

# ELABORATION SITES AND PREPOSITIONAL MEANING CONSTRUCTION IN ENGLISH AND POLISH

*MARIA BRENDA*

University of Szczecin

maria.brenda@usz.edu.pl

## **Abstract**

Although prepositions are relational linguistic units of modest sizes, they can contribute a variety of different meanings to the constructions they are found in. The paper looks into the notion of e-site, which allows for conceptual elaboration of more schematic entities along the vertical and horizontal dimensions of the human conceptual representation. It argues that e-sites are useful for prepositional meaning description. First, e-sites come into play when schematic TRs and LMs of the preposition are elaborated by more specific conceptual structures, thereby, forming a vertical schematic-specific hierarchy of conceptual structures. Along the horizontal dimension, e-sites are responsible for the integration of the conceptual content of expressions which come together to form constructions. This type of elaboration finds its expression in the typology of languages (satellite- or verb-framed) proposed by Talmy (2000) and elaborated by Slobin (2005).

**Keywords:** cognitive linguistics, semantics, preposition, meaning construction

## **1. Introduction**

Semantic studies, investigating the conceptual content of words, are especially insightful when they look at words used in combination with other words. Constructions demonstrate that semantic contents of linguistic units are altered to fit the conceptual characteristics of neighboring words. This is why word meaning is best conceived of as meaning potential (Hanks, 2000, Croft and Cruse 2004, p. 100-101), contributing to the overall meaning of a larger text, rather than as meaning “proper.” Langacker (1991, p. 5), explaining how meanings of grammatical expressions arise, observes that “[o]ften (if not typically), the composite structure displays *emergent* properties not discernible in any component taken individually” [emphasis in the original]. The fact that word meaning is seen as a meaning potential and the fact that these meaning potentials need to adjust to neighboring ones in a construction leave open a question of how this adjustment between two (or more) conceptual structures proceeds. While attempting to answer this question, the paper also suggests that the notion of elaboration site, or e-site for short, may be useful in the description of prepositional trajectors (TR) and landmarks (LM), as well as in the description of the typology of languages.

## 2. Meaning construction

Whenever we perceive a scene in the surrounding reality and want to communicate it, we face the task of selecting the relevant elements of the scene and of looking for linguistic means appropriate for the expression of its content. This means establishing correspondences between two mental systems—the conceptual system (the level of knowledge) and the linguistic system (the level of linguistic units at our disposal). For example, the scene in figure (**Błąd! Nie można odnaleźć źródła odwołania.**) shows an event in the streets of a city. Looking at it, we perceive (our perceptual system)<sup>1</sup> various elements that we recognize (categorization in our conceptual system), such as the people, the action of running, the street, the finish line, the spectators, the buildings and the trees lining the street. We see that it has been raining, as the street surface is wet and the spectators are hiding under umbrellas. The participants of the run are arranged in a certain way, wear different clothes, some of them have just crossed the yellow finish line, while the majority are still running toward it. The buildings in the background are of different colors, they are a few stories high and they have different shop windows. All this information is available to us when we look at the scene.

When we want to communicate what we see, we have to employ certain conceptual processes to select the perceptual/conceptual content for linguistic presentation. For example, we can focus on the communication of the motion event which involves the action of running, the runners, the path drawn by the participants of the run and the finish line. The conceptualizer has to determine the level of specificity of coding (cf. Langacker 2008, p. 55-57), that is, which of the increasingly specific expressions, *people*, *a group of people*, *runners* or *a group of runners*, to use. The process of focusing and establishing prominence (Langacker 2008, p. 57-73) allows the speaker to determine which entities should be established as the TR (figure) and which as the LM (ground). For instance, the speaker could regard the runners or the finish line as the TR of the action of running, producing the sentences *The runners ran to the finish line* or *The finish line was crossed by the runners*. Having construed the scene for linguistic communication, the conceptualizer can match linguistic units and the selected conceptual content. For example, the runners may be assigned the function of the TR of the verb *run*, the action of running can be assigned the function of the TR of the preposition *to*, while the finish line the function of the LM of the preposition, which results in the sentence *The runners ran to the finish line*. However, there is a considerable amount of indeterminacy in linguistic coding with regard to the perceptual information available to speakers when they look at the scene, that is, the noun *runners* does not encode the type and color of outfit, while the verb *run* does not encode the precise body movements the picture captured.

