

Anna Strzelecka
Katedra Filologii Angielskiej UWM w Olsztynie

REFLEXIVE PRONOUNS IN ENGLISH AND POLISH: A COGNITIVE GRAMMAR APPROACH

1. Introduction

Reflexive forms in English and Polish have been subject of multiple studies within different theoretical frameworks. This paper will attempt to approach the problem of reflexivization from the angle of Cognitive Grammar by offering a semantic account of the differences in the behaviour of English and Polish reflexive pronouns. The account will be based on the analyses of English reflexives proposed by Ronald Langacker (1991), Paul Deane (1992) and Karen van Hoek (1997). The article is organised as follows. Section 1 offers a short presentation of Polish reflexive pronouns and other reflexive forms focusing on where they differ from those in English. Section 2 provides a discussion of Langacker's, Deane's and van Hoek's approaches to English reflexives. Finally, Section 3 compares English reflexive constructions with their Polish counterparts and, by considering semantic facts, attempts to offer an explanation for the discrepancies in their distribution.

2. The system of Polish reflexives – description of the forms

The system of English reflexives has been extensively described (Quirk 1994), so I will focus only on the system of Polish reflexives, with special emphasis on differences between them. The Polish language has the following reflexive forms: (Kardela 1985:45; Reinders-Machowska 1991).

The reflexive pronouns in Polish are marked for case but not for number, gender, and person:

- (1) Nom. –
Gen. *siebie*
Dat. *sobie*
Acc. *siebie*
Inst. *sobą*
Loc. *sobie*

The possessive adjectives modifying a noun, marked for case, gender and number:

- (2) *swój* masc. / neuter sing.
swoja fem. sing
swoje neut. / fem. pl.
swoi masc. pl.

The emphatic pronouns marked for case, gender and number:

- (3) *sam* masc. sing
sama fem. sing.
samo neut. sing
sami masc. pl.
same fem / neut. pl.

The reflexive clitic *się* unmarked for case, number, gender, and person.

As a rule, in order to express reciprocity the reflexive forms *siebie* and *swój* are used.

Even this cursory review of forms allows to make some interesting observations:

- (4) (i) the reflexive in English is marked for person, gender, and number;
(ii) the reflexive possessive is nonexistent in English;
(iii) emphatic in Polish is different in form from the reflexive;
(iv) no clitic form exists in English;
(v) reciprocal in English is different in form from the reflexive.

In this paper, however, we will focus on the reflexives proper. We shall claim that Polish and English reflexive pronouns differ significantly in their semantic content which results in different distribution and usage. To account for this difference we will use the notion of 'schematicity'. Langacker (1987:492) defines schematicity as 'relative precision or specification along one or more parameters'. Taylor (1996:91-92) employs this notion to account for the difference between functional morphemes and content words. The level of schematicity is understood to correspond with the level of conceptual substance or semantic content that a linguistic unit displays. The difference between function morphemes and content words is held to reside, then, in the degree of schematicity. Returning to the study of reflexive pronouns, there is no doubt that pronouns are more schematic than full noun phrases. However, it appears that pronouns themselves may vary in their degree of schematicity. Thus English reflexive pronouns, due to their complex morphological structure (possessive + SELF) will be claimed to be less schematic than Polish reflexives. The former profile correspondences with these speech act participants which are evoked by the possessive part of the reflexive. The reflexive *myself*, for instance, will profile a correspondence with the conception of the speaker, in contrast to Polish reflexives which are unmarked for person, gender and number. What Polish reflexives profile is correspondences with unspecified participants of the speech acts. As we show below, this semantic property of Polish reflexives has far reaching consequences for their syntactic behaviour.

