CHAPTER 14

Metaphorical walking

Russian *idti* as a generalized motion verb*
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University of Tromsø

This article explores the metaphorical use of Russian *idti* ‘walk’ as a generalized motion verb in collocations like *poecd idet* ‘(lit.) train walks’. The study seeks to explain why *idti* is used in such collocations, and why this usage is restricted to examples where a goal is prominent in the context (Rakhilina 2004). It is suggested that *idti* is used as a generalized motion verb in metaphors because it represents prototypical motion. In metaphor, it is natural to take prototypical motion as the starting point. Unidirectionality is dominant in metaphorical usage, and this explains why *idti* is restricted to goal-oriented contexts. The analysis involves the notions of prototype, anthropocentrism, embodiment and metaphor and lends support to a cognitive approach to linguistic categories.

Although dictionaries translate Russian *idti* as ‘walk’, *idti* is widely used metaphorically as a generalized motion verb in contexts where walking is not involved:

1. *(Tramvaj šel po teperešnej Kropotkina.)*
   tram went along present Kropotkin
   ‘The tram went along what is now Kropotkin Street.’
   [Oleša: *Kniga proščaniia* (1930–1959)]

---

* This paper was presented at the Slavic Cognitive Linguistics Conference in Chicago, October 2007. I would like to thank the participants for questions and discussion. Thanks also to Laura Janda, two anonymous reviewers and the editors of this volume for detailed comments on earlier versions of the paper.

1. The majority of examples cited in this paper are from the Russian National Corpus (www.ruscorpora.ru). For corpus examples, the source is given in square brackets (either the author and a name of a work of fiction, or the name of a periodical). Examples with no source in square brackets are from Rakhilina (2000, 2004). Exact references are given in the text.
Ja vzal bilet na teplovod "Alušta", šedši iz Odessy v Soči.
I took ticket for steamer Alušta going from Odessa to Soči
'I bought a ticket for the steamer “Alušta”, which was going from Odessa to Sochi."

This paper addresses two questions concerning generalized idti. Why is idti used as the source domain in metaphorical examples of generalized motion like (1) and (2)? Why does generalized idti show affinity to “goal-oriented” contexts, as observed by Rakhilina (2000:303ff., 2004:7)? In this study, I will argue that idti is used metaphorically because it represents a prototypical kind of motion. It will furthermore be argued that metaphorical idti is used to describe “goal-oriented” motion because the unidirectionality component of the meaning of idti becomes more salient in metaphorical usage. The interest of my analysis goes beyond Russian. First, as observed by Majšak and Rakhilina (2007: 45), the generalized use of verbs like idti is quite common cross-linguistically. Second, the proposed analysis has theoretical implications in that it lends support to key concepts in cognitive linguistics, viz. prototypes, anthropocentrism, embodiment and metaphor. After a short introduction in Section 1, I will discuss prototypical motion in Section 2, and metaphorical motion in Section 3. The contribution of the paper is summarized in Section 4.

1. Introduction: Three conceptual layers

Russian verbs of motion involve three conceptual layers, “manner”, “directionality” and “path”, which correspond to the verbal root, suffixation, prefixation. The verb root specifies manner (in the sense of Talmy 1985). Manner is a cover term that involves information about mover, gait, speed, effort, and body part (Dodge and Lakoff 2005:68). The root /polz/ in polzi and polzat’ characterizes the manner of motion as crawling, while the root /lot/ in letet’ and letat’ indicates flying. These examples furthermore illustrate that Russian verbs of motion occur in pairs. The roots /polz/ and /lot/ combine with different suffixes, and the combination of root plus suffix indicates whether we are dealing with unidirectional, goal-oriented motion or not. The verbs polzi and letet’ are what we may call “unidirectional” motion verbs, whereas polzat’ and letat’ are “non-directional”. 2 We will return to