---

<sup>1</sup> For more on the perceptual basis of mental representation, see, for example, Evans (2010).

Polish speakers can express the same conceptual content using Polish linguistic means. In Polish it is possible to say, among other things, *biegacze dobiegli do mety* (runners <to-> ran to finish line [the runners reached the finish line]),<sup>2</sup> *biegacze pobiegli do mety* (runners <a short duration of an action / no focus on the result / no clear boundary of an action> ran to the finish line [the runners started running to the finish line and reached it])<sup>3</sup> or even, in a specific context when the runners start the run in an enclosed space, such as a building, *biegacze wybiegli do mety* (the runners <out> ran to the finish line [the runners left (some place) and ran to the finish line]). Generally speaking, a lot of Polish prefixes, except for having their own specific semantic content, signal the perfective aspect of the verb, in contrast to suffixes which usually signal the imperfective aspect (Łaziński, 2020, p. 19). The prefixes *do-* (to), *po-* (a short duration of an action / no focus on the result / no clear boundary of an action) and *wy-* (out) make their verbs perfective, as in, for example, *biegli* (were running)–imperfective and *dobiegli* (ran, arrived)–perfective. Their semantic content involves the following–i) the schema of the Polish prefix *do-* (to) encodes the path with a special emphasis on its final point and it presupposes the comparison of two states of affairs, state A before the change and state B after the change (Przybylska, 2006, p. 53), ii) the prefix *po-* encodes the whole motion event, that is, from its beginning to its end (Łaziński, 2020, p. 28) and iii) the prefix *wy-* (out) encodes motion from inside out (Przybylska, 2006, p. 11). The use of the Polish prefixes allows Polish speakers to encode additional concepts that may be present in the scene to be described or the ones they feel need addition even though they are not present in the scene itself. This shows that Polish allows for more precise coding of the motion event within the verbal structure than English which needs a more analytical construction to evoke the same meaning. This, in turn, means that the conceptual content of the Polish motion verb *run* has more e-sites than its English equivalent.<sup>4</sup>



**Figure 1:** Motion event–Boston Marathon

2 Prefixes in translations of Polish sentences are marked by angle brackets for clarity.

3 The semantic content of the Polish prefix *po-* is described, for example, by Przybylska (2006, p. 11) and Łaziński (2020, p. 26).

4 The notion of e-sites is defined in section 3 and elaborated on in sections 3.1 and 3.2.

### 3. How conceptual structures combine

Meaning construction involves the integration of conceptual structures coded by selected linguistic units. In Langacker's model of language (for example, 1987, 2008), mental representation has a hierarchical structure where conceptual structures are related to one another by means of four basic relations. Elaboration is just one of them, the remaining ones being correspondences, profiling and constituency (Langacker, 2008, p. 183). Correspondences indicate "how component and composite structures fit together in a coherent assembly (as opposed to being an arbitrary collection of unrelated elements)" (Langacker, 2008, p. 183). In other words, correspondences specify the conceptual overlap of structures and show the basis for their integration. The phonological and semantic poles of a symbolic unit are linked by a correspondence, which in simple terms means that the form of a word represents its meaning. Correspondences are also inherent in categorization when we recognize that one category member is more specific than another (Langacker, 1987, p. 91). For example, the prototypical sense of the preposition *beside*, the By-the-side-of Sense in *He stood beside the lake* is linked by a correspondence with the more peripheral Comparison Sense in *She looked so tiny beside the two men*. Profile determinance refers to the fact that constructions typically profile the same entity as one of its components. Profile determinance is observed when the preposition *in* and the nominal *closet* integrate through a correspondence to form a construction *in the closet*, where the preposition passes on its conceptual profile, that is, its denotation of the relation of inclusion between two entities, to the whole construction (Langacker 2008:192-193). Constituency is a manifestation of hierarchical organization where linguistic units at a lower level of organization function as components of higher order structures. For example, the expression *under the table* functions as a constituent of a higher-level structure *football under the table* (Langacker, 1987, p. 311).

