(v'\) (1985:10). Similarly, H.P. Houtzagers (1985) notes that in the Serbo-Croatian dialect of Cres the preposition \(v/va/vav\) is often omitted in both the accusative and locative cases (168). Cities are normally indicated with \(v\)-\(iz\) in this dialect; e.g., \(v\) Orlece 'in Orlec', \(f\) Crese 'in Cres' (387). Nonetheless, constructions like Orlece 'in Orlec' and
are frequently encountered.

While it is true that the morphology of the noun in Slovak and Serbo-Croat will generally indicate whether or not a locative or accusative relationship is being expressed, further examples show that the sufficiency of the case inflection is not the cause of the omission of \( v \).

The Dihovo dialect of Macedonian, like Slovak and the Cres dialect of Serbo-Croat, also omits the preposition \( v \). However, unlike Slovak and Serbo-Croat, Macedonian does not have case inflection. Groen notes that when it is possible to omit the preposition \( v \) in the Dihovo dialect, it is more often omitted than not (1977:197). He indicates the omissibility of the preposition with parenthesis. Hence, in the sentence:

\[
\text{(122) (f) plánina ţma kóliba}
\]

in mountain has-3SG hut

'I there is a hut on the mountain.' (Groen 1977:198)

it is possible to omit the preposition. Similarly, in what would correspond to an accusative construction:

\[
\text{(123) ţdám (v) grat}
\]

away.go-1SG in town

'I am going to town.' (Groen 1977:198)
the preposition is also omissible.

However, the preposition is not omissible in the Dihovo dialect when the noun with which it is used is definite:

(124) vo planínata íma kól'iba

in mountain.the have-3SG hut

'There is a hut on the mountain.' (Groen 1977:198)

Constructions like the following are also commonly found in the Dihovo dialect:

(125) ke oj§ do/kaj Tseba

FUT go-2SG to/to Tseba

'You will go to Tseba.' (Groen 1977:188)

Perhaps the prepositions do and kaj are being used to fill the syntactic gap left by the loss of the preposition v. This suggests intriguing possibilities regarding the substitution of do + GEN for v + ACC in West Slavic.

In none of these languages is the preposition na omitted. There are probably two reasons for this. First, na is a phonologically heavier particle than v, and less likely to be lost. Second, na is generally used to indicate a marked condition, and is therefore semantically heavier as well.

IV.1.2 Genitive Function of na

In Macedonian and Bulgarian, as a result of the loss of the declensional system, the preposition na has come to be used as a marker of possession. As
such, it essentially substitutes for the genitive case in these languages. The following examples from Bulgarian:

(126) къщата на баща ми

house.the on father my

'my father's house'

standard Macedonian:

(127) Пискот на жена

scream.the on woman

'A woman's scream' (Lunt 1952:58)

and the Dihovo dialect of Macedonian:

(128) кукјата на татко ми

house.the on father my

'the house of my father' (Groen 1977:190)

are all quite common types of expressions. The extra semantic load carried by the preposition *na* as a result of expressing possessive relationships may influence its distribution in expressions of spatial phenomena.

Apparantly, this use of *na* to express the genitive grew out of the use of dative constructions expressing possession in Old Bulgarian. As the case endings were lost, *na* came to be used to express dative relationships (Бояджиев 1952:114). This preposition is still used in dative constructions in the modern Bulgarian language:
(129) Батата отстъпи мястото на сина.
father.the yield-3SG place.the on son.the
'The father yields the place to the son.' (Бояджиев 1952:113)

Groen notes that the preposition *od* 'from' is also frequently used in constructions like example 128 in order to express possession (1977:190). Lunt (1952:59) makes a similar observation. Конески (1965) feels that the prepositional system of Macedonian has undergone great influence from contact with the non-Slavic Balkan languages (108), and suggests that this use of *od* to express possession may be due to Greek or Romanian influence (109).

IV.1.3 Definiteness

One of the ways in which the configuration of the relationship between *ν* and *να* may have changed in Bulgarian and Macedonian lies in the use of these prepositions with definite nouns. For example, in Bulgarian *να-να-ς* is used with theaters:

(130) Сега отивам на театър.
now away.go-1SG on theater
'I am going to a theater now.'

However, when the theater is a definite place (that is, it is conjoined with the postpositive article, named, or both), the prepositions *ν-ν-η* must be used:
(131) Сега отивам в Народния театър.

now away-go-1SG in national.the theater

'I am going to the National Theater now.' (Гинина et al. 1965:58)

In a similar fashion, the variant во of the Macedonian preposition в 'in' is used with definite nouns and pronouns, which are definite by nature (Lunt 1952:55). In these cases, the preposition is never omissible (cf. examples 124 and 131 above).

IV.2 Pedagogical Implications

There are a number of approaches which can be taken in grammars of Slavic languages when presenting the problem of the use of в-в-iz and na-na-s. Probably the least helpful of these is to simply decide that the problem is insurmountable and note that many words take na-na-s unexpectedly. The student is then left to determine which words these are and, hopefully, will recognize the construction when it is encountered. Fortunately most grammars do not take such a laissez faire approach, although it is regularly encountered. This approach is seen especially in grammars of the minor Slavic languages, perhaps because the authors assume that anyone who is interested in learning one of these languages will already be quite familiar with the phenomenon through another Slavic language (generally Russian) and will therefore not need extensive explanation of the semantics of the problem.

