

# Semantic Analysis of Verbs of Motion

---

**Kosić, Karla**

**Master's thesis / Diplomski rad**

**2022**

*Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj:* **University of Zagreb, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences / Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Filozofski fakultet**

*Permanent link / Trajna poveznica:* <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:131:832578>

*Rights / Prava:* [In copyright](#)/[Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

*Download date / Datum preuzimanja:* **2024-07-17**



Sveučilište u Zagrebu  
Filozofski fakultet  
University of Zagreb  
Faculty of Humanities  
and Social Sciences

*Repository / Repozitorij:*

[ODRAZ - open repository of the University of Zagreb  
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences](#)



Sveučilište u Zagrebu  
Filozofski fakultet  
Odsjek za anglistiku  
Odsjek za istočnoslavenske jezike i književnosti

Diplomski rad

*Semantic Analysis of Verbs of Motion*  
*(Семантический анализ глаголов движения)*

Student/ica: Karla Kosić

Mentor:

dr. sc. Janja Čulig Suknaić

dr. sc. Branka Barčot

ak. god.: 2021./2022.

U Zagrebu, 7. rujna 2022.



## Abstract

This study examines the semantic features and transformation of meaning in the verbs of motion *fall* and *run* in English and Russian language in a contextualized setting, and compares them with native speakers' perception of the verbs with no surrounding context. It uses frame semantics as a guiding tool to discern which mental images are evoked and transformed and attempts to apply it to stimulus-reaction bonds provided in the associative thesauruses. As the study shows, there is a considerable difference in perception of the motion verbs *fall* and *run* and their use. The perception is largely coherent with the use of verbs in their prototypical setting. The meanings of verbs in context has a much greater range and transformations of meaning is largely influenced by surrounding context, including the elements that pertain to spatial positioning and the grammatical properties of the verbs.

Keywords: semantics, verbs of motion, frame semantics, cognitive linguistics, context

## Резюме

Данное исследование рассматривает семантические особенности и трансформации значения глаголов *падать* и *бегать/бежать* в русском и английском языках, в контекстуальном окружении и вне его. Исследование пользуется фреймовой семантикой как главным инструментом для определения мысленных образов, которые возникают и трансформируются, и пытается применить ее к связям между стимулом и реакцией, представленным в ассоциативных словарях. Как показывает исследование, существует значительная разница в восприятии глаголов движения и их употребления. Восприятие глаголов в большой степени совпадает с употреблением глаголов в прототипичном окружении. Значения анализируемых глаголов в контексте имеют гораздо больший диапазон, и на их трансформации очень влияет окружающий контекст, включая элементы, относящиеся к пространственному расположению, а также и грамматические свойства глаголов.

Ключевые слова: семантика, глаголы движения, фреймовая семантика, когнитивная лингвистика, контекст

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .....	1
THEORETICAL BACKGROUND .....	2
1. The Nature of Meaning .....	2
2. Frame semantics.....	3
3. Verbs of motion .....	5
METHODOLOGY .....	7
ANALYSIS: VERB IN CONTEXT .....	9
FALL.....	9
ПАДАТЬ, ПАСТЬ, УПАСТЬ (padat', past', upast') .....	19
RUN .....	29
БЕГАТЬ, БЕЖАТЬ (begat', bezhat').....	41
ANALYSIS: VERB WITHOUT CONTEXT .....	50
CONCLUSION .....	68
List of refences: .....	70
APPENDIX: Abbreviations.....	77

## INTRODUCTION

Verbs of motion are a frequently discussed topic amongst linguists; from attempts to determine what can be considered motion to what verbs can be called motion verbs and how they differ across various languages, the list of diagrams, tables and formulas grows longer with each passing year. There is a deceptive simplicity about them – most of us have an intuition about which verbs can belong to this category; verbs such as *go*, *come*, *run*, *walk* give a clear mental image that involves movement from one place to another. Yet one rarely stops to think why the verb *run* is used in a sentence such as, *His brother runs the company*. Certainly, *run* cannot be considered to refer to any sort of movement in this context. It is also difficult to imagine that anyone would say that *fall* refers to a downward movement in a sentence like *Mary fell pregnant*. What contributes to these changes in meaning and how does it relate to our own perception of these verbs is precisely the topic of this study.

This study examines the semantic properties and transformations of meaning in the verbs of motion *fall* and *run* in both English and Russian. By means of frame semantics, it aims to determine how the meanings of these verbs are realized in a contextualized setting and which concepts it evokes. It also attempts to discern which elements trigger the transformation of meanings of these two verbs. Finally, it examines the verbs in a decontextualized setting as provided by associative thesauruses in English and Russian, and compares the perception of the verbs with their use.

The study consists of three parts: the first sets forth the theoretical background which served as the basis for the analysis. This is followed by the methodology of the research and analysis of verbs *fall* and *run*, in both English and Russian. The analysis is divided into two parts: the first is a corpus based study which observes the behavior of verbs in a contextualized setting. The second analyzes the perception of verbs without given context. Finally, the conclusion draws the main insights of the study.

## THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

### 1. The Nature of Meaning

This study relies on principles of cognitive linguistics. In the center of this framework is the nature of meaning; as Langacker (2002: 2) puts it succinctly, “Meaning is equated with conceptualization.” There are several important notions lying behind this premise. Firstly, there are two spheres of knowledge crucial for understanding information in human communication: knowledge of the world and knowledge of the language. There is no clear line that separates the two spheres; knowledge of the language implies knowledge of the world and vice versa (Žic Fuchs 1991: 85). The knowledge of the world, as Žic Fuchs (1991: 78) explains, is understood as “mental processing” of everything that surrounds us, that we can perceive or experience. In other words, we know what the meaning of the word *run*, for example, because we have either performed such motion or we have seen someone else perform it. This stored knowledge draws from experience which is layered – it may include the physical strain, speed, shape of the body, sounds associated with it and so on. In other words, the knowledge of the world itself is a sum of information a speaker possesses about certain concept (*Ibid.* 80). Though the knowledge of the world is often identified with conceptual structure, Žic Fuchs makes a distinction between them – whereas knowledge of the world is the total of information stored in the mind, the conceptual structure refers to the principles by which this information is organized and stored in their mind (*Ibid.*).

The issue of organization of knowledge through categories has been a long debate throughout history. The dominant theory has for a long time been what Langacker refers to as critical attribute model (2002: 266). This model describes categories as a fixed set of features and properties; if an entity lacks one feature prescribed for the category, it does not belong to that category. In other words, “Class membership is consequently an all-or-nothing affair; there are no degrees of membership, nor does a category display any significant internal structure” (*Ibid.*). A more recent theory, adopted by cognitive linguistics, is the prototype theory, introduced by Eleanor Rosch in 1973. Within this theory “a category is defined with reference to a prototype, i.e. a schematized representation of typical instances” (*Ibid.*) Class membership is based on similarity of an entity to the prototypical member of the category – those members that are perceived as similar are considered to be “central” members of a category, whereas those that are less typical are in turn “peripheral” members. How far an entity can depart from the representational model and still be accepted within the category depends solely with the judgment of the categorizer (*Ibid.*). Nevertheless, the principle of

similarity implies that *some* features must be shared. These features are determined by the perceptual, cultural, experiential background shared by a certain community of speakers of the same language (Žic Fuchs 1991: 80, 81). Such contextual background is structured into what Langacker (1987) refers to as domains: “Domains are necessarily cognitive entities: mental experiences, representational spaces, concepts, conceptual complexes” (147). To use his example, the concept *knuckle* presupposes and is explained by the conception of a *finger* (*Ibid.*); therefore *knuckle* belongs to the domain of *finger*. *Finger*, in turn is characterized by the domain of *hand*, which in turn belongs to the domain of *arm* and so on. Langacker differentiates between two types of domains: basic and abstract ones. Basic domains “occupy the lowest level in hierarchies of conceptual complexity,” (*Ibid.*: 149) which means that they are characterized in and by themselves, or in other words, irreducible. Among basic domains, Langacker includes space, time, domains of sensory capacities (visual, hearing, taste and/or smell, etc.) as well as emotive and kinesthetic domains (*Ibid.*). An abstract domain, on the other hand, is “any nonbasic domain, i.e. any concept or conceptual complex that functions as a domain for the definition of a higher-order concept” (*Ibid.*: 150). Therefore, *finger*, *hand*, *arm*, etc. are all considered to be abstract domains that relate to the basic domain of three-dimensional space (*Ibid.*). The notion of abstract domains is found among other scholars under different names, some of which include frames, schemas, scripts, scenes, etc. (*Ibid.*). In this study, the term used will be *frames* following Fillmore’s terminology from frame semantics.

## 2. Frame semantics

Frame semantics was introduced by Fillmore in 1982 in his work *Frame Semantics* and is focused on teasing out “the precise nature of the relationship between the word and the category, and the precise nature of the relationships between the category and the background” (Fillmore 1982: 136). The category in question is a term Fillmore uses to describe the system of concepts that is immediately evoked by a word. To use his example, the word *breakfast* can relate to practices associated with the concept of breakfast, including a specific menu (like eggs and toast), specific time of day (morning) or the sequential order of meals throughout the day (first meal of the day). All of these concepts hold true for the category of *breakfast* but not all are necessarily present in every use of the word; one can wake up after noon or eat ice cream or have eggs and toast in for dinner. What this shows, Fillmore says, “is not that we have so far failed to capture the true core of the word’s meaning, but rather that the word gives us a category which can be used in many different contexts” (*Ibid.*: 119). In other words,



the meaning of a word is dependent on its surrounding context. But the context is also determined to an extent by the category itself – for example, one is not likely to mention breakfast when discussing the contents and properties of a mechanical watch. As Fillmore words it, “this range of contexts is determined by the multiple aspects of its prototypic use – the use it has when the conditions of the background situation more or less exactly match the defining prototype” (*Ibid.*). As words are inherently connected to these categories, which are in turn connected to surrounding categories, a whole system of categories emerges. This is what Fillmore calls a *frame*. To give a full definition: “A ‘frame’, [...] is a system of categories structured in accordance with some motivating context” (*Ibid.*). A frame consists of frame elements – concepts relating to the same contextual environment – and activating one element brings to mind other elements of the same frame (*Ibid.*: 130). Frames also relate to other frames; in some cases there is a hierarchy of frames. For example, a Self\_motion frame, which includes movement of an entity that possesses a body, inherits elements from a more generic Motion frame (FrameNet). Moreover, words often have more than one meaning and can therefore evoke more than one frame. The cognitive mechanism involved in such cases is usually conceptual metaphor (or metonymy in some cases). Conceptual metaphor allows for understanding of one abstract concept in terms of another, less abstract concept (Lakoff, Johnson 1980: 6). For example, we often refer to concept of time in terms of money by saying “You’re wasting your time” or “I have a few minutes to spare.” Therefore, the conceptual metaphor is identified as TIME IS MONEY (*Ibid.*: 8). Moreover, by interaction of two separate frames, a third can emerge. In other words, frames can evoke other frames.

The intricate business of network of frames is documented to great extent on FrameNet. FrameNet functions as a lexicon that associates each lexical unit to a frame that it evokes. As Fillmore (2006) explains, FrameNet “differs from that of ordinary lexicography in an important way: instead of working with a single word and exploring all of its meanings, it takes a single frame and examines all of the LUs that evoke that frame.” (Fillmore 2006: 616). For example, the verb *fall* is connected to three separate frames on FrameNet: Motion\_directional, Conquering and Change\_position\_on\_a\_scale. Each frame entry provides definition of the frame and illustrates examples of each separate frame element that belongs to it. Finally it lists other lexemes that are also considered to evoke the same frame. A frame interpretation of sentence looks in the following way:

0.1. [<sup>Thm</sup> The paper] FELL<sup>Target</sup> [<sup>Path</sup> to the floor]. (FrameNet)

The entity falling, the Theme *the paper*, falls down the Path *to the floor*.

The principles of cognitive linguistics and frame semantics form the cornerstone of this study. However, they merely provide the tools for analysis of conceptualization and understanding of the verbs of motion. As Fillmore sums it up, “the fun part is that of analyzing how the actual choice of a lexical item evokes a frame, and what follows from that evocation” (Fillmore 2006: 620).

### 3. Verbs of motion

Verbs of motion presume a category of verbs that denote an activity related to motion of an entity. However this category is by no means clear to define; Fillmore (1971: 369) excludes spinning motion from the category and includes only the type of motion which implies change of location. Levin (1993: 132) makes distinction between verbs of carrying and verbs of motion; the verb *transport*, for example is listed in the former, but not the latter, even though in Ikegami’s (1969) list of verbs of motion it is comfortably grouped with Verbs of Motion with Components of Accompanying Circumstances (73). The blurry line between what is a verb of motion and what isn’t is certainly a curious topic, but for the purposes of this study it will suffice to understand the verbs of motion as those verbs whose primary meaning relates to movement of an entity that is perceived as a whole from one point to another. This is very much in line with Fillmore’s (1971) understanding of motion.

Moreover, the category of verbs of motion is immensely large (even without the verbs in the grey area), containing hundreds of verbs relating to some kind of movement. To analyze all would be an impossible task within the scope of this work. However, such a large category can be broken down into many subcategories according to other properties that these verbs show. A part of Levin’s (1993) *English Verb Classes and Alternations* does exactly that; she divides the category of Verbs of motion into seven distinct categories. There are two categories that are particularly prominent: Verbs of Inherently Directed Motion and Manner of Motion Verbs. These categories are based on the properties of PATH and MANNER in motion verbs, which also serve as basis for typology of languages – the main point of difference is in the expression of PATH: if a language shows prevalence of verb of motions that express PATH in their root, it belongs to a group of verb-framed languages; if the PATH is expressed by accompanying particle, the language is determined as a satellite-framed language (Slobin 2005: 4; for more on the categorization of languages based on expression of PATH in verbs, see Talmy 1985, 1991, 2000). Because of the salience of these two properties

two verbs were chosen for the analysis – one expressing PATH, the other MANNER. It should be noted that both Russian and English belong to satellite-framed languages; it is therefore expected that no great difference will emerge in the analysis of meaning of the verbs. The verb containing PATH in this study will be *fall* and its equivalent in Russian, *падать* (along with its perfective forms). The verb expressing MANNER will be *run* along with its counterparts *бегать* and *бежать*.