Elaboration involves description of finer details. E-sites are schematic substructures which other structures in a construction characterize (elaborate) (Langacker, 2008, p. 198). The process of meaning construction involves the internal reference (Langacker, 1987, p. 307) of one linguistic unit to a more specific one. For example, the LM of the preposition *in the closet*, a schematic conceptual structure implying the location of an object, is specified in finer detail by the semantic content of the noun *closet*. E-sites are found at both the semantic and phonological poles of a linguistic unit. At the phonological pole elaboration simply means that two linguistic units can appear one after another in a construction. At the semantic pole elaboration is responsible for specification of meaning and conceptual integration. If we envisage human conceptual representation as a three-dimensional structure, e-sites can come into play along its vertical and horizontal dimensions.

### 3.1. E-sites along the vertical dimension

Along the vertical dimension, e-sites of schematic TRs and LMs of the preposition are elaborated by more specific conceptual structures. In a usage event, the schematic TR-preposition-LM conceptual structure is elaborated by more specific conceptual structures of actual linguistic units. In *a chair beside his bed*, for example, the e-site of the prepositional TR is elaborated by the conceptual structure of the nominal *the chair*, while the e-site of its LM by the conceptual structure of the nominal *his bed*. This example involves the simplest possible TR/LM elaboration when both schematic structures are specified by nominals. However, more elaborate specifications are also possible. In *She took him to the park*, the TR of the preposition *to* is elaborated by a relatively more complex conceptual structure of the verb (*took*) involving its own TR of the verb, *she*, and LM, *him*.

Before the possible elaborations of the TR of prepositions are discussed, a comment is in order. Although the identification of the TR is crucial for establishing prepositional senses, it can sometimes be problematic. In fact, Tyler and Evans (2003), who acknowledge the fact that prepositional senses emerge as a result of a TR-LM relation (Tyler and Evans, 2003, p. 52), frequently blur the difference between the TR of the preposition and the TR of the verb (for example, Tyler and Evans, 2003, p. 150), the practice which may influence sense identification. However, if the TR of the preposition is not taken into consideration at all or if it is wrongly identified, the correct identification of prepositional senses is not always possible. For example, an attempt at establishing the meaning of *to* in isolation results in the activation in our mind of a very schematic concept of PATH and disregards the information about the full semantic potential of the preposition. Taking traditional PPs into consideration proves more insightful, but it still does not allow us to identify all possible prepositional senses. The expression *to her*, for example, can encode the concepts of DESTINATION in *go to her*, of RECIPIENT in *give it to her* and of EXPERIENCER in *happened to her*. Recognizing the fact that prepositions are relational units specifying the relation between two entities expressed by both the TR and the LM allows for the description of the full conceptual structure a given preposition provides an access to.

Prepositional TR can be elaborated by the following conceptual structures entering the relation with the LM. Prepositional TRs can be elaborated by things expressed by the nominal (*quay*), as in *A forgotten quay beside one of Cornwall's loveliest river*. This is the most typical elaboration which is relatively common with locational prepositions and less common, although not impossible, with *to*, a movement preposition, as evidenced by *Folkestone and Ramsgate routes to France*. The TR of *to* is frequently elaborated by actions/states expressed by verbs with their own TRs of the verb (agent) and, possibly, also, although not necessarily, LMs (patients), as in *On his release Ivan Foster went to Fermanagh*

or as in the already mentioned *She took him to the park*. In such cases, the TR of the verb (*Ivan Foster* and *she*) performs the action (*went* and *took*) in relation to the prepositional LM (*Fermanagh* and *the park*). Prepositional TRs can also be expressed by properties expressed by adjectives, as in *This was attributable to an increase in the number of branches*, where the TR of the preposition *attributable* is related to the LM of preposition, *an increase*. Finally, the most complex elaboration of prepositional TRs is that of a clause, as in *It's something very close to what I'm saying*, where the TR of the preposition *it's something* is related by means of the complex preposition *close to* with the LM of the preposition, *what I'm saying*.<sup>5</sup>

Prepositional LMs generally show less variety. Typically, prepositional LMs of locational and movement prepositions are elaborated by a thing expressed by a nominal. For example, *It's beside the point*, *A wine box appeared above the crowd of heads by the door* or *Media that are close to life* all involve nominal elaborations of the LM of the prepositions, that is, *the point*, *the crowd* and *the door* or *life*. Sometimes, the LM of the preposition can also be elaborated by an event or process scanned in a summary manner by the conceptualizer (Langacker, 1987, p. 249), which amounts to saying that such LMs are construed in a particular way. For example, in *He came close to joining the Italian giant Ferrari* the LM *joining*, traditionally referred to as gerund, is scanned in a summary manner, which means that subsequent stages of the verbal process are conceptualized wholistically. The same holds for *The second job of the day is to light the stove*, where the LM *light*, the bare infinitive, is conceptualized wholistically and infinitival *to* imposes summary scanning on the verbal process.