3. English Reflexives

Langacker (1991, Ch. 8) discusses reflexivization as a departure from the prototype of a transitive clause. He posits a canonical event model, called the billiard-ball model, as a prototype for a transitive clause, in which clause participants are separate and discrete physical objects. Clause participants are not only distinct from the setting and the designated process, but they are also different from one another. The reflexive construction departs from this model because the same participant plays more than one role, filling the roles normally coded by the clause subject and direct object. Reflexives then specify the identity of the two processual participants that would otherwise be taken as distinct. Deane (1991) and van Hoek (1997) develop Langacker's approach, making the correspondence between the reflexive and its antecedent a distinguishing feature of constructions with the reflexive marker.

3.1. The prototype

Cognitive Grammar analysis of reflexives is based on a network of schemas organised around the prototype. Though Deane's and van Hoek's analyses differ in details, they both posit that 'the various reflexive constructions in English have developed from a central, prototypical construction in which the reflexive marks reference between co-arguments of a single verb' (van Hoek 1997: 172).

According to Deane (1992:210-215) the core reflexivization has the following characteristics:

- (5) (i) the antecedent is the clausal subject of the clause containing the reflexive;
 (ii) the antecedent and the reflexive are coarguments;
 (iii) the (lexical) predicate is a verb;
 (iv) the prototypical reflexive sentence is active not passive;
 (v) the antecedent is the agent and the reflexive is the patient;
 (vi) the antecedent denotes the individual from whose viewpoint we are to view the scene named by the predicate.

Sentences such as (6) and (7) are examples of the prototypical reflexive construction:

- (6) a. John hit himself.
 b. I shaved myself.
 (7) John talked to himself.

For Deane, the viewpoint relationship between the reflexive and its antecedent, which comes to the fore in peripheral reflexivization, is optional for the prototypical reflexive.

Van Hoek (1997: 172-178) proposes a more elaborate model of the reflexive

prototype. According to her, the antecedent and reflexive must code arguments of the same verb thus satisfying the principle of proximity. Further, prototypical reflexive constructions must obey the principle of prominence, i.e. the antecedent is the most prominent nominal in relationship to the reflexive (the most prominent reference point). And finally, there comes the subjectified view of the referent. In Van Hoek's view the participant coded as the reflexive is construed 'semisubjectively' by the agent (by virtue of referring to the same person). On her analyses, the antecedent is viewed from the offstage region, while the reflexive – because it has its own point of view – is seen to occupy the onstage region. The conception of reflexivization is based on conceptual correspondence between the antecedent and the referent of the reflexive. In the prototypical reflexive construction the antecedent codes the trajector of the relation and the reflexive codes the landmark, where 'trajector' stands for the figure or most prominent element in any relational structure, whereas 'landmark' refers to the other entity in a relation (Langacker 1991; see also Ungerer, Schmid 1996:160).

3.2. The Extensions

For Deane, deviations from the prototype involves some kind of departure from the reflexive schema. The elements which are indispensable in a reflexive construction are the reflexive, the antecedent, and a reflexive-antecedent relation. Deane distinguishes the following deviations from the prototype (Deane 1992:215-224):

- (8) i/ cases where the lexical predicate is a preposition not a verb, with all the remaining characteristics of the prototype maintained (*John is beside himself*);
- ii/ long-distance reflexives (*Pictures of himself annoy John. John expects people like himself to be hanged. John heard that, as for himself, he would be released. Near himself, John saw a snake*).
Long-distance reflexives differ from the prototype in that they are objects of not verbs but prepositions; their antecedents are not coarguments, and their antecedents must identify viewpoint referents.
- iii/ logophoric reflexives – reflexives whose antecedents are subjects of verbs of saying, feeling, and perceiving, that is of verbs which inherently establish their subjects as viewpoint for the following complement clause (*John told Mary that there was no chance for himself to be selected in the lottery*).

Summing up, for Deane the reflexive prototype (i) is based on syntactic relations between the reflexive marker and its antecedent, and (ii) the viewpoint relation is optional. In contrast, peripheral reflexives involve the viewpoint relation, the syntactic links between the reflexive and antecedent being weak or virtually non-existent.

Van Hoek posits two prototypes: the emphatic reflexive and the reflexive

prototype. Because in Polish the emphatic marker is morphologically unrelated to the reflexive and as such it is not relevant in the present study, I will focus on the extensions from the reflexive prototype.