## METHODOLOGY

This study is separated into two parts. The first part includes a corpus-based analysis of the verbs *fall* and *run* and its counterparts in Russian. As explained in the previous section, the verbs were chosen by the properties of PATH and MANNER they express in their root. A pilot study included three English verbs expressing PATH and three that contained MANNER, as well as their respective counterparts in Russian. However, it soon proved that the scope of the study would not allow for a detailed analysis encompassing all of the verbs. Therefore, *fall* and *run* were chosen as representative verbs expressing PATH and MANNER. The corpora used in the study include English Web 2020 (enTenTen20) for verbs in English and Russian Web 2011 (ruTenTen11) for Russian verbs. Both are available on Sketch Engine. The corpus provides the following frequency data:

	Verb	Number of hits	Number of hits per million tokens
English	<i>fall</i>	10,067,890	233.46
	<i>run</i>	19,736,441	457.65
Russian	<i>падать</i>	846,708	46.32
	<i>пасть</i>	286,928	15.7
	<i>упасть</i>	955,378	52.26
	<i>бегать</i>	445,731	24.38
	<i>бежать</i>	897,069	49.07
	<i>прибегать / прибежать</i>	346,085	18.93
	<i>убегать / убежать</i>	206,563	11.3

Table 1.

There is an obvious discrepancy in the amount of Russian compared to the amount of English verbs – this is due to several reasons. First, the verb *fall* is equated with three lexical items: *падать*, *пасть*, and *упасть*. However, these are all forms of the same verb; *падать* is an imperfective form denoting falling motion and *пасть*, and *упасть* are its perfective counterparts. Due to the specifics of morphosyntactic annotation of the corpus the perfective forms had to be separately entered. The verb *run*, on the other hand, has two counterparts in Russian, *бегать* and *бежать*. This is primarily because they belong to a closed group called *глаголы движения* (‘verbs of motion’) that is based on a set of specific morphosyntactic, but also semantic features of several verbs of motion. Because of the differences in meaning they

had to be separately analyzed. The verbs *прибегать / прибежать* and *убегать / убежать* are also included to examine how the addition of a satellite prefix affects the meaning of the verbs *бегать* and *бежат*. This was not necessary for the English *run* because the satellites that include PATH are usually expressed by adverbs and prepositional phrases and are therefore included in the list by default.

For verbs *fall* and *run* a hundred instances of appearance were analyzed for each verb. To balance out the number of analyzed sentences, for the verbs *падать, насть, упасть* as well as *бегать* and *бежать*, fifty sentences were analyzed from the corpus for each verb. The prefixal verbs *прибегать / прибежать* and *убегать / убежать* were analyzed from 25 sentences each. Nouns derived from the verbs of motion were excluded from the analysis, as were homonyms pairs (this primarily relates to pairs *fall* (v.) – *fall* (n.) and *насть* (v.) – *насть* (n.)). The verbs are analyzed according to the principles of frame semantics, as described in the previous chapter.

The second part of the study examines the perception of the enumerated verbs from the point of view of native speakers. The source for this analysis comes from the associative thesauruses, which provide information on the semantics of these verbs based on native speaker input. For English, the data is provided by Edinburgh Associative Thesaurus (EAT) and for Russian, the source was *Русский ассоциативный словарь* ('Russian Associative Thesaurus', RAT). Both thesauruses are available online. The stimulus – reaction bonds were analyzed through the prism of frame semantics. In essence, this means that reactions were interpreted by the semantic role or frame(s) they were likely to evoke in association with the verb-stimulus. Although homonyms and derived nouns could not be discarded as in the corpus analysis, they were sorted into separate category which was not analyzed.

## ANALYSIS: VERB IN CONTEXT

### FALL

In the Oxford English Dictionary, the entry for the verb *fall* has five senses, each accompanied with at least one other subsense. They range from more general definitions of the literal meaning to more particular definitions of metaphorical meanings. As such, the first sense of the verb *fall* is defined as “move from a higher to a lower level, typically rapidly and without control” (Oxford English Dictionary). The first subsense following this definition says “hang down” and offers an illustrative sentence “hair that was allowed to fall to her shoulders.” (OED) There is an obvious difference between the two meanings; one includes the explicit movement of an entity whereas the other uses the perception of that movement to describe a position in space. The further the sense, the more non-transparent the meaning appears; the last sense is explained as “pass into a specified state, situation, or position” (OED), which is hard, I believe, to understand at first glance without an example sentence.

To try to discern the connection between such various senses of the verb, it is necessary to observe how the same verb behaves in various contexts, i.e. to examine the syntagmatic relations to other elements in sentences and how they affect the meaning of the verb. I will turn to Fillmore’s (1982) understanding of word meanings through frames. Frames, as he explains, are a “system of categories structured in accordance with some motivating context” (119). A lexeme presents one part of a frame, and “to speak of one part of a frame is to bring to consciousness, or to raise to question its other components” (1982: 130). In many cases, one lexeme can evoke more than one frame. Such is precisely the case with *fall*.

The lexeme *fall* primarily refers to a situation in which an entity moves vertically from a higher spatial point to a lower one. In terms of FrameNet *fall* evokes the “Motion\_directional” frame which takes on the core frame elements (FEs) Theme (the entity that moves), Area, Direction, Path, Goal and Source (FrameNet). The Theme can be an animate entity, a physical object, or in rarer cases an abstract concept. In other words, the verb *fall* does not impose any semantic restrictions upon this semantic role. The FE Area is associated with motion that is irregular or not very specified, whereas the elements Direction, Goal, Source, and Path identify specific spatial positioning and thus exclude the former frame element. However, other than the Theme, other core FEs are not necessarily explicated in a sentence, but are rather implied in the meaning of the verb itself or evoked by surrounding context. Consider the following sentence:

- (1) *Kevin is playing outside when he falls and bumps his head.*<sup>1</sup>

In this sentence the verb *fall* is accompanied by the Theme *he* which serves as anaphoric reference for *Kevin* (both therefore contextually functioning as the same FE). The Theme is the only core element present in the sentence. The non-core frame elements include the Circumstances *playing outside* that showcase the activity and place of the event and the Result *bumps his head*. To put it in the frame analysis form:

1. 1. [<sup>Cir</sup> [<sup>Thm</sup> Kevin] is playing outside] when [<sup>Thm</sup> he] FALLS<sup>Target</sup> [<sup>Result</sup> and bumps his head].

It can be argued that the frame element Area is represented in the lexical unit *outside*. Indeed, it is certainly evoked. However, I would argue *outside* to be a non-core FE within the Activity frame: [<sup>Agt</sup> Kevin] is [<sup>Act</sup> playing] [<sup>Place</sup> outside]. Therefore, the Area is only evoked through interaction of the Activity frame and Motion\_directional one.

More often than not, the Motion\_directional frame of the verb *fall* often seems to result in damage, injury or death. This is usually verbally expressed by means of elements that precede or come after the target predicate, such as *serious injuries*, *rushed off to the hospital*, *smashing the windscreen*, etc. However, sometimes the outcome is only contextually implied:

- (2) *A record-breaking free solo climber reportedly failed to tie a crucial knot in his rope before slipping off and falling 305 metres down the face of a mountain.*

In the sentence above, the resulting outcome of the falling motion is not explicitly stated, but with the contextual elements such as *crucial knot*, distance of *305 metres* and path *down the face of the mountain*, it may be presupposed that the result includes either death or at least severe injury. It is possible that this negative experience that is associated with the falling motion lies in the conceptual core of many metaphorically extended meanings of the verb, as we will see further below. However, this aspect is only present in Themes that include an animate entity or a large physical object; in the case of a large physical object, the damage is dealt rather than sustained:

- (3) *[The pipe] fell 14.5 meters hitting two cars below which had stopped at traffic lights, smashing the windscreen of one vehicle.*

---

<sup>1</sup> Majority of examples presented in this way throughout the analysis are taken from corpora (English Web 2020 (enTenTen20) for English and Russian Web 2011 (ruTenTen11) for Russian) available on Sketch Engine. Examples that are not taken from the corpora are marked in the text with references to their respective source.

The Themes that include precipitation or that are perceived as grouped particles (such as glitter, dust, etc.) are the exceptions to this aspect of meaning.

Another prevailing aspect of meaning that is associated with the falling motion is involuntariness of the event or the lack of control (usually ensuing from a mistake of some kind or outside forces). In the case above, this is expressed in the first clause – *failed to tie a crucial knot* – leading to an undesirable outcome. The aspect of failure is more common for animate Themes.

The vertical falling motion is metaphorically extended to the *Change\_position\_on\_a\_scale* frame. In this frame, the Item changes “position on a scale (the Attribute) from a starting point (Initial\_value) to an end point (Final\_value)” (FrameNet). In the case of this particular lexeme, the Initial\_value is always and exclusively higher than the Final\_value. The Path can also be present, alongside the magnitude of the change (Difference) (FrameNet).

- (4) *Inflation-adjusted wages in the UK fell by 3.2% between the third quarter of 2010 and the third quarter of 2012*

Here the Item *wages* changes position on the indefinite Attribute in the amount of Difference 3.2% in the Duration of *between the third quarter of 2010 and the third quarter of 2012* in the Place *in the UK*. To put it in a frame-analysis form:

- 1.2. Inflation-adjusted [<sup>Item</sup> wages] [<sup>Place</sup> in the UK] FELL<sup>Target</sup> [<sup>Diff</sup> by 3.2%] [<sup>Dur</sup> between the third quarter of 2010 and the third quarter of 2012.]

It is worth noting that in many cases the entity in the role of Item, usually an uncountable noun referring to some kind of substance, is most often metonymically connected to a more abstract concept that can be presented in quantities or percentages (such as *wages, price, income, value, attendance*, etc.) As such, in the sentence below the Item *crude oil* does not refer to the oil itself, but rather to the ‘price/worth/value/etc. of crude oil’.

- (5) *Crude oil fell more than 3% on November 19.*

More often than not, the Item includes some kind of monetary value. In such context, the verb *fall* will have negative connotations. For example, in the sentence below the *Change\_of\_position\_on\_a\_scale* frame is evoked by the lexical units *fell* and *recovered*. The LU *recover* also evokes the Recovery frame, which in turn interacts with the meaning of *fall*, setting an antonymic relationship between the two frames, which is possible due to the



background experience of the falling motion being associated with gaining injury or other type of damage. Though not explicitly evoked by any lexical unit, the background experience of gaining injury in juxtaposition with the Recovery frame arguably gives rise to the Experience\_bodily\_harm frame. Therefore, the implication of the *Real GDP* falling is that of experiencing damage.

(6) *Although there is a cost of disinflation and the Real GDP fell, it recovered.*

As already mentioned, Item is usually a concept that can be expressed numerically, such as monetary value, percentage of population, crime, attendance, etc., but sometimes it can take more abstract concepts such as regard, respect, admiration, etc. Nevertheless, the entire frame is constrained to depict evaluation of the Item on a scale. The vertical position of the scale as well as the vertical trajectory of the falling motion determines that the initial and final value must be juxtaposed as one being on a high point, and the other on a lower one (regardless of which value). This immediately brings to mind orientational conceptual metaphors in which UP is associated with largely positive traits or concepts such as happiness, high status, health, good, etc., and “down” with concepts in direct opposition: sadness, low status, sickness, bad, etc. (Lakoff, Johnson 1980: 15,16). It stands to reason that this orientational metaphor applies to the downward motion of the concept *fall*, therefore imbuing it with prevalently negative connotations. This may be so in the large majority of cases, but it ought to be pointed out that the negative or positive aspect of the verb itself is more likely to be dependent on the evaluative perception of the Item in the frame. Let us compare the following sentences:

(7) *Which says a lot about how much my regard for Apple has fallen lately [...]*

(8) *Crime in Scotland fell to its lowest recorded level for 32 years in 2009/10, falling by ten per cent.*

In (7) the Item *regard* perceived as a concept of high value, therefore, the downward motion of such Item is equals to losing value<sup>2</sup> and so coherent with the orientational metaphor GOOD IS UP; BAD IS DOWN. On the other hand the Item *crime* in (8) is safely presumed as a concept that invokes mainly negative associations. As such, the fall of (the rate of) crime is primarily seen as something positive, making the frame not coherent with the conceptual metaphor above. I will not go here into the particulars of the nature of orientational metaphors

---

<sup>2</sup> I must clarify here that the Item itself does not lose value in itself, but that the value of the object of regard is extended to the concept of the regard itself. Therefore, the presence or absence of regard determines the value of the object.

and exceptions in perceived rules, but limit myself to the metaphorical extension of this particular LU within this frame<sup>3</sup>. Suffice it to say that the falling motion is metaphorically coherent with conceptual perception of change of state that implies loss or diminishing of value (most often to an undesirable outcome, though not exclusively, depending on the meaning of the Item of the Change\_position\_on\_a\_scale frame).

Another frame in which *fall* is listed as a target in FrameNet includes the Conquering frame. In this frame, there are two core frame elements – Theme, the entity that is conquered – and the Conqueror. This frame can metaphorically be extended to competitive sport games with two opposing sides, such as football, soccer, etc. as is seen below:

(9) *Hogs fall to Tigers 24-14 in season finale.*

1.3. [<sup>The Hogs</sup>] FALL<sup>Target</sup> [<sup>Con</sup> to Tigers] 24-14 in season finale.

However, with more standard Themes of the Conquering frame, such as nations, governments, land, peoples, the picture shifts slightly when *fall* serves as the target. Let us examine the sentence below:

(10) *U.S. leaders have wanted this conflict to continue since the Soviet Union fell.*

In this sentence the Theme is clear – *the Soviet Union*. However, there is no Conqueror involved. Therefore, it is possible that the sentence in question does not evoke this frame but another by means of metaphor extension. If we take the meaning of *fall* in this context to be synonymous with ‘collapse’, it is then more congruent with the Endeavor\_failure frame, which includes single core FE Endeavor. Thus accordingly:

1.4. U.S. leaders have wanted this conflict to continue since [<sup>End</sup> the Soviet Union]  
FELL<sup>Target</sup>.

Once again, we can observe aspects of meaning related to *fall* that include negative connotations, such as damage or death. As before, this is inherited from the primary experience of the falling motion, and metaphorically transformed to the understanding of disappearance of a governmental institution (NATIONS ARE PEOPLE in ‘the Soviet Union’, SICKNESS AND DEATH ARE DOWN conceptual metaphor expressed in ‘fall’; Lakoff and

---

<sup>3</sup> Orientational metaphors are a category of conceptual metaphors that are centered on spatial relation such as up-down, in-out, front-back, deep-shallow, etc. These metaphors “organize a whole system of concepts with respect to one another” (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 15). For more on orientational and other categories of conceptual metaphors, see Lakoff and Johnson (1980); also Kövecses (2010).