A less frequent, but more enlightening, approach involves listing all, or
nearly all, of the words in the language which unexpectedly (from the perspective of the non-Slavic-language-speaking learner) take *na-na-s*. Such lists frequently appear in an appendix. Javarek and Sudjić's *Teach Yourself Serbo-Croat* (1963), for example, lists 49 such words in an appendix (184-86). Similarly, Magner's *Introduction to the Croatian and Serbian Language* (1991) lists 51 such words toward the end of the book (254-55).

Unfortunately, these lists are often presented with no explanation of the underlying semantics (as in Javarek and Sudjić 1963), or very little explanation. Magner (1963) gives only three semantic categories for words that take *na-na-s*—points of the compass, meals, and assembly places—and then concludes that 'it is probably easier to simply identify the words that take *na* without worrying about the logic of the situation' (254). Although the most common words are generally accounted for, students are once again left to their own resources when they encounter words not in the list.

Even so, this approach can work relatively well when the language is one like Russian or Serbo-Croat, in which the set of such nouns is fairly limited. This would not work, however, in a language like Slovene, in which there are hundreds of toponyms alone which take *na-na-s* unpredictably. An exhaustive listing of these would not only be very time consuming, but also of relatively little value. The foreign learner would infrequently, if ever, encounter most of the Slovene place names which are referenced with *na-na-s*.

The best approach seems to be that of combining a fairly extensive, but not
overwhelming, list of these words with an accompanying explanation of their semantic similarities. Brooks’ *Polish Reference Grammar* provides an excellent list of 42 words which take *na-na-s*, divided into nine semantic categories, and additionally lists exceptions within some of these categories. Such a presentation not only familiarizes a student with many of these words, but provides a framework upon which to not only understand why unlisted words may take *na-na-s*, but even predict which new words will be so referenced.

**IV.3 Diachronic Study**

There is a clear need for continued study of this phenomena, especially from the diachronic point of view. A number of nouns which take *na-na-s* may do so as historical relics, but this cannot be determined with certainty until the etymologies of these words become clearer. The determination of the histories of these words could eliminate some of the exceptions so often cited in studies of this sort.

It would also be helpful to know more precisely when specific innovations took place in the Slavic languages. Investigation of the advent of the use of the preposition *do + GEN* in place of *v + ACC* in the West Slavic languages, for example, could be enlightening. In particular, observing which semantic areas were first to be referenced with *do* rather than *v* might provide some keys to understanding how semantically rooted the pattern of prepositional usage really is. Similarly, an historical study of the semantic spread of the preposition *na* in
Bulgarian and Macedonian to include possessive meaning could prove equally enlightening.

Sources pertaining to both these topics, as well as plentiful texts illustrating them, undoubtedly exist. However, investigation along these lines lies outside the scope of the present study.
## APPENDIX 1: ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOR</td>
<td>aorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bul.</td>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bel.</td>
<td>Belarussian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COND</td>
<td>conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS.</td>
<td>Common Slavic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz.</td>
<td>Czech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DU</td>
<td>dual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>diminutive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ger.</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPF</td>
<td>imperfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn</td>
<td>Gospel of John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaš.</td>
<td>Kashubian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk</td>
<td>Gospel of Luke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSrb.</td>
<td>Lower Sorbian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac.</td>
<td>Macedonian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacD.</td>
<td>Macedonian, Dihovo dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk</td>
<td>Gospel of Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt</td>
<td>Gospel of Matthew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCS.</td>
<td>Old Church Slavic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol.</td>
<td>Polish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plb.</td>
<td>Polabian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRA</td>
<td>present active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>preterit active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTC</td>
<td>participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTP</td>
<td>preterit passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ.</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC.</td>
<td>Serbo-Croatian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC.</td>
<td>Serbo-Croatian, Cres dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slk.</td>
<td>Slovak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slv.</td>
<td>Slovenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SlvR.</td>
<td>Slovenian, Resia dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukr. Ukrainian</td>
<td>♂ masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDCL undeclined</td>
<td>♀ neuter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USrb. Upper Sorbian</td>
<td>♀ feminine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 2: INDEX OF PLACE NAMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alps</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brezovica</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brezovica</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areh</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brioni</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britof</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>39, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barje</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carevec</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batajini</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carinthia</td>
<td>38, 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bavaria</td>
<td>38, 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carniola</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>41-43, 48, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpathians</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betajnova</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasus</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bežigrad</td>
<td>59, 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cetinje</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bielany</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bled</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čičarija</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bohemia</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cres</td>
<td>32, 97, 98, 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bokalce</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimea</td>
<td>25, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boleniec</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>25, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borneo</td>
<td>20, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>23, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brajdi</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>39, 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brdo</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalmatia</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brezje</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobrova pri Ljubljani</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breznica</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobruja</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dol 53, 54
Dolnice 60
Dolsko 53, 54
Don 28, 65
Donava 53
Donbas 28
Drava 53
Dravograd 53
Dvor 59, 60
Dvorski hrib 60
Europe 21, 25
Germany 39
Gorica 53
Gorizia 53
Gradišče 60
Greenland 20, 21
Herzegovina 47
Hradčany 58
Hungary 42, 43, 45
Iceland 23, 24
Ireland 4
Istanbul 58
Istria 25
Italy 39, 52
Jelovica 18
Jesenice 56
Kamchatka 25
Karelia 26
Karst 47
Kashubia 49
Kielce 48
Kirghizia 26
Kolezija 66
Korea 25
Kosovo 32, 56, 57
Kranjska gora 53
Krapina 56
Latvia 43
Lenart 51
Lithuania 42, 43
Ljubljana 59, 60, 66
Lovrenc 51
Mirachowo 57
Mirna 53
Vršič 56
Wallachia 47
Warsaw 57
Zagradišče 60
Zagreb 55
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