---

2. Different authors use different terms to describe the pairs of motion verbs. In English, the most widely used terms seem to be determinate/indeterminate (Foote 1967; Forsyth 1970; Jakobson 1966; Timberlake 2004; Ward 1965) and unidirectional/multidirectional (Mahota 1996; Wade 1992). I prefer unidirectional to determinate, because the former gives a better indication of the meaning of the verbs in question. I will not use multidirectional, however,
the use of unidirectional and non-directional verbs in Section 3. For now it is sufficient to note that directionalities (unidirectional and non-directional) represents the second, intermediate conceptual layer of Russian verbs of motion. The third and outermost layer is introduced by prefixes, which add a path (in the sense of Talmy 1985) to the meaning of the verb. For instance, in vletet' 'fly into' the prefix v- indicates motion into something, while vy- in vyletet' 'fly out of' specifies the opposite path:

(3) Ja pil čaj, a na čerdak vletel artillerijskih snajd.  
I drank tea and on attic in.flew artillery shell  
'I was drinking tea, when an artillery shell flew into the attic.'

[Novaja gazeta 2003.01.15]

(4) Iz sosednej komnaty vyletela bolšaja temnaja ptica i tichon'ko  
from neighboring room out.flew big dark bird and lightly  
zadela kryalom lysinu bufečka.  
grazed with.wing bald.spot of.bartender  
'A big dark bird flew out of the neighboring room and lightly grazed the bartender's bald spot with its wing.'

[Bulgakov: Master i Margarita (1929–1940)]

The three conceptual layers are illustrated in Figure 1.

In this study I will focus on the two inner layers, i.e., non-prefixed verbs, since they are sufficient to shed light on the generalized use of idti, which is the

because this term covers only one of the meanings of the relevant verbs. A more precise term would be "non-unidirectional", which corresponds to the Russian term glagoly neodnonapravliennogo dvizhenija employed by the Academy Grammat (Svedova 1980). However, in the following I shall use the somewhat simpler term non-directional.
topic of this paper. I will not discuss motion verbs with the so-called postfix -sjja, since they do not contribute to the issue under scrutiny in this study. In the following, we will be concerned with the thirteen pairs of verbs listed in Table 1. Some sources include more verbs, such as bresti/brodit’ ‘wander’, lomit’/lo- mat’ ‘break’, mčat’/mykat’ ‘rush’, and valit’/valjat’ ‘drag’. However, in present-day Russian, the members of these four pairs do not display the same semantic difference as the verbs in Table 1 and therefore do not constitute pairs of the same type as those listed in the table (Garde 1980:386; Isačenko 1982:427; Wade 1992:340; Ward 1965:250).

2. Prototypical motion

An important contribution of cognitive linguistics has been to integrate categorization by prototypes into linguistic theory. Prototypes came to the attention of linguists from the work of Eleanor Rosch and her associates in psychology (e.g., Rosch 1978), and from the early 1980s cognitive linguists started exploring the implications of prototypes for linguistic categories (cf. e.g., Geeraerts 1989; Langacker 1987; Lakoff 1987; Nathan 1986; Taylor 1989). In a nutshell,

---

3. It should be noted that prefixed motion verbs are attested in generalized use as shown by examples like Korabl’ uliul dalšie na sever, k uščju Krivoj. ‘The ship went further north, to the mouth of the river Krivaja.’ [Golovanov: Ostrov, ili opravdanie besmyslennyx putešestvij (2002)]. However, discussion of examples like this are beyond the scope of the present study.
categorization by prototype involves comparing something to a central, representative subcategory. For example, this allows us to establish that robins and swallows are fairly prototypical birds, while penguins and ostriches are peripheral members of the category. Categorization by prototype differs from the traditional, Aristotelian conception where categories are defined in terms of necessary and sufficient criteria. In the Aristotelian line of reasoning, robins, swallows, penguins and ostriches are all birds if they meet the necessary and sufficient criteria for birdhood (whatever they are). However, Aristotelian categories do not enable us to say anything about central and peripheral subcategories, because all members meet the same set of criteria. Aristotelian categories lack internal structure.