Johnson 1980: 261, 16). The other aspect – lack of control – though not nonexistent, it does not seem to be relevant in this context.

In all previous examples, the verb *fall* functioned intransitively. In the following one, *fall* acts as a copula:

- (11) ...*they struggled to fall pregnant for nine years and only welcomed their son thanks to in vitro fertilization.*

The meaning of the verb in this context corresponds sufficiently to that of ‘become’. In that sense, adequate frame that could be applied would be the Becoming frame. As such, the following frame consists of an Entity *they*, which is the only core FE, and the Final Quality *pregnant* followed with Duration *for nine years*:

- 1.5. [<sup>Ent</sup> they] struggled to FALL<sup>Target</sup> [<sup>Finq</sup> pregnant] [<sup>Dur</sup> for nine years]

Unlike in previous example, where the more prominent aspect of meaning was the one of death or collapse, in this case it is the lack of control that seems to be more in focus. This might seem contradictory considering the preceding verb *struggle*, implying that one can strive to achieve a goal that is out of control, essentially a coincidence. However, it also implies failure precisely due to the coincidental nature of the goal.

It must be pointed out here that the lexeme *fall* is not listed in either Endeavor\_failure frame nor Becoming frame on FrameNet. This is not overly surprising but it does point to a rather glaring shortcoming of this lexicon. To quote from Dalpanagioti (2022: 6): “as Ruppenhofer et al. [2016: 100] note, ‘only a few metaphor relations have been added to the database’; FrameNet has not ‘annotated both the source domains on the same sentence, since such work is worthy of an entire research project in itself.’”

The verb *fall* tends to be accompanied by several adverbial or prepositional particles to express more idiomatic meanings. The matter of idiomaticity of phrasal verbs is a matter of degree; some phrasal verbs tend to be more literal than others (Dalpanagioti 2022: 1). For example, *fall over* is certainly closer to the literal (and/or compositional) meaning of *fall* + *over*, i.e. to lose balance and collapse, as opposed to *fall behind* in the sense ‘fail to keep up’ (OED). Therefore, it is difficult, to say the least, to make any certain claims about the behavior of the verb component within such a composition. Another issue is the matter of

polysemy of phrasal verbs. For instance, in the following sentences the phrasal verb *fall behind* exemplifies two distinct meanings:

- (12) *Based on market exchange rates the UK is today the sixth-largest economy in the world and the third-largest in Europe after Germany and France, having fallen behind France for the first time in over a decade in 2008.*
- (13) *If you've fallen behind on Cyberverses episodes fellow Seibertronians this is a great episode to jump back on.*

In (12), the meaning of the phrasal verb is connected to ranking based on economic power and is very much congruent with *Change\_position\_on\_a\_scale* frame, whereas in (13) there is no rank involved, but rather a perceived task which has not been fulfilled but still has the potential to be completed. Considering that phrasal verbs create separate frames that cannot be attributed to one single component but to the construction as a whole<sup>4</sup>, it is pointless to apply Fillmore's frames to the verb component alone. Instead, let us take a peek into the aspects of meaning of the verb that contribute to the overall meaning of the phrasal construction.

It has been argued that the "particles of phrasal verbs may carry more meanings than the verbs" (LU Zhi, SUN Juan 2015: 654), and if this is so, what then is the role of the verb component in such a construction? Morgan (1997: 354) argues that the particle provides an image schema to the phrasal construction through metaphorical extension whereas the verb serves as either source domain of the phrasal construction, "or else it too will add something new to the understanding of the expression by means of metonymy or metaphor." This addition, she goes on, tends to include the manner of action (*Ibid.*). In the example (12) above, the verb carries metaphorically extended meaning (much like the metaphorical extension of *fall* from *Motion\_directional* frame to *Change\_position\_on\_a\_scale*) and with it the background experience of the source domain. As mentioned in the beginning of this chapter, the experience of falling motion is surrounded by negative associations such as lack of control or gaining injury or other type of damage. The latter aspect has been nullified by the phrasal construction, but the former, lack of control, is still present. The other example (13), too, seems to imply (though not as strongly as the former) the involuntariness of the event<sup>5</sup>. The

---

<sup>4</sup> A good example of frame semantics analysis of phrasal verbs of motion can be found in Dalpanagioti (2022)

<sup>5</sup> This interpretation is based on the use of the expression *jump back on* at the end of the sentence. If the action was voluntary and deliberate, it could have been expressed with different phrasal expression (such as *leave off*, for example) or simply non-idiomatically (*stopped watching*). However, since the rest of the sentence implies the desire to continue watching, the choice of *fall behind* seems to serve as a euphemism for the former sentiments precisely by implying that watching was prevented by circumstances out of one's control.

aspect of lack of control can also be observed in other phrasal constructions in which *fall* is a constituent:

- (14) *I have to take some time to dissect the many, many ways in which they fall into decades-old failing arguments*
- (15) *The responsibility to get results falls on administrators and the school board over them.*
- (16) *Our relationship fell apart under the pressure.*
- (17) *I expected him to shout "Nike!" and fall over dead.*
- (18) *He rushed to the mailbox, opening it and peering inside, his smile falling away.*

It is worth pointing out that all of the sentences above are surrounded by either emotionally neutral or negative sentiment of the context. As such, in (14) and (15) no emotional value is attached to the phrasal verb whereas in (16) and (18) are marked with negative sentiment. It is however neither the meaning or background experience of the verb *fall* that carries the emotional value, but rather the context itself (especially the agent of the phrasal verb, similar to examples (7) and (8) earlier in the chapter). Even in (17), where the meaning of phrasal verb itself is less idiomatic than in other examples, the surrounding context transforms its meaning to another, more hyperbolic dimension, rendering the negative aspects of the primary meaning (primarily the experience of gaining injury) to near irrelevance<sup>6</sup>. In this respect, it can be assumed that the only aspect of meaning that the verb *fall* retains and perhaps, as Morgan put it, ‘adds to’ the overall meaning of the phrasal construction is the aspect of involuntariness. The question of the role and transformation of meaning of *fall* in phrasal verbs is outside of the scope of the present study; nevertheless, such an analysis would make for a useful study for deeper understanding of phrasal constructions.

The same can be said for other idiomatic expressions that include the component *fall*. As Kövecses points out, “idioms (or, at least, the majority of them) are conceptual, and not linguistic, in nature” (2010: 233). Therefore, it is the mental images that they evoked that motivate their meaning by means of cognitive mechanisms such as metaphor and metonymy as well as general and specific knowledge about concepts involved, and not individual meaning of one or all of the components. As such, the meanings idioms that contain the same

---

<sup>6</sup> It is interesting to note that in this example the phrasal verb *fall over* behaves here as a copular verb rather than an intransitive one. It is the only phrasal verb in the analysis to do so. A quick run through the corpus shows that this phrasal verb behaves primarily as intransitive or transitive verb and in far rarer instances as a copular verb. However, the token *fall over dead* has over 800 instances of use in this particular fixed expression

lexical component may vary to great extent without any clear connection. However, as it has been pointed out already, this is a matter of degree; some idiomatic expressions are more transparent than others. For example in the sentence below *fall* is non-transparent whereas *in love* seems more transparent in literal meaning. Still, there are three conceptual metaphors in play, as Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 259) have already analyzed: “LACK OF CONTROL IS DOWN, as with ‘fall’; STATES ARE LOCATIONS, as with ‘in love’; CHANGES ARE MOTION, as when falling in love is characterized as a change to a new state.” The component *fall* therefore fulfills two of those conceptual metaphors, which is congruent with the aspects meanings of the verb discussed earlier in the chapter (aspect of lack of control and the frame of *Change\_position\_on\_a\_scale*, which is metaphorically extended from *Motion\_directonal* frame).

(19) *This is the best time to fall in love with Delhi.*

Indeed, this aspect of meaning of the verb can be seen in other idiomatic expressions. It is especially interesting to examine examples (20) and (21) contrastively. In (20) the idiom ‘fall on one’s feet’ presupposes that the expected outcome is to fail – this would keep in line with the aspect of lack of control due to failure – but the second part of the idiom retracts the expectation and transforms it into success. In example (21) it is the other way around: the initial expectation is to succeed, but the result is failure. Although Lakoff and Johnson interpret the verb ‘fall’ in terms of Lack of Control is Down, this does not seem to be the case here – at least not completely. As mentioned, one component cannot be detached from the others within the idiom and it is the full background knowledge and experience from the mental image evoked by the idiom that is transferred to the target domain. As these two particular examples also share semantic relation of antonymy, it is not unlikely that they share some similarities in the mental image they evoke – in this case the falling motion. The main difference, it seems, is the experience of the result of this motion: the experience of landing on one’s feet is therefore extended to the domain of success, and to fall not on one’s feet is deemed as a failure. And whereas the latter includes the lack of control, the former seems to retract it.

(20) *I really fell on my feet right from the word go as a trainer.*

(21) *... but that attempt fell flat.*

These are far from the only idioms found in the corpus; some others include *the wheels fall off*, *the curtain falls*, *to fall short*, *to fall victim to*, and many more. However, seeing as the

focus of the topic is on *fall* primarily as a verb in a non-idiomatic context, there is no space to delve deeper into the world of idioms. As well it is so, for they, alongside phrasal verbs, deserve a much more focused study to be properly analyzed. We will therefore limit our discussion to our immediate topic and turn our attention to the Russian equivalent term.

## ПАДАТЬ, ПАСТЬ, УПАСТЬ (padat', past', upast')

Before delving into the analysis, a note must be made about the differences between English and Russian morphemic composition of verbs of motion. Both languages belong to the category of satellite-framed languages according to the typology of languages based on verbs of motion (Talmy 1985, 2000; Slobin 2004, 2005). In essence, this means that the majority of verbs of motion in those languages encode the PATH in elements related to the verb root (the so-called ‘satellites’) and not in the verb root itself, which instead encodes primarily the manner of motion (Gor et al. 2010: 363). Examples include verbs such as *walk, run, spin, drive*, etc. This is opposed to the category of verb-framed languages, in which majority of verbs of motion encode PATH in the verb root (*ibid.*), similarly as in verbs *enter, exit, climb, leave*, etc. However, whereas English uses primarily prepositions and adverbs as satellites and the main verb is largely monomorphemic, expressing either manner or path, in Russian verbs have a more complex morphemic composition, often co-expressing PATH, (non)-unidirectionality, and aspect (Hasko 2010: 214). The latter two categories of meaning are especially significant in Russian composition of verbs of motion. The former of the two refers to the semantic category of directionality, which in case of Russian language creates a closed group of verbs of motion known as *глаголы движения* (the verbs of motion), and generally includes up to fourteen pairs of verbs<sup>7</sup> (*бежать – бегать, брести – бродить, везти – возить, вести – водить, гнать – гонять, ехать – ездить, идти – ходить, катить – катать, лезть – лазить, лететь – летать, нести – носить, плыть – плавать, ползти – ползать, тащить – таскать*) expressing motion in either one direction (*идти, ехать, бежать*, etc.) or no fixed direction<sup>8</sup> (*ходить, ездить, бегать*, etc.) (Hasko 2010: 207). This feature will be further discussed in regards to the verb *run*. The category of aspect is also more prominent in Russian; to refer back to Hasko (2010: 206) once more: “Whereas in Russian [...] each verb must be marked for grammatical aspect, in English it is quite common to have non-perfect, non-progressive verbs, i.e. no grammatical aspectual marking on the verb.” The means by which these categories are marked tend to vary between pre-

---

<sup>7</sup> The exact number is still under debate, but it tends to range from 13 (Nesset 2000, 2008) to 17 (Исаченко 1960). However, the number fourteen seems to be generally most accepted (Hasko 2010; Gor et al. 2010, Корчик 2012).

<sup>8</sup> The exact English terminology for these verbs is still not agreed upon. The traditionally accepted terms include *determinate – indeterminate* (Foote 1967; Jakobson 1971) and *unidirectional – multidirectional* (Mahota 1996; Wade 1992). More recently, there seems to be a preference for terms *unidirectional – non-directional* (Nesset 2000, 2008; Gor et al. 2010). I have decided to follow Hasko (2010) in her use of term *unidirectionality – non-unidirectionality* for which she argues: “I largely agree with Ward (1965) who argued that the primary meaning common to one group of these verbs is the idea of motion in one direction, while the verbs serving as their paired counterparts lack this meaning of unidirectionality” (207).



and/or suffixation, change in verb root, or shifting of the stress. Not all verbs of motion in Russian language display all three categories at once as we will see below, but aspect, at least, is an indispensable characteristic that must be taken into account in the analysis. Therefore, following verb will first be analyzed first in its imperfect aspect and only after in its perfect aspect (which consists of two forms).

The primary meaning of the verb *падать* is very similar (if not identical) to that of its English equivalent *fall*, which is to say it denotes a vertical downward motion towards the ground under the influence of gravity (Ефремова 2000: el. publ). Therefore, it can be expected that many characteristic discussed about the English lexeme *fall* will be shared with its Russian counterpart. First such is the primary frame that it evokes, namely the Motion\_directional frame. Considering that the verb already contains the aspect of PATH, there are no additional satellites related to it. The only other spatial specification comes in the FE Source, as is shown below in 1.6.

- (22) *Я еле спасся, хотя несколько раз падал с высоты.*  
 ('I barely saved myself, though I fell from height more than once.')

There is once again interaction of two frames. The first is Rescuing frame, in which *Я* fulfills both the role of an Agent and Patient (due to the reflexiveness of the verb) and the Harmful\_situation is implied by the context divulged by the non-core FE Explanation encompassing another, Motion\_directional Frame. In the latter, *Я* is now a Theme and is followed by the core FE Source:

- 1.5. [<sup>Agt, Patient</sup> Я] еле СПАССЯ<sup>Target</sup>, [<sup>Exp</sup> хотя несколько раз падал с высоты].  
 [<sup>Harm</sup> DNI<sup>9</sup>]
- 1.6. [<sup>Thm</sup> Я] еле спасся, хотя несколько раз ПАДАЛ<sup>Target</sup> [<sup>Src</sup> с высоты].