Treating infinitival *to* as a preposition should not be surprising, as the affinity between prepositional *to* and infinitival *to* have already been recognized. Historically, infinitival *to* came into existence in the Old/Middle English period probably as a result of grammaticalization (Fischer et al., 2000, p. 96). However, it seems doubtful that a complete loss of the semantic content paralleled the process of grammaticalization. It may be argued that infinitival *to* still evokes the concepts of metaphorical PATH, GOAL or RESULT and that it denotes “a movement leading up to a terminus” (Duffley, 2003, p. 333). The second part of the infinitival construction, that is, the bare infinitive encodes the meaning more schematic than that of the verb with which it shares the same form, as the bare infinitive does not denote time/person characteristics. The whole *to*-infinitive structure should then be treated as “a prepositional phrase” (Duffley, 2004, p. 307) functioning as a “a goal- or result-specifier expressing that to which the main verb's event leads or is desired to lead” (Duffley, 2007, p. 59).

The study of the preposition *to* by Brenda and Mazurkiewicz-Sokołowska (2022) shows that the senses identified for the *to*-infinitive constructions overlap with the senses of prepositional *to*. For example, the Processual-path Sense is

---

<sup>5</sup> Langacker (2008, p. 354) specifies that a verb designates a process, while a clause “a grounded instance of a process type.”

encoded by *to* in both *Their objective career progression had come to an end*, where the LM of *to* is elaborated by the nominal, and in *Although objectives came to be redefined [...]*, where the LM of *to* is elaborated by the verb scanned in a summary manner. The conceptualizations of whole expressions involve the TRs of the verbs, *career progression* and *objectives*, metaphorically moving along the path towards their goals conceptualized as an object to reach and a state to be actualized, respectively.

A similar parallel can be drawn between prepositional and infinitival Purpose senses. Although the Purpose Sense of prepositional *to*, in, for example, *The land had been neglected for five years, not planted to corn as usual* is already obsolete (OED, 1989), clauses of purpose, such as *Everything was being done to catch the killers* are very frequent. In both sentences the LMs, *corn* and *catch* specify the purpose for which the land was (not) used and the purpose of the investigation. Once again, the difference resides in the conceptualization—the nominal LM is conceptualized as a thing and the infinitival LM as a nominalized action, that is, an action scanned in a summary way. Therefore, it may be claimed that the affinity of the prepositional and the infinitival LMs is grounded in the ACTIONS FOR OBJECTS metonymy (Brenda and Mazurkiewicz-Sokołowska, 2022, p. 46).

### 3.2. E-sites along the horizontal dimension

Below, Along the horizontal dimension e-sites are responsible for the integration of the conceptual content of expressions which come together to form constructions. For example, the conceptual content of the verb *go* makes reference to the TR of the verb (agent) performing the action, the concept of particular MOVEMENT which evolves along the PATH. This verb allows two e-sites which can be elaborated by more specific linguistic units, that is, the e-site for the direction of the path and the e-site for the forward or backward direction of movement, as evidenced by *He went to New York* and *He went back to New York*. In these sentences, the schematic PATH e-site of *went* is elaborated by the more specific concept of PATH, that is, a relatively straight path leading to a destination at its end encoded by the preposition *to* (Brenda and Mazurkiewicz-Sokołowska, 2022, p. 47), while the schematic DIRECTION-OF-MOVEMENT e-site is elaborated by the particle *back* encoding the reversed direction of motion along the path.