Cognitive linguists generally acknowledge the need to include both prototypes and Aristotelian categories in linguistics (Taylor 1989:59). In the following, however, I will focus on categorization by prototype, suggesting that walking represents a prototypical kind of motion and that the Russian walking verbs iditi/xoditi’ are prototypical. In order to corroborate this view, we need to compare iditi/xoditi’ to the remaining verbs of motion in Table 1. Let us start by comparing iditi/xoditi’ and polizti/polizat’‘crawl’. The former pair involves an erect posture, while the latter denotes movement in a prone position with the body resting on the ground, or on the hands and knees. Clearly, walking represents the typical case. Once a child has started walking, s/he will prefer this kind of motion unless special conditions make crawling appropriate. In a similar vein, iditi/xoditi’ are prototypical compared to nes’iti/nas’iti’‘climb’. Unless the presence of an impediment forces us to climb, we prefer walking. The verbs belat’/beqat’‘run’ involve extra effort and speed. Again, this may be desirable in certain circumstances, but in the normal case humans walk when they move about. Movement on the ground is more natural for humans than motion in air or water. Learning to fly is very difficult (if not impossible) for humans, and although we can learn to swim, walking represents a much more convenient way of moving from the perspective of humans. Therefore, iditi/xoditi’ are more prototypical than letet’/letat’‘fly’ and plyt’/plavat’ ‘swim’.

In addition to ‘swim’, plyt’/plavat’ means ‘sail’. This takes us to the motion verbs that involve vehicles, such as ezdit’/ezdat’‘ride’, which are used about riding on horseback, but also driving cars and other vehicles. The use of vehicles represents techniques developed by humans to accommodate special needs. However

4. As shown by Rakhilina (2007), plyt’/plavat’ also covers the meaning ‘float’, cf. examples like [...] po strogoj vode uže plyl opavitie list’ja. ‘Fallen leaves were already floating on the rough water.’ [Poljanskaia: Prozvječeni teni (1996)]. A thorough analysis of the meaning of plyt’/plavat’ is beyond the scope of the present study.
important as these technological revolutions are for human culture, walking remains the most natural, prototypical manner of motion. So far we have only considered intransitive motion verbs. The transitive verbs in Table 1 are vesti/voditi 'lead', vesti/voziti 'transport', gnat'/gonjat' 'chase', kattit/katat' 'roll', nesti/nosit' 'carry' and taštit'/taskat' 'drag'. Among the transitive verbs, nesti/nosit' 'carry' are closest to iditi/xoditi'. Carrying is essentially walking with the additional specification that the walker has something in his or her arms or on his or her back. Iditi/xoditi' represents the simpler concept, and furthermore a more natural way of moving. Carrying is something you do if you have to move something to a different location. Otherwise, you just walk. The remaining transitive motion verbs have more complex meanings, but they all combine some kind of intransitive motion with the concept of moving an object. The transitive motion verbs therefore stand out as less prototypical.

We have now compared the Russian motion verbs along six dimensions, and established that iditi/xoditi' 'walk' are prototypical on all of them. In this way, iditi/ xoditi' represent prototypical motion. Figure 2 illustrates this. Iditi/xoditi' are placed in the center of the category and connected to the remaining verbs by means of dashed arrows that represent comparison along the six dimensions described above. In the terminology of Langacker (1987:369ff.), the non-prototypical kinds of motion represent extensions from the central subcategory of walking. Each extension arrow is marked with a word in italics which represents the relevant dimension. In order to avoid unnecessary complications, I include only one verb pair for each dimension. Bear in mind that the figure is not intended as a complete analysis of the structure of the category. For one thing, the figure does not capture any relationships among the peripheral subcategories, although such connections

![Figure 2. Iditi/xoditi' representing prototypical motion](image-url)
may well exist. The ordering of the peripheral subcategories in the figure does not reflect their degree of semantic relatedness. Second, the peripheral subcategories are not mutually exclusive. For instance, vezői/voziti 'transport' are transitive and at the same time involve a vehicle. In order to make the figure as simple as possible, I have placed each verb pair in one subcategory only. However, while the figure does not capture all the details about verbs' meanings and the relations between them, the figure suffices to show that walking is prototypical – which is what matters for the purposes of the present study.