The simultaneous presence of both the Rescuing and Motion\_directional frame supports the prevalent aspect of meaning of the concept of falling, that of gaining injury or damage, or in more extreme cases dying. Although in this context, such result is avoided, the possibility of it is still heavily implied, hence reinforcing the connotation. But it is not only this example that gives strong connotations to negative aspect of the falling motion; in many cases the

---

<sup>9</sup> DNI (definite null instantiation) refers to a missing FE that that is understood from the context (Fillmore 2006: 617).

lexeme *падать* is preceded or followed by the lexeme *спотыкаться/споткнуться* (to trip), whereas in others the result is referred to more directly:

- (23) *Но Полина спорыкается и падает.*  
(‘But Polina trips and falls.’)
- (24) *Бежит путник из последних сил, падая и спотыкаясь.*  
(‘A traveler runs with all his might, falling and tripping.’)
- (25) *Чтобы окна не падали на головы прохожим...*  
(‘So the windows wouldn’t fall on heads of passers-by.’)
- (26) *Комары и мошки падают замертво.*  
(‘Mosquitos and midges fall dead.’)

The range of types of Theme of this frame is also aligned with that of the English *fall*. In general, the Theme includes an animate entity or a physical object and precipitation. The only notable difference is the inclusion of Themes such as light (*свет*) and shadow (*тень*). This however, cannot be considered as a difference from the English counterpart, as a follow-up search yields the possibility of same types of Themes in English as well. It can also be observed that in cases where the Theme includes a physical object (as in (25)), the focus of damage is not on the falling object but the entity on which it falls.

Similarities extend to the *Change\_position\_on\_a\_scale* frame. The most common Item on the scale is expectedly related to money, or more generally value. In other cases the Item may be another abstract noun referring to a concept that can be statistically or otherwise numerically presented, as seen in (28). In rarer cases, such as in (29) the *Change\_position\_on\_a\_scale* frame can be metaphorically extended to more abstract noun that is perceived as having high initial value.

- (27) *Цена каждого отдельного полотенца падает до 35 рублей.*  
(‘The price of each separate towel falls to 35 rubles.’)
- 1.7. [<sup>Item</sup> Цена каждого отдельного полотенца] ПАДАЕТ<sup>Target</sup> [<sup>val2</sup> до 35 рублей].
- (28) *... эффективность деятельности падает с каждым годом.*  
(‘The performance efficiency falls with each year.’)
- (29) *Его значение также может либо расти, либо падать...*  
(‘His significance can also either grow or fall...’)

The emotional connotation of the verb is similar to that of its English equivalent, that is to say the negative connotations will be present in cases where the Item presents a desired quality and positive connotations will depend on the negative aspect of the Item. Even in antonymic relations, the connotations of the verb *надать* are arguably lessened: as can be seen in example (29) the verb *надать* is contrasted with the verb *расти* (to grow), which is sooner associated with Expansion frame (the Item is expanding or shrinking); whereas the Recovery frame in the previous chapter raises associations with injury. This is not to say that this combination of frames is impossible for Russian – on the contrary, it is quite possible, though no example can be found within the first 100 instances the corpus offers – but only that the combination *надать* – *расти* is much more frequent in comparison<sup>10</sup>.

This is the total extent of the meaning of the imperfect aspect of the verb; there is a rather perceptible lack of more metaphorical and/or idiomatic expressions in the first hundred instances in the corpus. Once again, however, this does not mean that the imperfect form is never used in idiomatic setting but merely that it is not so frequent. Let us now observe the range and aspects of meaning offered by its forms of the perfect aspect, namely *насть* and *унасть*.

Both forms share the Motion\_directional frame with their imperfect equivalent, but with significant difference. Let us compare two examples:

(30) ... и вот, Тяжко огорчен, Пал на ложе он...  
(‘... and behold, sorely grieved, he fell on the bed...’)<sup>11</sup>

(31) ... и все трое гангстеров упали замертво.  
(‘... and all three gangsters fell dead.’)

In the first example, it is evident that the context is stylistically marked; indeed, the clause offered by the corpus is taken from A. K. Tolstoy’s translation of Goethe’s *The Bride of Corinth*<sup>12</sup>. The second, on the other hand, is much more coherent with the examples presented

<sup>10</sup> To give one example with price in the Recovery frame: *Цены на нефть начали восстанавливаться в среду.* (‘Oil prices began to recover on Wednesday.’) (<https://www.reuters.com/article/orubs-global-oil-idRUKCN2241Z1-ORUBS>)

<sup>11</sup> I have deliberately avoided official translation as it would have impeded on the semantic analysis of the use of the verb in context and instead opted for a more literal translation of the sentence in Russian. The official English translation by Edgar Alfred Bowring can be found at Project Gutenberg. The lines in question go as follows: “Till at length he sinks// On the bed and weeps without control” (<https://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/1287/pg1287.html>)

<sup>12</sup> The full Russian translation is available on the following site: [https://poems.net.ua/poet/%D0%93%D0%B5%D1%82%D0%B5\\_%D0%98%D0%BE%D0%B3%D0%B0%D0](https://poems.net.ua/poet/%D0%93%D0%B5%D1%82%D0%B5_%D0%98%D0%BE%D0%B3%D0%B0%D0)

earlier above. Furthermore, the form *пасть* has much fewer instances of Motion\_directional frame compared to *упасть*. Those that do belong to the same frame are always stylistically marked as either poetic or archaic, and very often associated with biblical context. This is not to say that *упасть* is not used in highly metaphorical context:

- (32) *Такое «я» [...] упадёт в глубины животной жизни.*  
(‘Such an “I” [...] will fall into the depths of animal life.’)

The core meaning, or the primary concept evoked by these two forms is identical to that of their imperfect aspect, i.e. the downward vertical motion. The example (31) also retains all the characteristics mentioned before in regards to its imperfect counterpart (and as such also with the respective frame equivalents in English), more precisely, the aspect of (in this case) death and involuntariness. However, it would seem that the more metaphorical the context is, the more does the aspect of damage or death fade. The example (30), despite being surrounded by the context that is heavy with negative emotional sentiment, does not include aspect of gaining injury or damage in the meaning of the verb itself. The aspect of involuntariness is still implied, however. The same goes for example (32). In both cases, the negative sentiment that arises is far more likely connected to the conceptual metaphor GOOD IS UP, BAD IS DOWN (and other more specific concepts related to this general metaphor, already mentioned in regards to the English *fall*) that is evoked by the vertical trajectory of the motion. Considering that both forms of the perfect aspect have the same very similar frame configuration as of their counterpart *падать*, it would be superfluous to repeat the frame structure.

Similar can be said about the Change\_position\_on\_a\_scale frame. In regards to the form *паст’* only one example was found to fit this frame:

- (33) *И как низко пал наш средний интеллигент...*  
(‘And how low our average intellectual has fallen...’)

However, even this one example is in fact a metaphorical extension from that frame. The *средний интеллигент* is metaphorically presented as an Item of certain (high) value which is criticized for losing that value. Once again, there is a certain stylistic mark for the choice for the verb just as we have seen in previous frame. The form *упасть* on the other hand is far

more frequently found in context of this frame and shows no departure from *падать* in its use within it:

- (34) ... индекс Nasdaq упал в пятницу на 0,6%.  
(‘... the Nasdaq index fell on Friday to 0,6%.’)

However, the differences observed up until now are of a relatively minor importance, especially considering that they function within their corresponding frame in identical ways, retaining the aspects of meaning of the verb discussed throughout the chapter. A more significant change is noted in the next two frames – the Conquering frame and Endeavor\_failure frame. In the former, the Theme *Лорд-Чародей* is conquered by the Conqueror *отряд Избранных*.

- (35) *Лорд-Чародей* пал от рук отряда Избранных.  
(‘The Sorcerer-Lord fell at the hands of a band of the Chosen.’)

- 1.8. [<sup>Thm</sup> Лорд-Чародей] ПАЛ<sup>Target</sup> [<sup>Con</sup> от рук отряда Избранных].

This is the first instance of the Conquering frame as seen in the English counterpart. And just as in English, the connotations surrounding the meaning of the verb *пасть* include the aspect of lack of control as well as implication of death. (Once again, note that the positive or negative sentiment of the context is entirely dependent on the Theme: if the sorcerer-lord is perceived as a villain, which is a more likely scenario, the overall sentence conveys positive sentiment; if he were a hero, the context would convey a tragic one.)

The perfect form *пасть* is also used frequently in the Endeavor\_failure frame with most frequent Endeavor being regimes, empires or nations:

- (36) Утверждение, что «режим» Каддафи пал – это смешно.  
(‘The claim that Gaddafi's "regime" has fallen is ridiculous.’)

- 1.9. Утверждение, что [<sup>End</sup> «режим» Каддафи] ПАЛ<sup>Target</sup> – это смешно.

The form *упасть*, however, rarely ever appears in such context. The only example that could be taken as Endeavor\_failure is the following one:

- (37) *Mchost.ru* упал в 22-00 06-04-2010, все сайты клиентов на нём тоже рухнули.  
(‘Mchost.ru crashed at 22:00 04/06/2010, all client sites on it also collapsed’)

The interpretation in which *Mchost.ru* is the FE Endeavor is only acceptable due to the synonymic relation between the verbs *упасть* and *рухнуть* ('fall' – 'collapse') within the sentence. It is not clear why the form *упасть* was used here instead of *пасть* – the latter seems to be far more frequent in Endeavor frame. We could speculate whether the meaning of the subject in the sentence, the FE Endeavor, affects the choice of which of the two forms of the perfect aspect of the verb will be used<sup>13</sup> but considering this is the only example found in the analysis of the corpus data, there is simply not enough data to make any sound judgments on this matter. Therefore, I will maintain here that there is a division of meaning between the two forms of the perfect aspect *пасть* and *упасть* – the former pertains to four frames, Motion\_directional, Change\_position\_on\_a\_scale, Conquering, and Endeavor\_failure. In the first two frames this form is more rarely used and it is always stylistically marked, whereas in the Conquering and Endeavor\_failure frames the form *пасть* is used almost exclusively. The reverse is true for the form *упасть*. However, the contexts and meanings that *упасть* evokes are more reflective of those related to its imperfect counterpart *падать*. This is also reflected in the slight difference in one of the aspects of the two forms: whereas *упасть* retains the aspects of injury, damage or in rare cases death, the form *пасть* is far more likely to imply death (whether literal or metaphorical) as the primary outcome.

Unlike in English analysis, the number of fixed multi-word expressions in which the verb of topic appears seems to be far lower. However, the sentiment about the analysis of such constructions is the same. That is to say, the focus of the analysis lies in the aspect of the meaning of the verb that is extended or otherwise contributes to the overall meaning of the expression.

The first such construction is the collocation *выбор пал*:

- (38) *Из всех возможных видов спорта выбор пал именно на футбол.*  
 ('Out of all the possible sports, the choice fell on soccer.')

What is evident here is the aspect of no control over the event, but without negative or positive, for that matter sentiment. In other words, the underlying sense of the 'choice falling'

---

<sup>13</sup> One possibility would imply a very strong, even fixed connection between the form *пасть* and Endeavor FEs that denote some kind of regime. This is supported by the frequency of exactly such types of Endeavors as noted with the example 1.9. In changing the Endeavour from a regime-like concept to an internet website there may be a discrepancy in metaphorical extension of the Endeavor, therefore requiring a less strongly connected form. On the other hand, this example may indicate that there is a possibility of a semantic change of *упасть* in which it is slowly acquiring this frame. A third possibility is that this is an isolated case. However, all three claims have little to no argument to support them, considering this is the only instance found in the analysis. A more focused research would be required to explore all the differences between these two forms.

is that of unpredictability and coincidence. The form *упасть* on the other hand includes also the negative sentiment in the following idiomatic expression:

- (39) *Потрясённый мальчик упал в обморок.*  
(‘The shocked boy fell unconscious.’)

Though the expression *упасть в обморок* does imply medical ailment of some kind, it cannot be attributed to the verb alone. It does imply a sudden change of state (as most motion verbs do according to CHANGES ARE MOTION conceptual metaphor) just as it has been observed in example (19) in English (*fall in love*). Indeed, the equivalent translation of the collocation points to great similarity between the mental image of fainting – the experience that if one is standing and faints, they lose balance and fall.<sup>14</sup> However, this state of change is not volatile, which emphasizes again the aspect of lack of control in the event and coherence with the LACK OF CONTROL IS DOWN conceptual metaphor.

In more idiomatic setting the same aspects are observed, only with the emotional sentiment in reverse. In (40) and (41), the idioms *пасть жертвой* and *пасть духом* share much of the sentiment as the form *пасть* in the Conquering frame and Endeavor\_failure frame respectively. Though there are similarities, can they be traced back to the meaning of the verb?

- (40) *Вторые [...] падут жертвой собственных амбиций.*  
(‘The others [...] will fall victim to their own ambitions.’)

- (41) *... ратники готовы пасть духом.*  
(‘... the warriors are ready to fall into despair’)

In (40) the overall meaning of the idiom denotes death, which can be also observed in the English equivalent expression *fall victim to*. This however, could also be interpreted as evoking rather the Death frame (FrameNet), in which the personal ambitions represent the Cause FE rather than the Conqueror FE within the Conquering frame. There are of course obvious similarities between the two frames and no clear line to distinguish one from the other, especially in more metaphorical contexts such as this one<sup>15</sup>. However, I would argue

---

<sup>14</sup> Indeed, in this respect even the English expression *to fall asleep* is more metaphorical; one assumes that a person is already in horizontal position when they ‘fall’ asleep. This then indicates that the relevant aspect of meaning of the verb is not the literal experience of falling, but rather the lack of control, or, as mentioned earlier, metaphorically extended experience of the falling motion in the metaphor LACK OF CONTROL IS DOWN.