Elaboration of concepts encoded by motion verbs and particles specifying the concept of PATH allows to refine the verb- and satellite-framed typology of languages proposed by Talmy (1985 [2007], 2000) and elaborated on, among others, by Slobin (1997, 2006, 2017). Talmy (2000, p. 222) observes that in languages the same semantic categories pertaining to events may be mapped onto different syntactic structures. This mapping is not usually one-to-one, but it may form different patterns of lexicalization where a few semantic elements can be expressed by one linguistic unit or where a single semantic component can be

lexicalized by a few overt forms. Satellites, which are of particular interest here, as prepositions are regarded satellite-like linguistic units, are “any constituent other than a noun-phrase or prepositional-phrase complement that is in a sister relation to the verb root” (Talmy, 2000, p. 102) and they can be either a bound or a free linguistic unit. Satellites usually include—English prepositions, verb particles or affixes, German separable and inseparable verb prefixes, and Russian and Polish verb prefixes (Talmy, 2000, p. 102).

A motion event, especially the concept of PATH and MANNER, is usually diagnostic with respect to verb- or satellite-framed type of language. In verb-framed languages, such as Romance, Greek, Turkic or Japanese, PATH is encoded by a finite verb, while MANNER by a subordinate manner expression. In contrast, satellite-framed languages, such as Germanic, Slavic, Celtic or Finno-Ugric, use satellites to express the path of motion and verbs to encode its manner. For example, *exit flying*, an expression typical of a verb-framed language, would probably be replaced by *come out* or *fly out* in a satellite-framed language (Slobin, 2006, p. 62). In a verb-framed language, the manner of motion is expressed by the present participle *flying*, while in a satellite-framed language the manner is expressed by the main verb of the clause.<sup>6</sup>

Even though Talmy’s (1985 [2007], 2000) classification has been frequently used to characterize different lexicalization patterns across languages, there are some problematic issues with it. As a result of subsequent investigation, Talmy’s ([1985] 2007) initial typology has been revised to include the so-called serial-verb languages (Mandarin Chinese, Thai or West African languages) and tripartite equipollently-framed languages (Niger-Congo, Hokan, Australian languages) (Slobin, 2006, p. 63-64). As Slobin (2017, p. 419) remarks, “the more we probe linguistic expressions of motion events, the more we uncover mixed types, indeterminate types, hybrid forms, and changes in progress.” For example, English and Spanish, which belong to the satellite- and verb-framed languages respectively, are different from each other not only in respect of the general classification, but also in terms of their “lexicalization resources” (Slobin, 1997, p. 19), that is, more types of motion verbs in English, a bigger capacity of English verbs to conflate motion and manner, and a capacity of these verbs to combine with a wide range of satellites to produce an open class of verb+satellite constructions. What is more, the research has shown that at a closer perspective we find considerable differences between languages belonging to the same typological class. Languages that belong to the same group do not always show the same lexicalization patterns and frequently characterize motion events more or less saliently. For instance, Łozińska (2019) shows that, although English, Polish and Russian belong to the same, satellite-framed class, English is a more path salient language, as it uses more path verbs, than the remaining two, while

---

<sup>6</sup> Slobin (2006, p. 62) makes a general comment that in verb-framed languages, manner is specified by “some kind of subordinate element, such as a gerund or other adverbial expression (‘exit flying’).”



Brenda and Mazurkiewicz-Sokołowska (2022, p. 73-83) observe more similarities between German and the two Slavic languages, Polish and Russian, than English.

It seems that the differences pertaining to PATH expression between satellite- and verb-framed languages can be understood in terms of the semantic schematicity of verbs in verb-framed languages, which amounts to saying that verbs in these languages allow more e-sites for other semantic components to modify them. For example, the path and manner of motion are expressed differently in English and Spanish, as shown in *The man ran into the house* and *El hombre entró corriendo a la casa* (The man entered running to the house) (Slobin, 1997, p. 16). The English verb *ran* encodes the manner of motion and a schematic path, since the action of running always entails path. Therefore, the verb *run* is already specified in terms of manner of motion, while its schematic path is elaborated by the preposition *into* which denotes a relatively straight, directed path (Brenda and Mazurkiewicz-Sokołowska, 2022, p. 74) leading to the inside of the house. In contrast, the Spanish past tense form *entró* (entered) encodes the action of changing location from the outside to the inside the house and a path leading to the inside of the house, while the manner of motion is expressed by the gerund *corriendo* (running). Therefore, *entró* (entered) does not evoke the conceptualization of manner of motion. Its schematic path is, like it was the case in English, elaborated by a relatively straight, directed path encoded by *a* (to). Note that English *enter* in *he entered the house* does not allow a more specific elaboration of the path,<sup>7</sup> as it is normally not used with the preposition *to* providing more information about it.