Van Hoek (1997:179-190) distinguishes the following extensions:

near extensions:

- (9) I talked to Bill about himself.
- (10) I talked to Bill about myself.
- (11) John put the book under himself.

nonprocessual reflexives:

- (12) This in itself is not a big deal.

point of view reflexives:

- (13) Mary found a picture of herself in the paper.
- (14) Ringo fell on himself.

logophoric reflexives

- (15) Someone like yourself.
- (16) Mary said that this book was written by Jim and herself.

In (9), which is similar to the prototypical construction, the reflexive and the antecedent correspond to the same verb. The difference lies in the roles of the nominals: the antecedent does not correspond to the trajector, and the reflexive does not correspond to the primary landmark. Thus consider the following example:

- (17) I talked to Sally about herself.
 Im (primary) Im (secondary)

In this construction the importance of viewing relationship is evident: for this construction to be acceptable, the participant coded as the primary landmark must be also a cognizer, with awareness of himself. The antecedent and the reflexive are connected therefore by a viewing relationship.

(10) and (11) are constructions in which the object of the preposition corresponds to the subject of the clause. In (10) the antecedent is the subject of the clause, but the reflexive corresponds to the secondary landmark rather than the primary landmark. The subject is the most salient reference point of the relation, but it is not the closest in terms of linear order. In (11) both a reflexive and a nonreflexive pronoun can be used and the difference resides in meaning. If the antecedent and the anaphor are linked by the energetic connection profiled by the verb, then the reflexive is selected. If the object of the preposition describes part of the setting and no energetic interaction is involved, then a pronoun is used instead.

- (18) a. John put the books under him.
 b. John put the books under himself.

In (18b) an onstage referent's semi-subjective view of himself is well visible and is the reason for employing the reflexive.

The construction (12) is a more distant extension from the prototype.

Although the correspondence between the trajector and the landmark of the relation (coded by a reflexive marker) is maintained, this construction has nonprocessual relation.

(19) This book by itself is worth millions.

(13-16) are called point of view (POV) reflexives, where point of view is defined as 'referring to the conception of an animate entity, typically a person, from whose perspective a conception is construed' (van Hoek 1997:200). The material 'viewed' from that POV is construed within a mental space representing the viewer's perceptions or thoughts. Therefore, in a reflexive construction, an antecedent of the reflexive corresponds to the point of view and the content of the reflexive is viewed from this perspective. (12-16) are POV reflexives because this kind of viewing relation is the only relation connecting the antecedent and the reflexive with the absence of a verb profiling the interconnection. What is interesting about POV reflexives is the fact that in this relation the referent of the reflexive views himself.

(13) exemplifies so-called picture-noun noun phrases. For instance:

(20) John recently read a book about himself.

In this construction the use of the reflexive marker is sanctioned when the referent can be construed as perceiving the object named by the picture-noun phrase and perceiving that it is an image or description of himself, the perceiver. When the referent of the reflexive cannot be construed as viewing the picture (or story, etc.), the sentence is ungrammatical (van Hoek 1997:183).

(21) *Funny stories about himself won't restore John to life.

(14) is a construction in which there is a relation between a real person and a representation of that person.

(22) The Beatles were touring the wax museum and Ringo fell on himself.

The only interpretation is that the real person fell on his statue (and not the opposite). This construction depends again on viewing relationship. The referent perceives the image as a representation of himself and thus the schema for POV-anteceded reflexives is activated.

(15) are logophoric reflexives. They are reflexives whose antecedent is a conceived POV in a narrative. If the text is construed as representing the thoughts or perceptions of one of the characters in a narrative, then a reflexive is possible.

(23) Carmen understood. Between her first lover and herself, it was no longer tennis; it was war.

If the anaphor occurs in an objectively-construed clause, then a personal pronoun is preferred.

(24) She was not pretty, no, her size was against her [*herself].