<sup>15</sup> This is one of the glaring shortcomings of the FrameNet that will keep up surfacing throughout this work. Several frames in FrameNet contain very similar (if not identical) frame elements and are obviously related to one

that the nature of the overall sentiment is not that of dying but rather of being overcome, and the presence of the form *пасть* (which is primarily a part of Conquering and Endeavor\_failure frames) remains more coherent with Conquering frame as the suitable source domain. In the example (41) the waters are even murkier. The idiom conveys an emotional state, mainly despair. This implies a change from the regular state mainly that the spirit (*дух*) that fell was the Endeavor which failed to be upheld. However, this cannot be as the whole idiom would have to be the target of the frame and its constituents inseparable to maintain the wholeness of its meaning. This is an example of why the frame semantics cannot work for individual constituents within an idiomatic construction<sup>16</sup>. Instead, all that can be said for *пасть* in this context is that it retains its aspects of lack of control (implied as the fighters have not yet, but are ready to ‘fall’), and negative sentiment associated with the falling motion.

There is no point then in digging deeper through the idioms, but for the sake of deceptive symmetry, the last example shows the form *упасть* in a more emotionally positive context:

- (42) *С меня упал огромный груз ответственности и проблем.*  
 (‘A huge burden of responsibility and problems fell off me.’)

However, this positive sentiment is brought not by the verb in the idiom, but by the perception of the ‘burden’ – as noted before, the negatively perceived entity that falls influences the concept of falling to be taken as a good thing. The aspect that the verb itself retains in the idiom is one of unexpectedness, lack of control.

Regardless of the differences of which frame one or the other perfect form evokes compared to another, there seems to be no significant change from the overall meaning and associations of the concept of the falling motion. The forms *надать*, *пасть* and *упасть* all refer to the same mental image – that of an entity moving through space vertically, from a higher point to a lower one. In this sense, it is no different than the verb counterpart in English.

---

another. However, the more metaphorical context of a sentence is, the more difficult it is to ascertain the source frame related to it.

<sup>16</sup> One may wonder then, why did I argue the previous example (40) as if it in fact *is* possible to analyze it through Fillmore’s frames? The answer is that the idiom and the Conquering frame which *пасть* often evokes have essentially the same meaning in the context of this sentence. However, it is misleading to say that the idiom has ‘inherited’ its entire meaning from the verb constituent alone. This is clear when the context is changed:

*Российский император Павел I пал жертвой заговора: он был убит в 1801 году.*  
 (‘The Russian tsar Pavel I fell victim to a conspiracy: he was killed in 1801.’)

Here the meaning of the idiom is explicated in the second half of the sentence – and the meaning is not coherent with the Conquering frame at all. This is why in the example (40) it is said that the presence of the verb form *пасть* is coherent with its usual frame – not that it adds this frame to the idiom itself.



Indeed, in many other respects the concept in the two languages takes on strikingly similar characteristics. The experience of falling includes aspects of gaining an injury, damage or, at worst, dying – this is prevalent throughout the Motion\_directional frame in both languages. The vertical trajectory of the motion is reflected in the conceptual metaphor UP IS GOOD DOWN IS BAD (and most other conceptual metaphors that include UP and DOWN) which is most easily perceptible in Change\_position\_on\_a\_scale frame. The aspect of lack of control is the most prominent characteristic of the concept – it is the one aspect of the concept that remains after the transformation of meaning in metaphorical contexts, multi-word expressions and even idioms. The entity that can be related to the falling motion also coincides in the two languages; it includes animate entities and non-animate ones, including physical objects (with slight change of aspect of injury or damage, seen in both languages), and precipitation, and in rare cases abstract concepts. Metaphorical extension throughout the frames can be traced back to the aspect of meanings of the concept that arise from the experience of falling (in other words, the Motion\_directional frame is the source domain for all metaphorically extended frames in regards to this verb). However, the more metaphorical the context becomes, the more these aspects tend to lose weight – to such extent that they disappear entirely (the only exception is the aspect of lack of control). The concept of falling does not carry emotional sentiment – it is neither positive nor negative – but it is influenced by the emotional value of its subject, that is, the falling entity. The relation of the subject and the verb then is a contrastive one – if the subject is seen as a positive thing, the falling motion will be perceived as a negative event, and vice versa. All these characteristics found in both English and Russian point to the fact that the meanings of *fall* and *падать* (and its perfect forms) are nearly identical.

## RUN

The previous two analyses of the verbs *fall* and *падать* examined motion verbs that are distinguished primarily by the expression of the PATH element in their root. Within the verb there is no indication of the position of limbs or the shape of the body in space during the motion event, just as there is no indication whether the movement is quiet or loud, or fast or slow, or otherwise distinguished. The verb *run* (and its equivalents in Russian *бежать* and *бежать*), in contrast, contains no information about the direction of movement; the PATH is expressed in the “satellites”, elements related to the verb, such as verb particles and/or affixes (Slobin 2005: 4). The component that is more prominent in the verb *run* is the Manner of motion. The meaning of the verb is, therefore, often described as such: “Move at a speed faster than a walk, never having both or all the feet on the ground at the same time,” (OED); “To go faster than a walk; *specifically*: to go steadily by springing steps so that both feet leave the ground for an instant in each step,” (Merriam Webster); “To move quickly to a place using your legs and feet” (Macmillan Dictionary). To use an example from the OED:

(43) *The dog ran across the road.*

As we can see, there are two elements that seem particularly relevant for the perception of the Manner of this verb – the speed and the position of legs during the motion event. These two qualities are the primarily connected to the prototypical meaning of the verb. However, in the following, far less prototypical sentence, neither speed nor legs are involved in the meaning:

(44) *In a fit of jealousy, he ran a key down the side of Greg’s car.*<sup>17</sup>

One of the most apparent differences between this sentence and the former one is the difference in transitivity of the verb. This verb feature has only fleetingly been mentioned in the previous chapters but, as we will see throughout this chapter, it has a great effect on the meaning of the verb. Unlike with *fall* which is nearly exclusively an intransitive verb (though it can act as a copula in some cases, as we have seen), the verb *run* can take an object. In some sentences, however, the verb may only seem as transitive, but the object the verb takes is in fact the Path element:

(44) *He run [sic] his last mile (1609m) in 1.53.8.*

---

<sup>17</sup> The example is taken from Macmillan Dictionary.  
([https://www.macmillandictionary.com/dictionary/british/run\\_1#run\\_1\\_\\_58](https://www.macmillandictionary.com/dictionary/british/run_1#run_1__58))

In such cases, the verb is “pseudo-transitive”, as the sentence itself cannot be transformed into a passive one (Žic Fuchs 1991: 100).

As in the previous analysis, the verb *run* will be examined by means of Fillmore’s frame semantics, relying on FrameNet as the starting point for more prototypical frames evoked by the verb to deduce more prominent aspects of its meaning and gradually shift to more metaphorical contexts to observe how the meaning transforms. Finally, the phrasal verb-particle constructions and idioms will be briefly touched upon at the end, to glimpse at the verb’s behavior in idiomatic situations.

The primary meaning of the verb *run* is reflected in the Self\_motion frame. In this frame “The Self\_mover, a living being, moves under its own direction along a Path” (FrameNet). This is a very broad category and includes a very large number of verbs (and nouns as well as a few adjectives) that greatly vary in meaning – for example, *taxi* (v.), *waltz* (v.), *edge* (v.). What binds all the words in the Frame entry is the notion that this frame “most prototypically involves individuals moving under their own power by means of their bodies” (FrameNet). As both Motion\_directional and Self\_motion inherit elements from the Motion frame, the majority of their cores FEs are shared: Area, Direction, Goal, Path, and Source. The only difference is element in the subject position – whereas in the Motion\_directional the event is happening to a Theme, in the Self\_motion frame, the Self\_mover implies controlled movement. Let us examine how the verb *run* behaves within this frame:

(45) *He shied and ran out.*

2.1. [<sup>SMov</sup> He] shied and RAN<sup>Target</sup> [<sup>Src</sup> out].

The animate Self\_mover *he* moves from an implied Source *out*. The manner of how the Self\_mover moved is only reflected in the verb – the speed and the position of feet is known to us due to our own experience of such motion in such context (whether from performing the same activity or from seeing it). Another aspect that is evident from the sentence is the sense of urgency. This aspect is not evoked solely by the other verb *shy* (though it is certainly amplified by it), because when *shy* is removed, the sense of urgency is still present:

(46) *He ran out.*

The verb on its own expresses speed, but it does not necessarily imply urgency<sup>18</sup>:

(47) *He ran.*

Therefore, it is the particle related to the verb, in this case the Source element *out*, that changes, or perhaps ‘adds’ to the meaning of the verb. According to Morgan (1997: 333), the particle *out* carries a metaphorical extension PREVIOUS BOUNDARY IS A CONTAINER in many of the verb-particle constructions<sup>19</sup>; however, in this case, *out* is an adverb referring to a literal spatial relation that implies a physical container (presumably a room). When this implication of containment is combined with the manner of the motion of the verb *run* (both speed and position of legs), the sense of urgency emerges. This in turn, gives rise to another frame interpretation of example (46), namely the Fleeing frame:

2.2. [<sup>SMov</sup> He] shied and RAN<sup>Target</sup> [<sup>Src</sup> out].

As the Fleeing frame inherits the frame elements from the Self\_motion frame, the structure seems identical. However, the main difference between the frames is the implication of danger in the Fleeing frame: “The Self\_mover responds to a (real or imagined) danger by moving away from it<sup>20</sup>” (FrameNet). Another thing that is rather evident about the two interpretations is that the two frames share a relation based on metonymy – the act of fleeing from immediate danger prototypically involves the act of running. It is impossible to truly draw a line between the two interpretations in the example above – the Fleeing frame does not exclude the Self\_motion frame, and the context allows for both to coexist at once.

The situation with verb and particle is slightly different in the next sentence:

(48) *... when a fresh faced student worker [...] runs in asking for my friend by name.*

The frame is once again Self\_motion, where the Self\_mover is *a fresh faced student worker* that moves to an unspecified Goal indicated by *in*. The verb still does convey the manner of motion and speed, but both aspects seem to be secondary to the overall sentiment

---

<sup>18</sup> It may or may not, depending on wider context.

<sup>19</sup> For thorough investigation on the extended meanings and behavior of the particle *out* in phrasal constructions, see Morgan (1997: 332 – 346)

<sup>20</sup> There may be some debate about whether the Fleeing frame can be truly applied here considering that the motion of the Self\_mover is focused on moving away from the containment rather than from the source of danger itself. There is also the issue that only the phrasal construction *run away* is included in the Fleeing frame on FrameNet and *run (+ out)* is not. However, considering that the implied source of danger is also contained (supported by the verb *shy*) the implication of *run out* includes distancing from the source of danger. Therefore, I will maintain that the Fleeing frame is indeed applicable to this context.

of the sentence. Instead, the focus is on the suddenness of appearance. The main indicator for this is the particle *in* – it once again refers to a contained space but in the opposite direction. It also sets the deictic relation between the speaker (*'my' friend*) and the Self\_mover (*student worker*): the Self\_mover, outside of containment, is not within the view of the speaker until the end of motion. The contribution of *run* as a verb of motion is primarily that of the aspect of speed. In other words, the 'student worker' appeared suddenly. This is not to say that the manner of motion disappears entirely – only that the position of feet in respect to the ground is not very substantial to the meaning of the sentence. As we can see from the two examples above, the particle influences the meaning of the verb significantly. It changes the focus from the primary meaning of *run* to that of spatial relation the particle denotes. As a result, some aspects of one manner of the motion (in this case the position of feet) can be diminished in favor of another (speed). It is important to note that these are not phrasal constructions; the particles merely serve as an indicator for the motion's trajectory. However, this shift from verb to particle in literal contexts does seem to set ground for further transformation of meaning to more metaphorical dimension that is found in more idiomatic setting. This is not surprising; as Morgan (1997: 330) claims, it is the particle that provides metaphorical extension of the verb-particle constructions – a point to which we will return later in the chapter.

The aspect of speed is most prominently present in contexts of racing. Let us examine some examples:

- (49) *Cain ran competitively for the first time in 2.5 years and won a four-mile race in NYC.*
- (50) *Cain ran a mile in 5:03 as a 7th grader.*
- (51) *He ran second in the A\$500,000 Grand Final behind Tiger Tara.*

In each example, the speed is accentuated or strongly implied by the surrounding words in the context. In the example (49) the implication, other than in the verb itself, is present in the accompanying adverb *competitively* (as well as the second clause); how fast Cain runs is not directly stated, but the fact that she competes accentuates that her speed is beyond average. In the example (50) the speed is explicitly measured by distance and time. Note that pseudotransitivity does not affect the frame of the verb. On the other hand, the measurement of speed evokes the concept of competition. Indeed, competitive setting is strongly tied to the verb *run* in all three examples, and it is most overtly expressed in the example (51) where the

verb directly evokes the Competition frame (FrameNet), with Participant-1 *he* competing in the Competition *Grand Final* with the offered Prize *\$500,000* and gaining Rank *second* behind the Participant-2 *Tiger Tara*.

- 2.3. [<sup>Partic-1</sup> He] RAN<sup>Target</sup> [<sup>Rank</sup> second] [<sup>Comp</sup> in the [<sup>Prize</sup> A\$500,000] Grand Final] behind [<sup>Partic-2</sup> Tiger Tara].

It is also worth pointing out that this is the only frame in which the verb *run* behaves as a copula. In fact, it is likely that it is due to this syntactic trait that the Competition frame is evoked by *run* instead of the Self\_motion frame in the first place<sup>21</sup>.

In nearly all of the examples above, the element in subject position, or the Self\_mover, in most cases was a human being. However, this is not a requirement for *run* – as we have seen from the example sentence from OED, the Self\_mover can be an animal. Even if it is not a literal animal:

- (52) *The other threw an idiotic interception late in the first half after a black cat had run into the endzone a few minutes earlier.*

The metaphorical surrounding of the Self\_motion frame in this context transforms the meaning of *run*. The focus of the second clause is on the appearance of bad luck, sudden and unexpected. Of course, due to the convenience that the symbol for bad luck is a legged animal that can run enables the creative play of concepts, but once again, the prominent aspect of meaning of *run* in this context seems to be suddenness and unexpectedness of appearance rather than the act of motion itself.