The analysis sketched above, simple as it is, has implications for two important theoretical issues. First of all, it demonstrates the need to recognize categories organized around prototypes in linguistics. The notion of prototype enables us to capture generalizations about the relations between motion verbs; without prototypes these generalizations would not be accounted for. Second, the analysis presented above offers a strong argument in favor of an anthropocentric and embodied perspective on language. Xoditi/îtti are only prototypical from the perspective of humans. If we adopted an objectivist position which ignores the fundamental role of human experience, the perspective of a fish or a bird would be just as valid as a starting point. Presumably, for a fish swimming is the prototypical kind of motion, while flying would be the prototypical kind of motion for most birds. In other words, if we do not adopt an anthropocentric approach to linguistic categorization (as suggested by Wierzbicka 1988: 2, 526 et passim), we are not able to make sense of the Russian motion verbs. Anthropocentrism is closely related to the notion of embodiment, which in cognitive linguistics is used to indicate that our conceptualization is grounded in experience with our bodies and how we use them in interacting with our surroundings (Lakoff & Johnson 1999: 36, see also Johnson 1987: 19ff. and Feldman 2006: 95ff.). This perspective is evident in the analysis presented above. Ildi/xoditi occupy a central position in the category of motion verbs exactly because they represent the prototypical way to interact with our bodies.

3. Metaphorical motion

In the beginning of the paper, I asked why îtti is used as the source domain in metaphorical examples of generalized motion like (1) and (2). We are now in a position to give a principled answer to this question. Ildi is used as the source domain for metaphors because for humans it represents the prototypical manner of motion. This insight, in turn, enables us to address the second question mentioned in the beginning of the article, namely why generalized (metaphorical) îtti shows affinity to "goal-oriented" contexts. Rakhilina (2000: 304, 2004: 9) considers examples like this:
(5) Korabl’ idet / "plyvet v port.
    ship goes "sails to harbor
    ‘The ship is going*/sailing to the harbor.’

She observes that idti is preferable because there is a specific itinerary provided by the adverbial s nopr ‘to the harbor’. Notice that Rakhlina’s claim is not that plyt’ is excluded in sentences like (5); what she suggests is that the use of idti involves a stronger emphasis on the goal than plyt’. Rakhlina does not specify whether (5) is a constructed example, but similar examples with idti are attested in the Russian National Corpus:

(6) Poslednjaja škuna idet v gavan’.
    last schooner goes to harbor
    ‘The last schooner is going to the harbor.’ [Zemajtis: Bolšaja laguna (1977)]

If no itinerary is specified, plyt’ is preferable to idti, as illustrated by the following example from a popular song (Rakhlina 2004: 10), where the focus is on the manner of motion rather than its goal:

(7) Plya / *sla, kačalas’ lodočka.
    swam / *went rocking boat
    ‘There was a boat sailing/*going and rocking.’

The generalization of the “goal-orientation” of idti is not restricted to motion in water. The generalization implies that generalized idti is particularly felicitous for streetcars and trains, which follow fixed itineraries and have no freedom of movement since they move on rails. Examples like the following are indeed very common:

(8) Ja udivilsja, tramvaj šel v tom že napravljenii.
    I was surprised streetcar went in same direction
    ‘I was surprised – the streetcar went in the same direction.’
    [Svetov: Moe otkrytie muzeja, Znamja (2001)]

(9) Poezd idet v Moskvu v dvenadcat’ časov.
    train goes to Moscow in twelve o’clock
    ‘The train goes to Moscow at twelve o’clock.’ [Leskov: Nekuda (1864)]

Exat’ is less common in sentences like (8) and (9). While a search in the Russian National Corpus for poezd + idti gave 208 examples, there were only thirteen examples with poezd + exat’ in the corpus.5 Interestingly, eight of the examples with