(15) is a construction in which reflexives refer to the speaker or addressee and have no overt antecedents.

- (25) Everyone except yourself.
 (26) This book was written by Mary and myself.

The speaker and the addressee are speech-event participants (conceptualizers) and as such they are antecedents for the reflexive expressions. They are salient enough to be conceived as viewing the content of the predication. This construction, however, does not allow third-person reflexives out of context.

(16) is a construction in which embedded clauses contain a third-person reflexive. This construction is in many ways analogous to (15).

- (27) I told Albert that physicists like himself are godsend.
 (28) He said that the faculty tend to be cowardly about these things, including himself.

The difference with between (15) and (16) is that in (16) the implied POV is located in the conception of the ground of the original speech event, which conceptually included the participants in the reported speech event. Those conceived participants may antecede a reflexive.

4. Polish Reflexives

4.1. The prototype

The most striking difference between English and Polish is the fact that in Polish the prototype is most often realised by a reflexive verb, which consists of a verb and the reflexive clitic *się*, and not a reflexive pronoun. This is the most natural option for a native speaker to code a situation perceived as reflexive.

- (29) a. Janek podrapał się
 John scratched himself.
 b. Ogoliłem się.
 I shaved myself.

Sometimes the clitic *się* can be replaced by a reflexive pronoun, but the resulting meaning is not the same.

- (30) a. Janek podrapał się.
 b. Janek podrapał siebie.

The use of the reflexive is more contrasting – it was John himself that was scratched, not anybody else. However, *się* is used only when the reflexive is verbal object. When it is a prepositional object, a reflexive pronoun is used:

- (31) a. Janek powiedział do siebie.
 John said to himself
 b. Janek popatrzył przed siebie.
 John looked ahead.

Often the antecedent functions as a reference point in space and time:

- (32) a. Popatrzył przed siebie.
He looked ahead.
- b. Rzucił kamień za siebie.
He threw a stone behind (himself).
- c. Dom zapadł się w sobie.
The house collapsed.
- d. Patrzę za siebie w przeszłość.
I look back into the past.
- e. Nie bierz tego do siebie.
Don't take it personally.
- f. Doszedł do siebie.
(lit. He came to himself)
He came round.

(32e) and (32f) are metaphorical extensions of this use.

It appears that in Polish we have two mechanisms for expressing reflexivity: verbal and pronominal reflexives, although the status of the verbal reflexive in relation to pronominal reflexive within the cognitive framework is yet to be determined.

4.2. The extensions

I will start my analysis of Polish extensions with their direct comparison with the framework proposed by van Hoek. First, let us have a look at Polish counterparts of English constructions. The constructions (8-16) are rewritten here as (33-41) for the sake of convenience. (All translations and Polish examples are mine).

- (33) I talked to Bill about himself.
Rozmawiałem z Billem o nim.
- (34) I talked to Bill about myself.
(Ja) Rozmawiałem z Billem o sobie.
- (35) John put the book under himself.
John położył książkę pod sobą.
- (36) This in itself is not a big deal.
Samo w sobie nie jest to wielkim problemem.
- (37) John recently read a book about himself.
John ostatnio przeczytał książkę o sobie.
- (38) Ringo fell on himself.
Ringo wpadł na siebie.

- (39) Carmen understood. Between her first lover and herself it was no longer tennis, it war.
Carmen zrozumiała – pomiędzy nią i jej pierwszym kochankiem to nie był tenis, tylko wojna.
- (40) Someone like yourself.
Ktoś taki jak ty.
- (41) Mary said that this book was written by Jim and herself.
Mary powiedziała, że ta książka została napisana przez nią i Jima.

Even from such a cursory review of Polish reflexives it becomes apparent that some constructions which are reflexive in English are not so in Polish. The remaining part of this section offers a more detailed description of Polish equivalents of reflexive constructions. Consider the following example (cf. (33)):

- (42) a. I talked to Bill about himself.
b. *(Ja) rozmawiałem z Billem o sobie.
c. (Ja) rozmawiałem z Billem o nim.
d. (Ja) rozmawiałem z Billem o sobie.