Even though prototypical Self\_movers are usually animate beings with legs, there are inanimate objects that can also fulfill this role, namely vehicles. Cars are especially common in this position, but airplanes also seem to be quite frequent:

- (53) *... the museum's Napier Railton race car, which still holds the speed record on the Brooklands circuit, will run on the runway.*

- (54) *... if all goes well, two VCI0s will run on the same day.*

---

<sup>21</sup> It can be observed that in the example (49) the Competition frame is also present. However, unlike in (51), in the former case the frame is evoked primarily in the second clause (*and won a four-mile race in NYC*) which then interacts with the frame Self\_motion and therefore affecting the meaning of *run* to be aligned with the notion of competition rather than the act of running (the adverb *competitively* also affects the verb that way). However, in example (51) the motion of running is much more sidelined than in that of example (49).

In (53) there is an obvious contextual relation to the examples (49), (50) and (51), namely that of competition – a car competing with other cars is metonymically extended from the actual participants in the competition – drivers controlling the cars<sup>22</sup>. However, there also seems to be significant metaphoric relation between cars and human bodies; for example, the similarity of wheels and legs, i.e. their position and function (touching the ground, used for moving a larger body from one place to another). If the wheels attached to the body of a vehicle are limbs attached to a legged creature, the whole vehicle is perceived as being an individual entity that is able to move through space by its own power. However, it is important that the vehicle is connected to the ground – this is best seen in example (54). Considering that the main function of planes is flying, the use of the verb *run* in this frame can only point to movement by means of wheels touching the ground.

Nonetheless, the notion of general movement on the ground in *run* can sometimes be blurred and even disappear. Consider the following two sentences:

(55) ... while the disk spins whenever the car is running.

(56) ... which allows the engine to run without moving the vehicle.

The example (55) is somewhat ambiguous. The second clause can be interpreted in two ways, and accordingly, with two frames. One interpretation is that the verb *run* is a part of the Self\_motion frame. In other words, the disk spins whenever the car is moving on the ground. On the other hand, one can interpret the sentence to mean that the disk spins whenever the car is *working* or *functioning*. This would then evoke another frame, Being\_operational:

2.4. ... while the disk spins whenever [<sup>Obj</sup> the car] IS RUNNING<sup>Target</sup>.

The car is in this case an Object instead of a Self\_mover. In the example (56), the meaning of *run* is much clearer – the engine never moves, but it is ignited and the car does not move. This again points to the fact that the only appropriate frame for the sentence is Being\_operational. It is hard to miss the metonymical relation between the two frames in these two examples – the movement of the car is strictly tied to it functioning, being ignited. Nonetheless, even if the car does not move – but is ignited – it has the potential to move. However, the speed and the position of legs or feet are completely irrelevant here. Instead,

---

<sup>22</sup> A similar relation is found in contexts of horse sports – it is the riders that win prizes and enter races, yet it is the animal's speed that is actually measured. This is not surprising – racing is primarily seen as competition in speed rather than control.

there seems to be a connection between the concept of running and having and using a singular power source. This aspect has already been stated earlier above, from the definition of the Self\_motion frame on FrameNet: “individuals moving under their own power by means of their bodies.” The metonymical relation between *moving* and *operating* as well as the metaphorical relation between *body* and *object* allows for the extension of Self\_motion frame to a Being\_operational one, but the notion of *using power*, having a source of energy, present in the verb *run* seems to be another crucial element for connection between the two.

In all examples above, the element in the subject position was a physical entity – either an entity with legs or an object that can be perceived as a body through metaphorical extension. In the next examples, the concept of having a body seems to be removed:

(57) *The contest launches this week and will run until December 10th, 2008.*

(58) *The show runs for two days.*

In both examples, the element in the subject position is an abstract noun, and as such they cannot move through space. Neither is there any indication for the element of speed nor metaphorical relation to having a body. However, in example (57) there is indication of the aspect of using power: the contest is seen as an entity that operates by itself, drawing from its own power. Similar case is seen in the example (58). There is a notion of control, i.e. perception that these entities function autonomously, on their own accord.

This is the extent of meanings found in corpus regarding the intransitive (and pseudo-transitive) use of the verb *run*. When used as a transitive verb, *run* shifts from its primary meaning significantly. We have already seen this in the example from Macmillan’s Dictionary. I will repeat the example here<sup>23</sup>:

(44) *In a fit of jealousy, he ran a key down the side of Greg’s car.*

The aspect of movement is transferred onto the object instead of the subject. The element in the subject position, *he*, is now an Agent controlling the object *key*, a Theme moving along a path *down the side of Greg’s car*:

---

<sup>23</sup> I am using an example from Macmillan’s Dictionary because this particular sense of *run* did not appear in the first 100 instances in the corpus. However, I believe it is necessary to include this frame because it seems to be the source domain for other extensions of meaning of *run* as a transitive verb.



- 2.5. In a fit of jealousy, [<sup>Agt</sup> he] RAN<sup>Target</sup> [<sup>Thm</sup> a key] [<sup>Path</sup> down the side of Greg's car].

In other words, the *run* as a transitive verb primarily evokes the Cause\_motion frame (FrameNet). It is immediately clear that speed has no significant relevance to the motion at hand. No legs or feet are touching the ground either. Instead, what protrudes as the focus of the meaning is the control exhibited by the Agent. However, in passive constructions, the Agent is no longer directly present, but implied:

- (59) *The port side engines [...] were run in front of an appreciative audience.*

Still, the Theme is not in control and it does not use its own power to move. Example (59) is particularly interesting because it shows a complex transformation of frames. In examples (55) and (56) we have already seen that the noun *engine* can appear (and frequently does so) in the Being\_operational frame with the intransitive verb *run*. In such cases, it is perceived as if the engine is powered by itself. However, when *run* is transitive, the perception of where the power stems from is changed – now it is powered by someone else (the implied Agent). In this way, power is seen as control over an object and not as the source of energy. Furthermore, there is still the metonymic relation between movement of an object and it functioning – if an engine is functioning, the vehicle moves, i.e. it is the vehicle that is being run – therefore, there are many elements that can apply to the Cause\_motion frame. However, the sentence does not convey the fact that the vehicles were being moved across a platform or that the engines were ignited, but rather that they were exhibited in front of an audience. So, once again there is a metonymic relation, this time of movement of vehicles (and therefore engines) being connected to being presented to an audience. This, finally, evokes the Cause\_to\_perceive frame (FrameNet):

- 2.6. [<sup>Phenomenon</sup> The port side engines] WERE RUN<sup>Target</sup> [<sup>Place</sup> in front of [<sup>Perceiver</sup> an appreciative audience.]]

The aspect of control is more prominent as the Theme becomes more abstract. As such, the following example below shows a non-corporeal entity, an application for an electronic device – note that the aspect of movement has completely been replaced with that of functioning:

- (60) *I was running a virus scan in Norton 360 and it cracked my screen.*

Such abstract entities are referred to as Systems in the *Operating\_a\_system* frame, and the element in the subject position represents the Operator:

- 2.7. [ope I] WAS RUNNING<sup>Target</sup> [sys a virus scan] in Norton 360 and it cracked my screen.

Finally, the aspect of control in the transitive verb *run* is most prominently shown in the *Leadership* frame, in which the Leader element *Cortese* governs or leads an entity *gaming company*, (the Governed FE):

- (61) *Cortese is a lobbyist who helped secure state grants for Cinespace Chicago Film Studios, where he now runs a gaming company...*

- 2.8. [lea Cortese] is a lobbyist who helped secure state grants for Cinespace Chicago Film Studios, where [lea he] now RUNS<sup>Target</sup> [gov a gaming company]...

There are strong similarities between the *Operating\_a\_system* and *Leadership* frame: it is a blurred line between what can be considered a System and how different it is from the Governed entity. The main difference, however, seems to be the shift in the focus of the sentence; whereas in the *Operating\_a\_system* frame the focus seems to be on activity itself, as seen in example (60), in the *Leadership* frame, example (61), the activity serves to depict a state, i.e. head position of the Leader.

Somewhat less frequent meaning of *run* is found in the following sentence:

- (62) *... the team commenced troubleshooting the entire cable run from the cockpit to the Fuel Control Unit.*

- 2.9. ... the team commenced troubleshooting the entire [Road cable] RUN<sup>Target</sup> [Src from the cockpit] [Goal to the Fuell Control Unit].

This meaning of *run* fits perfectly in the *Path\_shape* frame in which “The words [...] describe the ‘fictive’ motion of a stationary Road” (FrameNet). As the frame definition explains it, there is no physical motion present but the experience of motion on ground is metonymically transferred onto the shape of the road-like entity. In this particular case the Road is a cable: the shape of a ground road-like entity is metaphorically transferred on a physical object based on the similarity of their shape. Usually, the *Path\_shape* frame is

evoked by intransitive verbs. Indeed, this would be applicable to this context as well, if the intransitive *run* was used: *The cable runs from the cockpit to the Fuel Control Unit*. However, the change of the transitivity of the verb does not in this case change the frame evoked. Nonetheless, there is a slight difference of meaning between the transitive use (in passive voice) and the intransitive use of the verb *run*. Unlike the latter, which describes the position of the cable alone, the former also implies that such position of the cable was set by an outside force, i.e. that it can be moved or rearranged or entirely removed.

Taking all these frames into account, we arrive at the point that transitive and intransitive uses of the verb *run* have largely different meanings based on the perception of power used. The intransitive *run* is used in contexts in which the entity ‘running’ uses its own source of power, or at least, the source of power *we* perceive as belonging to that entity. Such power is seen as a source of energy (whether limited or unlimited) that enables the entity to perform a specific motion or other functions. The transitive use of *run*, on the other hand, depicts a change of state that stems from an outside force. In other words, the source of power does not stem from the entity but instead from the entity that ‘controls’ it.

It is time now to return to the aforementioned verb-particle phrasal constructions. Let us observe some phrasal constructions involving the verb *run*.

(63) *Below are just a few of the Stencil & Associated Products & Manufacturers I have run across.*

(64) *... many people get at least 50,000 miles or so before running into problems.*

(65) *Nick hopes to stay here for most of the meet, which runs through April, with one caveat.*

(66) *Proust introduces the themes that run through the entire work.*

In the examples above, all of the phrasal constructions have some degree of idiomaticity. Therefore, the meaning of the verb *run* in these settings is transformed significantly. The particles connected to the verb in these sentences originally indicate a trajectory; however, there is a metaphorical extension involved. As has been mentioned, it is the metaphorical extension of the particle that is inherited by the phrasal construction, whereas the verb tends to serve as a source domain, and can sometimes ‘add’ to the overall meaning of the construction (Morgan 1997: 329). This seems true for examples (63) and (64); the overall

meaning of the phrasal constructions is one of encounter – it involves a metaphorical movement along path on which is momentarily obstructed by an unexpected impediment. Therefore, the verb *run* serves as a source domain for the metaphorical encounter. However, if it was only the aspect of movement, in (63) there would be no need to use *run* instead of *come* – the phrasal construction *come across* is perfectly applicable to this context. Therefore, it would seem that *run* retains some of its characteristics of manner – in the case of both (63) and (64) this would include the aspect of speed: in both cases there is a sentiment of suddenness and unexpectedness of encounter – the aspect of speed would give rise to both (similar to the example (48) in the analysis). In examples (65) and (66) the situation is somewhat more complicated. In both cases the entity that is ‘running through’ is an abstract noun, non-corporeal. This would by itself exclude the aspect movement, if not for the particle *through*, which does indicate a trajectory of movement (in which case *April* and *work* represent the metaphorical ground). It seems that it is the perception of the entities *meet* and *themes* that allows for the motion to be metaphorical. They are seen as having autonomous existence and control that is delimited by external boundary; they ‘move’ from point A (beginning of April; beginning of Proust’s work) to point B (end of April; end of Proust’s work). As we can see, the spatial relation is metaphorically extended – in (65) to the domain of time, in (66) to an abstract entity. Yet the meaning of the phrasal constructions themselves does not refer to any kind of motion but rather to the pervasive presence of the entities involved. This would mean that movement is not retained in the verb. There is also no indication of speed or suddenness. So how can a running movement serve as a source domain? One possible explanation would be if the abstract nouns that are presented as ‘movers’ are seen as metaphorically extended fluid-like entities (or more specifically, water-like entities). That they *can* be seen as such is more evident in the example below involving an idiom *to run deep*:

(67) *While the facts seem stark and simple the questions and meanings run much deeper.*

Considering that this is idiom is derived from the proverb *still waters run deep* (Titelman 1996: 309), it is not implausible that the image evoked by it can be extended to other entities – in this case, the *questions* and *meanings*. Still, there is very little of the semantic features that the verb *run* retains – the aspects of meaning that have been observed in the chapter are transformed in the idiomatic setting to such extent that they are unrecognizable.

Throughout this analysis it has been observed that the English verb *run* yields a great range of meanings that depend on several features. One such is the syntactic feature, transitivity, which can affect the meaning of the verb to great extent. As such intransitive *run* holds the prototypical denotation of the running movement based on speed, having a body, and particular configuration of feet against the ground. The aspect of speed in this meaning seems to serve as a baseline for more metaphorically extended meanings which evoke the Competition frame and the Fleeing frame. Another important aspect of meaning is the notion of power. This is especially clear in the Being\_operational frame, where the entity ‘running’ does not move but is functional. The relation between the frames is largely based on metaphor and metonymy, depending on the type of the entity involved. The transitive equivalent, on the other hand, primarily refers to exhibiting control over an entity, whether a physical entity (as seen in the Cause\_motion frame) or more abstract one, (Operating\_a\_system and Leadership frame). The verb *run* is often coupled with particles – in the primary, Self\_motion frame, these particles tend to serve as satellites denoting the trajectory of the movement. However, due to the particles’ role to depict PATH, they become carriers of metaphorical extension related to this element, in which case the primary aspects of meaning of *run* tend to be greatly diminished. This is most evident in phrasal constructions and idioms, where the verb *run* retains very few elements of its primary meaning.

## БЕГАТЬ, БЕЖАТЬ (begat', bezhat')

There are two verbs that can be considered as Russian equivalent for the English verb *run* in its primary meaning: *бегать* and *бежать*. Unlike with the verb *падать* and its perfect forms *пасть* and *упасть*, the difference between *бегать* and *бежать* is not one of aspectual forms but of (non-)unidirectionality. Both verbs are imperfective and can take on a perfective prefix (for example *по-*) to express finite action. The verbs belong among the fourteen verbs of motion (*глаголы движения*) that share similar morphosyntactic properties. Nessel (2008) offers a comprehensive analysis of the three conceptual layers of the verbs in this group that are expressed in root, stem and prefix of the verbs: the first relates to the Manner of the verb of motion which is contained in the root; the second layer, expressed by the stem by adding appropriate suffix, reveals whether the verb is unidirectional or not; the final is evoked when the prefix expressing the Path is attached to the verb (138, 139). This analysis will first and foremost focus on the first and second layer; the third, Path, will be discussed to a much lesser degree due to the inability to encompass the whole range of meanings expressed by the large number of prefixes that can be attached to the verbs (it would require a separate paper on its own). Finally, a brief look will be offered on both verbs in idiomatic setting.