5. Corpus search performed on July 18, 2008.
exat' describe the speed of the train. The focus on the speed backgrounds the goal of the motion, which may make the use of exat' more felicitous:

(10) Poezd exat očen' medlenno, ostanavliva, gas svet.
    train drove very slowly stopping went.out light
    'The train went very slowly, stopped, and the light went out.'
    [Najman: Ljubovnyj interes (1998–1999)]

For cars, which unlike trains normally do not follow fixed itineraries, both exat' and idti are common. However, on the basis of the following examples Rakhilina (2000: 304, 2004: 9) argues that there is a subtle difference in meaning:

(11) Ne volnujes', za nami v aeroport uži idet / židet mašina.
    NEG worry after us to airport already goes / drives car
    'Don't worry, a car is already coming to pick us up at the airport.'

(12) Sмотри, za nami edet / židet kakaj-to mašina.
    look after us drives / goes some car
    'Look a car is following us.'

Although exat' is possible in (7) idti is preferred because the car in question follows a fixed itinerary. However, Rakhilina judges exat' felicitous in (8), where the car most likely is moving behind us accidentally. According to Rakhilina (2004: 11ff.), the situation for movement in air is somewhat less clear. However, heavenly bodies, which indeed have fixed "itineraries", combine with idti:6

(13) Ne zabyvaj, solnce idet s vostoka, u vas po utram
    NEG forget sun goes from east with you in mornings
    budet žarko.
    will.be hot
    'Don't forget that the sun goes from the east; it is going to be hot at your place in the mornings.'
    [Ščerbakova: Mitina ljubov' (1996)]

On the face of it, the following corpus example questions Rakhilina's judgment that letet' is incompatible with heavenly bodies:

(14) No on znal: ničega teper' ne moglo, ne dolžno slučitiša, vse
    but he knew nothing now NEG could NEG should happen everything
    bylo ščastlivoe, legkoe, solnce letelo.
    was happy light sun flew

6. Heavenly bodies also combine with plať' and dvigaščja. For a detailed account of the metaphorical use of plať', the reader is referred to Rakhilina (2007: 27ff.). The use of dvigaščja is discussed in Rakhilina (2004: 15ff.).
'But he knew that nothing would, nothing could happen; everything was happy, light, the sun was flying.'

[Zamjatin: *Ela* (1928)]

However, upon closer inspection (14) lends further support to Rakhilina's argument; the sun is associated here with happiness and is described as if it were able to loosen itself from its orbit — and fly. As pointed out by Rakhilina (2004:11), in the Russian folk taxonomy birds are associated with freedom (cf. the saying *svoboden kak ptica* 'free like a bird'). Since freedom is antagonistic to goal-bias, we should expect birds to combine with *letet*, and not with *iditi*. According to Rakhilina (2004:11), this prediction is borne out by the facts. The verb *iditi* cannot replace *letet* in the following example (Rakhilina 2004:6):

(15) Lastočka s vesnoju v seni k nam letit / ‘ideti.’
swallow with spring to porch to us flies / ‘goes
‘A swallow arrives at our doorstep with the spring.’

[Volos: *Nedvižnost* (2000)]

The Russian National Corpus provides 100 examples of *ptica + letet*, but only one apparent counterexample where *ptica* collocates with *iditi*:

(16) Pticy bili po nebju rovno, spokojno, krasivo.
birds went on sky evenly quietly gracefully
‘The birds moved across the sky evenly, quietly and gracefully.’


However, this example is not at variance with Rakhilina’s generalization about the goal-orientation of generalized *iditi*. The use of the adverb *rovno* ‘evenly’ suggests that in (16) the birds are described as if they were following a fixed itinerary across the sky.

In the same way as birds, insects and dragons combine with *letet*, since they do not have fixed itineraries:

(17) Ćeloveku nado otdoxnut’ v puti, a strekozy i babočki
human needs to rest in trip but dragon-flies and butterflies
*letjat, ne otdyxaja, i desjat, i dvadcat*, i sto verst.
fly neg resting and ten and twenty and hundred verst
‘A human must rest on his/her way, but dragon-flies and butterflies fly without rest for ten, twenty, and even a hundred verst.