As exemplified by (42b) this construction does not take a reflexive in Polish. Any attempt to use a reflexive in the position of the indirect object is immediately interpreted as referring to the sentence subject and not to the direct object. If the primary landmark is to be selected as the antecedent for an anaphor, then a personal pronoun must be used (42c).

The construction shown in (34) is very productive in Polish, especially in the form exemplified by (44c), with the reflexive occupying the position before the direct object, which in fact is more frequent and natural. An informal count showed that out of 119 reflexive sentences 33 qualified as this construction thus constituting 27% of all cases.

- (43) a. I talked to Bill about myself.
b. (Ja) rozmawiałem z Billem o sobie.
- (44) a. Mary bought a book for herself.
b. Mary kupiła książkę dla siebie.
c. Mary kupiła sobie książkę.

Consider other examples:

- (45) a. (Oni) oświetlali sobie drogę latarkami.
They lighted their way with torches.
b. (On) włożył sobie pistolet do kieszeni.
He put the gun into his pocket.
c. (Ja) biorę sobie ciebie za żonę.
I take you for my wedded wife.

The Polish variant (c) is a true representative of this construction, as it displays the relation between the trajector and landmark analogous to the English construction, only the order of the primary and secondary landmark is reversed, which can be attributed to Polish stylistics.

- (46) I bought a book for myself.
 tr 1m prim. 1m. second.
 Ja kupiłam książkę dla siebie.
 tr 1m. prim. 1m second.
 Ja kupiłam sobie książkę.
 tr 1m sec. 1m prim.

The construction exemplified in (35) brings out another difference between Polish and English. In English we have the option – a reflexive or a personal pronoun with the consequences to the meaning. Both variants maintain the coreference between the subject and an anaphor. Polish, however, does not allow for a personal pronoun coreferential with the antecedent in this construction. Only the reflexive can code the coreference between *Janek* and *siebie* in (47a), while the personal pronoun in (47b) refers to some other person.

- (47) a. Janek naciągnął koc na siebie.
 b. *Janek naciągnął koc na niego.

I will attribute the differences between Polish and English in the constructions (33) and (35) to the difference in the semantic content of Polish reflexives. As already mentioned, Polish reflexives are more schematic in their semantic content as compared to English reflexives. As such they need a more accessible referent for their antecedent and what can be more accessible than the subject of a sentence in which a reflexive occurs? (More on accessibility see van Hoek 1997:33-37). On the other hand, Polish personal pronouns, on account of being marked for person, gender and number, are less schematic and can take a less accessible referent for their antecedent. Therefore, in (33), when two potential antecedents occur, the reflexive takes the more salient and hence more accessible noun phrase for its antecedent, that is the subject. Choosing the other noun phrase as an antecedent demands more cognitive effort and more information, hence a more specific personal pronoun qualifies. (34) confirms this subject orientation of Polish reflexives. (35) does not allow for alternation between a reflexive and personal pronoun on the same grounds. While in English the speaker can choose between the two to accommodate for subtle differences in meaning, the use of a personal pronoun in Polish obliterates coreference.

(36) is a construction in which the landmark is a nonprocessual relation.

As (48) demonstrates, Polish has a construction corresponding to (36) in English.

- (48) The situation in itself is difficult.
 Sytuacja sama w sobie jest trudna.

The Polish construction, however, requires the combination of the reflexive with *sam* in its inflectional form. *Sam* is emphatic; it locates this construction somewhere in between the reflexive and emphatic prototype. Additionally, this construction, both in Polish and in English, does not have a viewing relationship, so crucial for the reflexive prototype. Observe also that (36) in both languages can have corresponding emphatic sentences:

- (49) a. The situation in itself is difficult.
 b. The situation itself is difficult.
- (50) a. Sytuacja sama w sobie jest trudna.
 b. Już sama sytuacja jest trudna.