In the Efremova's dictionary of Russian language, the primary meaning of the verb *бегать* is very similar to definitions of *run* in English. That is to say, it is defined as movement through space, alternating between one leg and the other, quickly and swiftly pushing against the ground (Ефремова 2000: el. publ.). Nearly the same definition is given for its counterpart *бежать* with one notable difference – instead of moving through space, one moves *forward* (Ефремова, 2000). This is very much in line with Nessel's (2008) claim that unidirectional motion verbs already contain a "highly schematic PATH" (140). Unlike the English verb *run*, *бегать* and *бежать* are exclusively intransitive. As can be expected, this will have bearing on the differences in the meaning of the English and Russian concepts of running. But let us take one step at the time.

The verbs *бегать* and *бежать* appear primarily in the Self\_motion frame in their prototypical meaning:

(69) [Он] Много рисует, раскрашивает, вырезает, все время бегает по дому и распрашивает, почему то, почему это.

(‘[He] draws a lot, paints, cuts, runs around the house all the time and asks why this, why that.’)

2.9. [<sup>SMov</sup> Он] Много рисует, раскрашивает, вырезает, все время БЕГАЕТ<sup>Target</sup>  
[<sup>Area</sup> по дому] и расспрашивает, почему то, почему это.

(70) *К царю бежал гонец с сообщением о поражении его войска.*  
(‘A messenger ran to the emperor with a message about the defeat of his army.’)

2.10. [<sup>Goal</sup> К царю] БЕЖАЛ<sup>Target</sup> [<sup>SMov</sup> гонец] [<sup>Purp</sup> с сообщением о поражении его войска].

In both cases the Self Mover moves along a path – an Area FE in the first, and Goal FE in the second sentence. The manner of motion is encoded within the root of verb itself - *бег*; therefore it requires our background knowledge to understand the type of motion the verbs depict, which includes the movement of legs and the relative speed of movement. This is the essential quality in both verbs, identical to the English counterpart. The difference between *бегать* and *бежать* lies in the direction and purpose of motion. In the example (69) the motion is perceived as sporadic and with no defined aim. Note that the element *по дому* is an Area – a FE that is used when “the motion is understood as irregular and not to consist of a single linear path” (FrameNet). In contrast to that the example (70) has a clearly defined line of direction – *к царю* – and with clear, singular purpose to inform him of his army’s defeat. As we can see, the (non-)unidirectionality is not exclusively expressed by the different stems, but is also often followed by supporting elements in the frame.

However, the unidirectional verb *бежать* can at times be much less straightforward in its aim:

(71) *Придется бегом по улицам бежать.*  
(‘Gotta run through the streets.’)

2.11. Придется [<sup>Manner</sup> бегом] [<sup>Area</sup> по улицам] БЕЖАТЬ<sup>Target</sup>.

Direction here is very broadly depicted. The Area element, very similar to the one in example (69) implies that the motion ought to be irregular and with no linear path. However, the verb itself encodes the information that the motion is neither sporadic nor irregular and that it has an unspecified aim (the implied Goal FE). The Area element is therefore not a substitute for the Goal but rather an additional spatial relation.

The Self\_mover FE is most often a human being or an animal; any creature that possesses at least one pair of legs. However, in some less frequent cases, the verb *бегать* includes vehicle subjects as Self\_movers:

- (72) *Ваш автомобиль должен бегать с максимальной скоростью на 10-15% меньшей, чем та, которую «разрешают» шины.*  
(‘Your car should run at a maximum speed 10-15% less than what the tires “allow”.’)

No such example was found with the verb *бежать*. The use of *бегать* with reference to a vehicle does not indicate change in frame, however. There is only metaphorical extension of the running motion to the physical object that is perceived as having a body that can move. There is no metonymic relation between functioning of an engine and the movement of the vehicle as there was with the English *run*. Therefore, the use of *бегать* in this context refers primarily to fast movement with no specified aim, rather than being operational.

As mentioned before, the notion of speed is always implied in the verb due to our background knowledge of such movement. However, it can often be supported with additional context:

- (73) *Расчет, видимо, был на способность оленя бегать быстрее лошади.*  
(‘The reasoning, apparently, was counting on the ability of a deer to run faster than a horse.’)
- (74) *Если же предположить, что тираннозавр не бегал, а ходил, всё становится на свои места.*  
(‘If we assume that the tyrannosaurus did not run, but walked, everything falls into place.’)
- (75) *Чем быстрее бежать вперед – тем лучше.*  
(‘The faster you run forward, the better.’)

Such context includes direct reference to measuring speed by comparative form of the adverb *быстро* (‘fast’) as is seen in examples (73) and (75), or by contrasting the running motion to a walking one as is evident in example (74). Still, more often, the notion of speed is implicitly present in the verb. In the example (76) below, there are two ways to interpret the sentence. On one hand the verb *бегать* here is meant literally – to move quickly without two feet touching ground at the same time; on the other, it may only indicate that the person is



moving quickly, but not necessarily in the prototypical way of pushing against the ground with one leg and then another. In other words, the notion of speed in the verb *бегать* can be extended to more generic type of swift movement.

- (76) *Не бегай зря и не хлопай дверью.*  
(‘Don't run pointlessly and don't slam the door.’)

As we have seen in previous chapter, speed often gives rise to the sense of hurry or urgency. As such the next couple of examples evoke the Self\_motion frame but only to the extent that it illustrates the dynamic type of movement, without necessarily implying that one literally runs in the specific situations:

- (77) *Вам надоело бегать по сервисам, где вам не могут предложить услуги по ремонту 8800 arte?*  
(‘Are you tired of running around services where you cannot be offered repair services for 8800 Arte?’)

- (78) *Бегаете на Макдональдс?*  
(‘Are you running for McDonald's?’)

- (79) *... люди не замечают, как становятся заложниками этой гонки, бегут, несутся навстречу светлому сытому и обеспеченному будущему.*  
(‘... people do not notice how they become hostages of this race, run, rush towards a bright, well-fed and secure future.’)

In example (77) the meaning of the verb is focused on constant change of location, perceived as one following after another in a short interval of time;<sup>24</sup> similarly, in example (78) the verb only implies hurry to reach a place. Neither example requires explicit form of running as is defined in the dictionary entry, but instead refers to a generic hurried motion. The same can be said about the verb *бежать* in example (79): the aspect of speed in the verb is in this context is additionally supported with words such as *гонки* (races) and *нестись* (rush). However, the entire context of the sentence is highly metaphorical, and no act of running is present in the literal sense.

---

<sup>24</sup> Short interval of time is meant in a relative sense; it can include days, weeks, or even months, but it can also be limited to the span of just one day. This also points to the irregular and non-linear perception of the running motion in the verb *бегать* in relation to time (instead of just space).

The sense of urgency, evoked by speed, is most evident in the use of *бегать* and *бежать* in the Fleeing frame (FrameNet):

(80) *Ходорвский, Лебедев что-то скрывали от кого-то бегали.*  
(‘Hodorvskij, Lebedev were hiding something and running from someone.’)

(81) *... тот вынужден был бежат из страны.*  
(‘... he was forced to run from the country.’)

As it has been mentioned before, the Fleeing frame inherits many of its elements from the Self\_motion frame, which is why the frame elements appear to be largely the same. The main difference between the frames is that in the Fleeing frame there is a sense of imminent danger from which the Self\_mover moves away (FrameNet). In other words, there is always a Source present – in Russian, this is usually explicitly shown with prepositions *из* or *от*, as in examples above, and in rarer cases implicitly<sup>25</sup>:

2.12. [<sup>SMov</sup> Ходорвский], [<sup>SMov</sup> Лебедев] что-то скрывали [<sup>Src</sup> от кого-то] БЕГАЛИ<sup>Target</sup>.

2.13. ... [<sup>SMov</sup> тот] вынужден был БЕЖАТЬ<sup>Target</sup> [<sup>Src</sup> из страны].

The relation between running motion and fleeing action is metonymically connected. However, this also means that the *бегать* and *бежать* are once again used in non-literal sense. What is different about these verbs in the Fleeing frame is that, unlike in the previous frame and contexts, they hold a more emotionally marked connotation. That is to say, in contexts of fleeing, the running motion is primarily not seen as a voluntary activity but rather as an abstract motion, a change of place, brought upon by necessity and unlikely to stop.

As mentioned previously, the verbs *бегать* and *бежать* belong to a group of motion verbs that take on prefixes to indicate the Path of the motion event. Some of the prefixes include *при-*, *у-*, *в-*, *вы-*, *про-*, *пере-*, *раз-*, etc. Each prefix denotes a particular schematic

---

<sup>25</sup> An example of implicit presence of the Source FE would be the following sentence:

*Но даже самый яркий «демократический камуфляж» не может спрятать того факта, что большинство восточных немцев никуда бежать не стремилось.*  
(‘But even the brightest "camouflage of democracy" cannot hide the fact that the majority of East Germans were in no hurry to run anywhere.’)

In this case, the context offers sufficient information to infer the Source – the Self\_mover ‘Eastern Germans’ could only flee from Eastern Germany. It is worth pointing out that in the case where the Source FE is not present, it is usually compensated with the Goal FE. In the particular example the corresponding element would be *никуда*.

path and they are often coupled with prepositions denoting similar (or the same) trajectory of motion; as such, *в-* is often followed by a prepositional phrase with the preposition *в* as its head (*вбежать в дом*; example mine). Examining each and every transformation of the verbs' meaning by adding the prefixes would require much more space than this work allows. Therefore, I will concentrate only on two prefixes added to the verb: *при-* and *у-*. These two prefixes will serve only as a general illustration of the effect of a satellite element containing PATH on the meaning of the motion verb. The choice of the particular prefixes above rests primarily on the contrastive deictic relation – one refers to arrival to a certain goal location and the other on distancing from a particular source location (more on this below). However, it must be pointed out that the findings presented in this analysis are far from absolute certainty – it merely provides grounds for further investigation on the effects of PATH prefixes on motion verbs.

There is a grammatical change occurring when a prefix indicating PATH is attached to a unidirectional (*бежать*) and a non-unidirectional verb (*бегать*) of the same MANNER. In the case of the former, the prefix changes the verb's aspect: *бежать* (imperf.) – *прибежать* (perf.); whereas in the latter, the verb does not change aspect (it remains imperfective) but acquires direction: *бегать* (imperf.) – *прибегать* (perf.). Therefore, the *прибегать* (imperf.) – *прибежать* (perf.) can be seen as two aspectual forms of the same verb (the same situation applies to the prefix *у-*)<sup>26</sup>.

The verb *прибегать/прибежать* primarily refers to a running motion oriented towards the goal of the motion. As such the following in examples include a Self\_mover and a Goal as core elements in the Self\_motion frame. In the example (82) the Goal is explicitly present (*к родителям*), but in the example (83) it is only implied – this is because the addition of prefix that denotes Path already sets the implication of Goal regardless of (non)-unidirectionality (Nesset 2008: 145). Another layer of meaning that the addition of *при-* sets is the deictic relation of the Self\_mover and the Goal. This is especially evident in the example where the Goal is not explicitly present; the prefix indicates relation to the speaker – the relatives move

---

<sup>26</sup> The change and types of aspects brought upon by affixation in Russian (motion) verbs is a much wider topic that includes many complexities, including specifics about the individual meaning of verbs and the individual meaning of affixes. Considering that this paper is more concerned with the perception of general motion depicted by the verb, the specifics of more complex aspect change will not be included in the analysis. For a more detailed picture of aspect in Russian motion verbs, see Janda (2007), (2008); Зализняк, Шмелев (1997).

from area beyond the immediate surroundings of the speaker to the immediate area of the speaker (whether the speaker is projected or not; see Падучева 2002: 123, 124)<sup>27</sup>.

(82) *Ребенок, который научился вылезать из кроватки, может прибегать к родителям.*

(‘A child who has learned to get out of the crib may run to parents.’)

2.14. [<sup>SMov</sup> Ребенок, который научился вылезать из кроватки], может ПРИБЕГАТЬ<sup>Target</sup> [<sup>Goal</sup> к родителям]

(83) *Когда прибежали родные, баня уже полыхала.*

(‘When relatives came running, the bath was already on fire.’)

2.15. Когда ПРИБЕЖАЛИ<sup>Target</sup> [<sup>SMov</sup> родные], баня уже полыхала.

The prefix *y-* stands opposed to the former one in terms of direction – it refers to distancing from a general area. Therefore, it can be expected that the often accompanying core element would be the Source (indeed, most frequently it is). However, in example (84), which is a Self\_motion frame, the adverb expresses a general Goal instead:

(84) *Если их нападающий и получал мяч, то далеко с ним убежать не мог.*

(‘If their striker did get the ball, he couldn’t run far with him.’)

2.16. Если [<sup>Thm</sup> их нападающий] и получал мяч, то [<sup>Goal</sup> далеко] [<sup>Thm-c</sup> с ним] УБЕЖАТЬ<sup>Target</sup> не мог.

Nevertheless, there is an implied presence of the unspecified Source due to the meaning of the prefix – some general area to move away from. Considering that moving away is the accompanying implication, it is not surprising that explication of the Source can evoke the Fleeing frame:

(85) *Южный Гоа – место для классического пляжного отдыха всей семьей, где можно убежать от городской суеты.*

(‘South Goa is a place for a classic beach holiday for the whole family, where one can run away from the bustle of the city.’)

2.17. Южный Гоа – место для классического пляжного отдыха всей семьей, где можно УБЕЖАТЬ<sup>Target</sup> [<sup>Src</sup> от городской суеты].

<sup>27</sup> For more on deictic relations brought upon with the prefix *при-*, see Падучева (2002).