[Bragin: *V strane dremučix trav* (1962)]

7. I did not count examples like the following, where the birds are actually walking on the ground: *Syje, belye, važnje pticy bili po plotine.* ‘Plump, white, important birds were walking along the dam.’ [A. Tolsto: *Xošdenie po mukam* (1941)].
(18) *Drakon letel, lenivo vzmaxivaja kryl'jami.*
    dragon flew lazily flapping wings
    'The dragon was flying, lazily flapping his wings.'
    [Lazarčuk & Uspenskij: *Posmotri v glaza čudovišč* (1996)]

The examples discussed in this section cannot do justice to Rakhilina's (2000, 2004) detailed analysis of a substantial body of data, but suffice to show that the contexts where generalized (metaphorical) *idti* can replace *plyt', exat' or *letet'* have something in common: they all involve a strong focus on the goal of motion. The question is why generalized *idti* is goal-oriented. In order to see that, we need to consider the meaning difference between *idti* and *xodit*', and more generally the difference between the unidirectional and non-directional verbs in Table 1. In Nesson (2000), I give a detailed analysis of the relationship, but for the purposes of the present study, the following brief overview will suffice. As suggested by the term, unidirectional verbs like *idti* are used about motion in one direction towards a goal. Consider the following examples:

(19) *Poëtoma on bežit v kino, čtoby v temnote odyjat'sja.*
    therefore he runs to movies in order to in darkness catch breath
    'Therefore he runs to the movie theater in order to catch his breath in the
    dark.' [Izmaylov: *Naši ljudi* (1984)]

(20) *Kostja i Njura idut k babuške.*
    Kostja and Njura go to grandmother
    'Kostja and Njura are walking to their granmother's place.'
    [Dubov: *Ogni na reke* (1966)]

(21) *Lisa polţla k nim s podvetrennoj storony.*
    fox crawled to them from leeward side
    'The fox was crawling towards them from the leeward side.'
    [Mamin-Sibirjak: *Malinovye gory* (1899)]

In examples (19)–(21) the goal is expressed by prepositional phrases. However, this is not necessary, and unidirectional verbs often combine with prepositional phrases representing the starting point:

(22) *My byli vynuzdenny idti iz gostinicy peškom.*
    we were forced to go from hotel on foot
    'We were forced to leave the hotel on foot.' [Arkipova: *Muzyka žizni* (1996)]

The non-directional motion verbs are used whenever we are not dealing with motion in one direction (cf. Isačenko 1982:421). It may be fruitful to distinguish between three types of situation, all of which are described in major grammars
such as Isačenko (1982: 422) and Timberlake (2004: 412). First, we have "motion round about", i.e., motion in various directions with no particular goal:

(23) On xodit, to’čno letaet; ego budto kto-to nosit po komnate. he walks like flies him as if somebody carries around room ‘He is walking, almost flying; it is as if someone is carrying him around the room.’

[ Gončarov: Oblomov (1859)]

(24) Izvestno, cto on mnogo ezdil po Evrope i pobyval well-known that he much drove around Europe and has been daže v Amerike. even in Amerika ‘It is well known that he traveled a lot in Europe and had even been to America.’

[ Rossijskaja muzykal’noja gazeta 2003.03.12]

The second type of situation involves “movement back and forth”, i.e., movement to a goal and back again.9

(25) Borisjuk ezdil v Avstraliju? Borisjuk drove to Australia
‘Has Borisjuk been to Australia?’

[ Argumenty i Fakty 2001.04.04]

(26) Včera on xodil v kino i dolžen byl pokazat mestnym, kak yesterday he went to movies and had to show locals how odevajutsja normal’nye ljudi. dress normal people
‘Yesterday he went to the movie theater and was supposed to show the locals how normal people dress.’