E-sites can be helpful in explaining differences between languages within each typological group when it comes to lexicalization of motion events. English and Polish are both classified as satellite-framed languages, but they encode conceptual content related to motion events in a different way. *Freeman flew to Poland* and *Freeman przyleciał do Polski* (Freeman <near> flew to Poland)<sup>8</sup> encode different concepts that can possibly be found in a situation when a plane flies to a destination.<sup>9</sup> The English verb *flew* encodes the PATH and MANNER of motion, while the preposition *to* specifies the PATH expressed by the verb as relatively straight leading to a destination and vague in terms of actually reaching this destination. The Polish verb *przyleciał* also encodes the PATH and MANNER of motion, but it also encodes the concepts

---

7 Obviously, it is possible to provide more specific information about the path by using a particular description of this path, as in, for example *He entered the house by squeezing himself in between two window protector bars* (<https://www.nairaland.com/7087826/arrested-thief-demonstrates-how-he>).

8 The Polish prefix *przy-* is thought to be near synonymous with the Polish prefix *do-*, corresponding to English *to* (Przybylska, 2006, p. 81). However, as different Polish forms correspond to similar meanings, I use *to* as an equivalent of Polish *do-* and *near* as an equivalent of *przy-*.

9 Both, English and Polish, sentences are metonymic in nature, as they encode Freeman's action of flying instead of the plane's action of flying with Freeman in it.

of APPROACHING/COMING CLOSER and COMPLETING (the perfective verbal aspect) expressed by the prefix *przy-* (near). Therefore, the English and Polish verbs both specify the manner of motion, but the Polish verb *lecieć* (to fly) allows an additional e-site for the specification of coming closer to the intended place and of completing the action.

It is worth noting that the Polish verb *lecieć* allows a variety of other concepts as its elaboration, not only the concepts of APPROACHING/COMING CLOSER. Except for saying *przylecieć do Polski* (to <near> fly to Poland), we can also say i) *polecieć do Polski* (to <a short duration of an action / no focus on the result / no clear boundary of an action> fly to Poland), meaning ‘fly to Poland,’ (Przybylska, 2006, p. 11, Łaziński, 2020, p. 26), ii) *odlecieć do Polski* (to <from/away> fly to Poland), meaning ‘to leave a place and fly to Poland’ (Wierzbicka-Piotrowska, 2020, p. 483), iii) *wylecieć do Polski* (to <out> fly to Poland), meaning ‘to leave a place and fly to Poland,’ and iv) *dolecieć do Polski* (to <to> fly to Poland), meaning ‘to arrive in Poland.’ Although sentences ii) and iii) seem to denote the same, there is a difference in the conceptualization, as different prefixes evoke different concepts. While *od-* (from/away) in ii) evokes the concept of moving away from a place (Przybylska, 2006, p. 86), *wy-* (out) in iii) encodes the concept of leaving a container (Łaziński, 2020, p. 72). This results in the place of departure being conceptualized as a zero-dimensional point in ii) and a three-dimensional entity in iii).<sup>10</sup> In iv) the prefix encodes the concept of REACHING A DESTINATION indicating that the agent reached the final point of the path.

A motion event does not need to involve a change of location, but it may involve a circular movement around one’s own axis. In this case division of labor between linguistic units in English and Polish encoding such a scene is similar. In *She turned to her father for a moment* and *Na chwilę odwróciła się do ojca*, the verbs *turned* and *odwróciła* encode a circular path. The prepositions *to* and *do* encode a relatively straight, directed path pointing in the direction of the father, thereby elaborating the PATH e-site of the verbs. The Polish verb contains the prefix *od-* (from/away) that can also be interpreted as PATH elaboration, indicating the initial part of the path and the reversed direction of motion.

## 5. A brief conclusion

Meaning construction necessarily involves the integration of the conceptual content of linguistic units forming an expression. E-sites can be considered a helpful tool in the description of the elaboration of more schematic structures by more specific ones along the vertical dimension and in the description of conceptual content integration along the horizontal dimension. The second type

---

<sup>10</sup> Conceptualizations involving prepositions *from* and *out* in English are described by Lindstromberg (2010) and Lee (2001).

of elaboration has especially important consequences for the conceptualization of the same motion events by speakers of English and Polish (and also for German and Russian as shown by Brenda and Mazurkiewicz-Sokołowska, 2022). It was shown that Polish verbs allow more e-sites to be elaborated by particular spatial concepts, such as APPROACHING/COMING CLOSER, DIRECTION OF MOTION or LEAVING A CONTAINER, as well as the concept of COMPLETING introduced by the perfective function usually associated with prefixes.