Picture-noun reflexives open the group of point of view reflexives. Thus an equivalent of (36) appears in Polish as well:

- (51) a. Janek ostatnio przeczytał książkę o sobie.
 (John read a book about himself.)
 b. Ralf posłał Sally książkę o sobie.
 (Ralf sent Sally a book about himself.)
 c. John usłyszał plotki o sobie.
 (John heard gossip about himself.)

The principle of subject orientation restricts the use of the reflexive in this construction as it did in (33) and (35). For example:

- (52) a. Ralph posłał Sally książkę o niej/*sobie.
 (Ralph sent Sally a book about herself.)
 b. Zabawne historyjki o nim/ *sobie nie przywrócą Tomowi dobrego humoru.
 (Funny stories about himself won't restore Tom to good humour.)
 c. Zapytano Johna o plotki o nim/ *sobie.
 (John was asked about all gossip about himself.)

However, there are circumstances when the constraint of 'subject orientation' can be overridden:

- (53) Nawet przeczytanie śmiesznych historyjek o sobie nie przywróci Tomowi dobrego humoru.
 (Even reading funny stories about himself won't restore Tom to good humour)

(53) unlike (52a) allows the use of the reflexive coreferential with *Tom*. In (52a) *zabawne historyjki* functions as the subject of the sentence while *Tom* is not salient enough and too distant to count as an antecedent. In (53) the use of the verb *czytać* 'prepares' the appearance of *Tom* by implying Tom's active role. His active role makes him more salient and justifies the use of the reflexive.

(38) is an interesting construction in which a person views a representation of himself.

- (54) Ringo fell on himself
 Ringo wpadł na siebie.

Van Hoek offers one more example of this construction:

(55) Nixon listened to himself singing to Mao.

(55) describes a situation in which Richard Nixon (the real person) listened to the actor impersonating him. But if the characteristic feature of this construction is the fact that the viewing relation takes place between a representation, an image of the antecedent and not the antecedent himself, than even less sophisticated sentences could serve as examples:

- (56) a. I saw myself in the mirror (= my reflection)
Zobaczyłam w lustrze siebie.
- b. I saw myself in the painting. (= my image)
Zobaczyłam siebie na obrazie.
- c. I heard myself. (= my voice on the tape)
Usłyszałam siebie.

The difference between (38) and the reflexive prototype resides then in the nature of the referent of the reflexive: unlike the prototype the referent of the reflexive in (38) is an image of an antecedent and not the antecedent himself.

(39) and (40) are traditionally discussed jointly as logophoric reflexives though van Hoek makes finer distinctions. Both constructions, however, have pronominal counterparts in Polish, which I will again attribute to higher schematicity of Polish reflexives. In van Hoek's classification, logophoric reflexives, as exemplified by (39), cover those uses of the reflexive where the reflexive marker and its antecedent are linked by the point of view relation and the text is construed in such a way as to represent thoughts or perceptions of the antecedent. Consider:

- (57) a. And that was exactly it, he thought. He didn't care too much what happened to himself.
- b. I o to właśnie chodzi, pomyślał. Nie zastanawiał się zbyt, co się z nim stanie.

Interestingly, Polish allows for a considerable distance between an antecedent (nominal or pronominal) and a reflexive, which might resemble logophoric use of the reflexive:

- (58) a. Wszedł Jim. Rozejrzał się ciekawie. Podszedł do biurka, otworzył je i zaczął przerzucać papiery. Chyba coś go zaciekało, bo pochylił się nad gęsto zapisaną kartką. "Coś podobnego" – powiedział do siebie.
- b. Jim came in. He looked around with curiosity. He approached the desk and started to shuffle the papers. Something must have attracted his attention, because he bent over a piece of paper densely covered with writing. "Well, well", he said to himself.)

There is no limit to the length of the text separating the antecedent and

the reflexive as long as the topic remains unchanged and no new character is introduced. This is so because in Polish, pronominal subjects typically remain unexpressed. The identity of the antecedent is maintained in the verbal form and the subject can be easily recovered. The resulting sentence will be a prototypical reflexive (or a close extension).