[ Bolmat: Sami po sebe (1999)]

---

8. The three situations represent broad categories with several subcategories, and there are uses that lie beyond the three subcategories. Consider the following example, which is more about location than movement (Majsk and Rakhilina 2007: 53ff. and Rakhilina 2007: 271): U dverej ee, na taburete, stojal taz, i v nem plavali vyčesannye volosy. ‘By her door on a stool there was a wash-basin, and combed out hairs were floating in it.’ [Oleša: Zavis’ (1927)] However, detailed discussion of examples like this is beyond the scope of the present study.

9. The “back and forth” type explains the widespread use of non-directional motion verbs for repeated events. In order to go to the movie theater again in (26), for example, one has to go back home before repeating the event. Notice, however, that unidirectional motion verbs are used about repeated events, as by examples like Inogda Mixas’ka ostavjal ix vidvoem i bežal daleko vpered, a potom ostanovil’sja i smotrel, kak oni idut k nemu. ‘Sometimes Mixas’ka would leave the two of them alone and run far ahead, but afterwards he would stop and watch them walk towards him.’ [Lixanov: Cistye kamuskii (1967)] Here, we are dealing with repeated motion in one direction, and accordingly the unidirectional verbs bežat ‘run’ and idti ‘walk’ are used.
(27) Ešće budući na gostroljaj v Rige vesnoj 1959 goda, ja letal v while being on tour in Riga in spring 1959 year I flew to Moskovu, gde repetiroval v "Sovremennike" pervuju svoju rol' v Moscow where I rehearsed in Sovremennik first my role in spektakle "Vzlomščiki tišiny".
play Thieves of silence
‘While I was on tour in Riga in the spring of 1959, I made a roundtrip flight to Moscow where I rehearsed my first role in the play “The thieves of silence” at the “Sovremennik” theater.’ [Kozakov: Akterskaja kniga (1978–1995)]

The third type of context involves what Timberlake (2004:412) calls the “essentialist idea of a certain type of activity”. For simplicity, I will use the terms “ability situation”. In the following examples, the focus is on the ability to move, while directionality is irrelevant.

(28) On zabyl, čto ne umeet plavat', i, estestvenno, utonul.
he forgot that he can swim and naturally drowned
‘He forgot he wasn’t able to swim, and, naturally, drowned.’
[Amurskiy meridian (Khabarovsk), 2004.12.22]

(29) A moi deti, Tiša i Toša, vsjdu v mestie, odin ešće polzaet, and my kids Tiša and Toša everywhere together one still crawls a drugoj uže xodit.
and other already walks
‘And my kids, Tiša and Toša, are always together, one is still crawling, while the other is already walking.’ [Petruševskaja: Nevinnye glaza (1998–2000)]

(30) Vidor naučilsja letat' po-nastojaščemu.
Vidor learned to fly for real
‘Vidor learned to fly for real.’ [Sem'ja 2000.01.19]

Since the non-directional verbs are compatible with different kinds of situations, and since, as shown in (28)–(30), these verbs are used when directionality is irrelevant, we can conclude that non-directional verbs are semantically unmarked (cf. Nesson 2000 for further discussion). Unidirectional verbs like iditi, on the other hand, must be specified for directionality. Summarizing, the meaning of iditi (used non-metaphorically) involves two components:

(31) The meaning of iditi:
a. Motion on foot at normal speed.
b. Motion in one direction towards a goal.

Clearly, (31) does not offer an exhaustive description of the meaning of iditi. In particular, the brief statement in (a) does not do justice to the analysis of proto-
typical motion in Section 2. However, (31) is sufficiently precise for a discussion of the metaphorical use of *idti* as a generalized verb of motion.