## References

- Brenda, Maria and Jolanta Mazurkiewicz-Sokołowska. 2022. *A Cognitive Perspective on Spatial Prepositions. Intertwining networks*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/hcp.74>
- Croft, William and D. Alan Cruse. 2004. *Cognitive linguistics*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511803864>
- Duffley, Patrick. 2003. The gerund and the *to*-infinitive as subject. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 31-4, 324-352. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0075424203257833>
- Duffley, Patrick. 2004. Verbs of liking with the infinitive and the gerund. *English Studies* 4, 358-380. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00138380412331339158>
- Duffley, Patrick. 2007. A natural-language semantics approach to infinitival and gerund-participial complementation in English. *Anglophonia. French Journal of English Studies* 22, 55-67. <https://doi.org/10.4000/anglophonia.775>
- Evans, Vyvyan. 2010. The perceptual basis of spatial representation. In V. Evans and P. Chilton (eds.), *Language, Cognition and Space: The State of the Art and New Directions*, 21-48. Equinox.
- Fischer, Olga, Van Kemenade, Ans, Koopman, Willem and Wim Van Der Wurff. 2000. *The syntax of Early English*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511612312>
- Hanks, Patrick. 2000. Do word meanings exist? *Computers and the Humanities* 34, 205-215. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1002471322828>
- Langacker, Ronald, W. 1987. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Theoretical Prerequisites, vol. I*. Stanford University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald, W. 1991. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Descriptive Application, vol. II*. Stanford University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald, W. 2008. *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195331967.001.0001>
- Lee, David. 2001. *Cognitive Linguistic: An Introduction*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195331967.001.0001>
- Lindstromberg, Seth. 2010. *English prepositions explained. Revised edition*. John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/z.157>
- Łaziński, Marek. 2020. *Wykłady o Aspekcie Polskiego Czasownika*. Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego. <https://doi.org/10.31338/uw.9788323542346>
- Łozińska, Joanna. 2019. The Expression of Path in Three Satellite-framed Languages. *A Cognitive Study of Polish, Russian, and English. Jezikoslovlje*, 20.1, 31-61. <https://doi.org/10.29162/jez.2019.2>
- Murray, James A. H., Bradley, Henry, Craigie, William A. and C. T. Onions (Eds.). 1989. *The Oxford English dictionary* (2nd ed.). Clarendon Press.

- Przybylska, Renata. 2006. *Schematy wyobrażeniowe a semantyka Polskich Prefiksów Czasownikowych do-, od-, prze-, roz-, u-*. TAIWPN UNIVERSITAS.
- Slobin, Dan, I. 1997. The Universal, the Typological, and the Particular in Acquisition. In D. I. Slobin (ed.), *The Crosslinguistic Study of Language Acquisition. Volume 5: Expanding the Contexts*. Psychology Press.
- Slobin, Dan, I. 2006. What Makes Manner of Motion Salient? Explorations in Linguistic Typology, Discourse, and Cognition. In M. Hickmann and S. Robert (eds.), *Space in Languages: Linguistic Systems and Cognitive Categories*, 59-82. John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.66.05slo>
- Slobin, Dan, I. 2017. Typology and language use. Motion and Space across Languages. Theory and applications. Edited by Iraide Ibarretxe-Antuñano John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/hcp.59.17slo>
- Talmy, Leonard. [1985] 2007. Lexical typologies. In T. Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Volume III: Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*, 66-168. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511618437.002>
- Talmy, Leonard. 2000. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics. Vol.2. Typology and process in concept structuring*. The MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/6848.001.0001>
- Tyler, Andrea and Vyvyan Evans. 2003. *The Semantics of English Prepositions: Spatial Scenes, Embodied Meaning and Cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486517>
- Wierzbicka-Piotrowska, Elżbieta. 2020. Wpływ Prefiksacji na Walencję Polskich Czasowników. *Prace Filologiczne*, LXXV.1, 479-500. <https://doi.org/10.32798/pf.669>