(59) (On) powiedział do siebie.

In addition, no viewpoint relationship is needed to sanction this use of the reflexive.

(40), which is a construction with no overt antecedent, is not reflexive in Polish, which is to be expected.

- (60) a. Someone like yourself.
Ktoś taki jak ty.
b. Everybody except for myself.
Wszyscy z wyjątkiem mnie.

The Polish reflexive is too schematic in that the range of possible antecedents it can select is too big, and there is virtually almost no limit as to the choice to the speaker and the listener. In addition, in (60a) the nominative form of the reflexive is needed, and it does not exist in Polish.

* The reflexive in Polish can be used with an overt antecedent in subject position unless the nominative is needed:

- (61) a. Oni nienawidzą wszystkich z wyjątkiem siebie.
(They hate everybody but themselves.)
b. Ona nie kocha nikogo prócz siebie.
(She loves no one but herself.)
c. Ona nie zna nikogo lepszego od siebie.
(She knows no one better than herself.)

But again, if a construction demands the nominative then the pronoun is used:

- (62) a. Ona podziwia ludzi takich jak ona (sama).
(She admires people like herself.)
b. Skały były porośnięte porostami twardymi jak one (same).
(The rocks bore lichens as hard as themselves.)

All examples of (41) have pronominal counterparts in Polish, and the referent's status as conceptualizer, so important in English, bears no consequence in Polish. Consider:

- (63) a. Mary said that this book was written by Tom and herself.
(Mary powiedziała, że ta książka została napisana przez nią i przez Toma).
b. Mary said to Tom that physicists like himself were a godsend.
(Mary powiedziała Tomowi, że fizycy tacy jak on są wybawieniem.)

- c. *Mary heard about Tom that physicists like himself were a godsend.
(Mary słyszała o Tomie, że fizycy tacy jak on są wybawieniem.)

The reasons why (41) has non-reflexive realizations in Polish are similar to those given in relation to (33) and (35). Since the Polish reflexive is subject oriented, it cannot refer to *Tom* which does not function as the subject. In addition, in (63b) and (63c) nominative is needed.

5. Conclusions

Although Polish system of reflexives displays the organisation around the prototype as it does in English, there are differences in the nature of the prototype and its extensions. Firstly, the prototype in Polish can be coded in two ways: either with the use of a reflexive verb or a reflexive pronoun. Whether it is legitimate to treat reflexive verbs on a par with the reflexive prototype is yet to be investigated. Secondly, not all constructions functioning as extensions from the prototype in English have their counterparts in Polish. This discrepancy shows an interesting regularity which I have attributed to a semantic factor: Polish reflexives rank higher on the scale of schematicity than English reflexives and Polish pronouns. This feature accounts for a number of phenomena including the fact that the Polish reflexives tend to be subject-oriented and blocked from long-distance anaphora.

REFERENCES

- Deane Paul. (1992) *Grammar in Mind and Brain. Explorations in Cognitive Syntax*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Haegeman, Liliane. (1996) *Introduction to Government and Binding Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kardela, Henryk. (1985) *A Grammar of English and Polish Reflexives*. Lublin.
- Langacker, Ronald. (1987) *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar Vol I. Theoretical Prerequisites* Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald. (1991) *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar Vol. 2: Descriptive Application*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Quirk, Randolph (et al.) (1994) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Reinders-Machowska Ewa. (1991) "Binding in Polish." in Koster, Jan and Eric Reuland (eds.) *Long-Distance Anaphora*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Reinhart Tanya and Eric Reuland (1991) "Anaphors and logophors: an argument structure perspective." in Koster, Jan and Eric Reuland (eds.) *Long-Distance Anaphora*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, John. (1996) *Possessives in English. An exploration in Cognitive Grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ungerer, F. and H. Schmid. (1996) *An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Van Hoek, Karen. (1997) *Anaphora and Conceptual Structure*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.