Metaphor has been one of the cornerstones of cognitive linguistics ever since Lakoff and Johnson (1980) argued that metaphor plays a pivotal role in linguistic semantics. Metaphor can be defined as “a cross-domain mapping in a conceptual system” (Lakoff 1993: 203).\(^{10}\) When *idti* is used metaphorically, we can identify a mapping from a domain of walking on foot to a domain of generalized motion. Mapping means that some of the structure from the source domain (walking on foot) carries over to the target domain (generalized motion). Consider the following example:

(32) \[\text{Vot } \text{idet } \text{poezd - normal'no, po rel 'sam.}\]
\[\text{here goes train normally, along rails}\]
\[\text{‘Here comes the train – as usual, along the rails.’}\]


In this example, the idea of motion along a path towards a goal is mapped onto the target domain. This makes it possible to make inferences. Since we know that when people are walking in one direction towards a goal, they normally reach that goal, we may infer that the train in (32) will arrive at its destination (where we are waiting for it). However, as is normally the case in metaphor, not all structure from the source domain carries over to the target domain of a metaphor. Example (32) illustrates this. Since trains do not have legs, it is clear that the part concerning motion on foot is not included in the target domain. Simplifying somewhat, we can say that the directionality component in (31b) carries over to the target domain, whereas the specification that *idti* involves motion on foot in (31a) does not.

In the beginning of this section, I argued that *idti* is used metaphorically as a generalized motion verb because it represents a prototypical kind of motion. However, why is the metaphorical use restricted to “goal-oriented” contexts? The analysis sketched in this section enables us to give a principled answer to this question. As we have seen, the component involving motion on foot does not carry over to the target domain of the metaphor. As a consequence of this, the second component of the meaning, unidirectionality, becomes more salient in the target domain.

---

10. The cognitive linguistics approach to metaphor adopted in this article is inclusive, insofar as all examples of *idti* not involving actual movement on foot are classified as metaphorical. However, since cognitive linguistics endorse gradient categories, it is possible to accommodate the intuition that expressions like *krov’ idet* ‘the blood is flowing’ are “more metaphorical” than *poezd idet* ‘the train is coming’. The cognitive linguistics approach to metaphor is controversial, but a comparison with other conceptions is beyond the scope of the present study. For a recent critical discussion, the reader may consult Fadučeva (2004: 172ff.).
In a sense, in metaphors unidirectionality does not have to compete for attention with the foot-based motion component. The prediction that follows from this is that unidirectionality is dominant in metaphorical uses. This prediction is borne out by the facts discussed in the beginning of this section. By way of illustration, consider again example (9), which for convenience is repeated here:

(33) \textit{Poezd idet v Moskvu v dvenadcat' časov.}
    train goes to Moscow in twelve o'clock
    'The train goes to Moscow at twelve o'clock.' \footnote{Leskov: \textit{Nekuda} (1864)}

Since trains have fixed itineraries and are bound to move on rails, we expect frequent use of the "goal-oriented" generalized \textit{idi} in sentences like this. As we have seen, this prediction is indeed borne out by the facts. On the other hand, we do not expect \textit{idi} to collocate with \textit{ptica}, since birds are associated with freedom and do not have fixed itineraries. Once again this prediction is borne out by the facts from the Russian National Corpus reviewed earlier in this section.

4. Conclusion

The analysis of Russian motion verbs proposed in this paper suggests three conclusions. First of all, I have argued that \textit{idi} is used as a generalized motion verb in metaphors because it represents prototypical motion. In metaphorical speaking and reasoning about motion, it is natural to take prototypical motion as the point of departure. Second, the analysis enables us to explain the affinity between generalized, metaphorical \textit{idi} and "goal-oriented" contexts. Since unidirectionality is dominant in the target domain, we predict that generalized \textit{idi} occurs in "goal-oriented" contexts, which is exactly what we observe. The third and final conclusion takes us beyond Russian and Slavic linguistics. As we have seen, the proposed analysis crucially involves the notions of prototype, anthropocentrism, embodiment and metaphor. The analysis therefore testifies to the value of these key concepts of cognitive linguistics and lends support to a cognitive approach to linguistic categories.

References


Appendix. Abbreviations

* ungrammatical
? questionable phrasing
?? extremely questionable phrasing
AUX auxiliary
NEG auxiliary