The Path prefixes contribute additional information to the verbs *бегать* and *бежать* regarding the trajectory of movement<sup>28</sup>, which can be amplified, or specified with accompanying Goal or Source. However, the question remains as to whether the core aspects of primary meaning have been transformed by the addition of the prefixes. In example (82) and (84) the verbs *прибегать* and *убежать* refer to the same manner of motion; the aspect of the shape of the body in this movement seems the main focus, but speed is also not diminished. In example (83) there is additional layer of urgency. In the example (85) the running motion is not literal. Still, the general motion is present in the due to the sentiment of distancing. Therefore, it can be concluded that the prefixes containing PATH do not change either the frames in which the verb *бегать* and *бежать* can appear or their meaning to any significant extent. They merely provide more specific information on the movement's positioning in space (literal or metaphorical).

However there is a context in which the verb is coupled with a preposition that transforms its meaning to an extent:

- (86) ... не стоит так сильно *бегать* за оригинальностью.  
 ('... it doesn't do to run so hard after originality.')

In this context the verb is purely metaphorical. The frame seems to be Self\_motion one, based on the configuration of the sentence:

- 2.18. не стоит так сильно БЕГАТЬ<sup>Target</sup> [<sup>Goal</sup> за оригинальностью].

However, the meaning of the verb in this case is not that of movement towards a goal, but rather after it. Therefore, a more appropriate frame would be Cotheme (FrameNet):

- 2.19. не стоит так сильно БЕГАТЬ<sup>Target</sup> [<sup>Thm\_C</sup> за оригинальностью].

It cannot be said that the primary features of meaning have disappeared or are in any way diminished; the movement (though metaphorical) is still based on speed prototypical configuration of feet against the ground. However, the focus of the meaning has shifted – whereas in the former the focus would be the act of running, the Cotheme frame is more centered on the entity that is being chased. In this sense, it can be said that the particle *за* carries a significant amount of meaning that affects the meaning of the verb to the extent of

---

<sup>28</sup> A more thorough discussion on meaning, role and classification of prefixes in motion verbs can be found in Шмелев (2002) and Падучева (2002). Nessel (2008) also offers a general view on the effect of prefixes on image schema of the motion verbs.

evoking another frame. It is not surprising that such construction should then acquire a degree of idiomaticity, as seen in the next the construction:

- (87) ... *именно мужчина должен бегать за женщинами.*  
(‘... it is the man who ought to chase after women.’)

In the example above, the particle *за* seems to influence the verb similarly as in example (86). However, considering this is an idiom, it cannot be separated into parts to be analyzed within the constraints of frames. Still, it does point to the weight of the particle’s meaning in verb-particle relation – that is, that the particle is very likely to transform the aspect of meaning of the verb. It should be noted, however, that the particle *за-* was the only particle found in the corpus data to affect the meaning of the verb to such extent.

The analysis of the Russian counterparts of *run* shows that they are much less versatile in than the English verb. This is primarily due to the difference in the syntactic properties of verbs – Russian verbs *бегать* and *бежать* are exclusively intransitive. However, there is significant difference in the perception of these verbs. The verbs *бегать* and *бежать* take on concrete nouns as their subjects: in most cases they include a legged creature and more rarely vehicles. No example was found in the corpus that would include abstract nouns as potential movers. Just as in English, the notion speed and position of legs are the most prominent aspects of their meaning. Speed is especially prominent; it often gives rise to implication of hurry or urgency, and it remains in the metaphorical uses of the verb (whereas the particularity of the manner of running is reduced to general movement). The feature of (non)-unidirectionality has an effect on the perception of the trajectory of the verbs but otherwise shows no great impact on the aspects of meaning of the verbs. The specific morphosyntactic properties of the verbs *бегать* and *бежать* also do not impact the verb greatly – the addition of satellite prefixes serves to set a more specific trajectory, i.e. Path, and provide a change of aspect in unidirectional *бежать*, but otherwise do not transform any aspect of their meaning. The one element that does seem to impact a change in meaning is the particle element; yet even so, the aspects of the meaning of *бегать* and *бежать* do not disappear. Finally, the greatest difference between the intransitive English *run* and the Russian *бегать* and *бежать* is in the conceptual core of the verbs: where *run* showed great extent of meanings all connected by the notion of using one’s own power, *бегать* and *бежать* are seem to be much more concentrated on the notion of movement itself.

## ANALYSIS: VERB WITHOUT CONTEXT

In the previous chapter the meanings of the selected verbs were analyzed according to the context in which they appeared. The corpus data has given valuable insights into the range of use and transformations of meaning of the verbs. However, such data is somewhat less useful for establishing whether the speakers themselves consciously perceive the meanings of words in the same manner they are used. Therefore, the questions about a speaker's own intuitive understanding of the words, the awareness of their range of meanings as well as attitudes and emotional weight that may arise from them are left unanswered – how do these qualities relate to the usage of the words in everyday language? A partial view into these matters is provided by data from associative thesauruses. As Ufimtseva (2014: 37) explains, “the associative thesaurus is the model of human consciousness.” It provides a linguistic picture of the world of the native language speaker, which in turn gives insight into the cultural background, values and experiences of the speaker (*Ibid.*). The data of an associative thesaurus consists of stimuli and their accompanying reactions provided by native speakers. The frequency of reactions allows for a hierarchical structure to determine the “core of language consciousness,” (*Ibid.*). From this material, an associative verbal network can be derived, which represents “the linguistic picture of the world of a naïve (ordinary) speaker and [...] the culture as a system of consciousness” (*Ibid.*). This study, however, will not require an entire associative network but only make use of the stimuli entries for the verbs *fall* and *run* and their Russian equivalents *падать* (*пасть, упасть*), and *бегать* and *бежать* (as well as *прибегать* and *убегать, убежать*) to examine the perception of meanings of the motion verbs from the viewpoint of the native speaker.

The data from the associative thesauruses will be analyzed within the limits of frame semantics. As we will see, it is not possible to entirely apply frame semantics to associative relations in the thesaurus and this is due to several reasons. First of all, the data is based on free-association test, with a single word stimulus. This goes against the basic principle of frame semantics, i.e. the requirement of surrounding context to establish the meaning of a word. Therefore, it is rather impossible to assign proper frame elements to the stimulus – reaction bonds as there is often no predicate involved. However, the reactions provided by the thesauruses will be examined and sorted in relation to the frames discussed in previous chapter. In cases where a reaction to the stimuli has no discernible connection to any of the aspects of meaning discussed previously, it will be appropriately noted. Furthermore, the analysis will concentrate on reactions with a higher frequency number, i.e. the core bonds

between the stimuli and reactions. This is primarily to focus on stronger stimulus – reaction bonds that present the core of language consciousness, i.e. the primary mental images evoked by the verbs. It must be emphasized that the goal of this analysis is not to find the ‘correct way’ to apply frame semantics to stimulus – reaction bond; rather it attempts to observe differences in perception and usage of verbs.

For verbs in English, the data was gathered from Edinburgh Associative Thesaurus (EAT). In the entry for the verb *fall*, the following reactions are given:

FALL

down 12; hurt, rise 11; drop 8; out 5; ground, water 4; autumn 3; fear, free, pain 2; [...]<sup>29</sup>

The strongest association with the verb is the explication of its PATH feature. The lexemes *hurt* and somewhat less frequent *pain* indicate that the aspect of gaining injury is strongly evoked by *fall*. Also present is the contrasting motion based on the PATH feature, *rise*. The lexeme *drop*, also containing PATH, is likely evoked due to the synonymic relation to the verb *fall*. The adverb *out* is another association that indicates direction, in particular a Source FE, but it cannot be established whether it this reaction is brought upon by the phrasal expression *fall out*<sup>30</sup>. The reaction *ground* points to the Area FE as a point of impact. The lexeme *water* may indicate the same, but it may also be a relation based on the homonym *fall* (n.), not at all related to the verb. Such is certainly the case with *autumn* which shows synonymic relation with the noun *fall*. The reaction *fear* indicates the negative emotional connotation of the verb (it is also the only emotional evaluation found within this range of associations). The reaction *free* is likely related to *fall* as a noun derived from the verb.

From this interpretation, some of the core frame elements of Motion\_directional frame are discernible, mainly Direction, Source and Area FEs. Also, the presence of *rise* and *drop* indicate that these verbs form a close bond based on their semantic relations (antonymy and synonymy respectively). It is significant that they too belong to the same frame. Although there is no explicit Theme present among the reactions, the lexemes *hurt* and *pain* indicate

---

<sup>29</sup> As noted earlier, due to focus on the core of language consciousness, the reactions with low frequency number will not be taken into account.

<sup>30</sup> The same can be said for reaction *down*. However, I am inclined to think that *down* is truly marked primarily as the PATH element due to the fact that it is the strongest association with the verb in all forms. The same does not hold for other particles which makes it difficult to determine the nature of association.



that there is likelihood of a potential Theme as an animate entity. Below is the schematic overview of the interpretation.<sup>31</sup>

FALL (v.): Motion\_directional

**Frame elements:**

Direction: *down*<sup>?</sup> 12

Source: *out*<sup>?</sup> 5

Area: *ground* 4, *water*<sup>?</sup> 4

Theme: [animate entity]

**Connotations:**

experience: *hurt* 11, *pain* 2

emotion: *fear* 2

**LUs within the same frame**: *rise* 11 (antonym), *drop* 8 (synonym)

**Phrasal relation**: *down*<sup>?</sup> 12, *out*<sup>?</sup> 5

**Derivations**: [fall n.]: *free* 2

**Unrelated**: *water*<sup>?</sup> 4, *autumn* 3

Unlike in the corpus analysis, which offered all inflectional forms of the verb with no significant changes on the semantic level, in this analysis it is necessary to approach each form individually in order to obtain a more complete picture of the lexeme. It must be mentioned, however, that grammatical aspect of the verb (or other verbs) will not be closely examined in this study. While this aspect is certainly an intriguing subject to be studied, this work will remain focused on the semantic aspect of the stimulus-reaction bonds.<sup>32</sup>

Therefore, we now turn to the past simple form of the verb *fall* as presented in EAT:

FELL

down 29; tree 11; dropped, hurt, over 4; drop, off 3; cut, moor, mountain, out, trees, walking 2

Once again the most salient connection is with the PATH element *down*. Another very frequent reaction is *tree*. While there is slight possibility that this reaction can point to the Theme in the Motion\_directional frame, it is far more likely that *tree* is connected to the transitive verb *fell*. Although the verbs *fall* and *fell* do share etymological origin (Merriam Webster), the meaning of the transitive *fell* has departed far enough to be considered to share

---

<sup>31</sup> The words that are marked with a question mark (?) are those whose nature of association is not clear. Most often these are adverbs/particles for which it cannot be determined whether they arise as possible frame element evoked by the verb or from frequency of use in phrasal constructions. The square brackets [] signify words or information that is easily recoverable from the reactions. LU stands for lexical unit. The category “Unrelated” refers mainly to reactions to the homonymic counterparts, which are not relevant for the topic of this study.

<sup>32</sup> For more on the topic of associative grammar, see Стефановић (2005)

homonymic relation, rather than polysemous. Therefore, *tree*, *trees* and *cut* (synonym to *fell*) represent elements of a different domain, not related to the motion verb *fall*. Also unrelated seem to be reactions *moor* and *mountain* both of which seem to be evoked by the noun *fell* (“a high barren field or moor,” Merriam Webster). Reactions that are connected to the intransitive *fall* in past tense resemble the ones in present tense; besides the most salient *down* and somewhat less prominent *over*, which can be seen as Direction FE, others include Source FEs *off* and *out*. Other relevant reaction is *walking*, which may indicate a non-core FE Circumstances. The reaction *hurt* once again points to aspect of gaining injury, which tends to be associated with animate entities as Theme FE. From verbs that belong to the same frame, only *drop/dropped*<sup>33</sup> appears as a synonymic relation to the stimulus.

FELL (v., *intrans.*): Motion\_directional

**Frame elements:**

Direction: *down*<sup>2</sup> 29, *over*<sup>2</sup> 4

Source: *off*<sup>2</sup> 3, *out*<sup>2</sup> 2

Theme: [animate entity]

Circumstances: *walking* 2

**Connotations:**

experience: *hurt* 4

**LUs within the same frame**: *dropped* 4, *drop* 3

**Phrasal relation**: *down*<sup>2</sup> 29, *over*<sup>2</sup> 4, *off*<sup>2</sup> 3, *out*<sup>2</sup> 2,

**Unrelated**: *tree* 11, *cut* 2, *moor* 2, *trees* 2

The following past participle form offers a quite different group of reactions:

FALLEN

down 11, idol 8, tree, woman 7, hurt, 6, women 5, angel 4, out 3, angels, drop, leaves, off, over, slipped 2

There is a significant increase of noun reactions, which is unsurprising as participles can often act as modifiers to nouns. However, the most frequent reaction is still the Direction *down*. The nouns *idol*, *woman/women* and *angel/angles* are likely related to more phrasal expressions: *idol* seems to be citation of the title of the film *The Fallen Idol*; the reaction *woman/women* is likely connected to the idiom *fallen woman* (Farlex Dictionary of Idioms), and *angel/angles* is associated with collocation *fallen angel* of biblical origin, also existing as

---

<sup>33</sup> The difference in form, although preserved in the schematic overview, is not drawn attention to in this study. As mentioned, I will not go into the intricacies of grammatical changes observed in the stimulus-reaction relations. I will note, however, that it is a tendency among verb stimuli to elicit verb reactions often in the same form, which is in agreement to Стефановић 's(2005) own claims.

an idiom (FDI). Of the nouns that seem to be more related to possible Theme FE are *tree*, and *leaves*. The reaction *tree* may also indicate a Source. The experience of gaining injury is still a prominent reaction and still present are Source FEs *out* and *off*. Another, non-core FE Cause is evoked as noted from reaction *slipped*. The synonym *drop* is still present, though with markedly lesser frequency.

FALLEN: Motion\_directional

**Frame elements:**

Direction: *down*<sup>?</sup> 11, *over*<sup>?</sup> 2

Source: *tree*<sup>?</sup> 7, *out*<sup>?</sup> 3, *off*<sup>?</sup> 2

Theme: *tree*<sup>?</sup> 7, *leaves* 2, [animate entity]

Cause: *slipped* 2

**Connotations:**

experience: *hurt* 6

**LUs within the same frame**: *drop* 2 (synonym)

**Phrasal relation**: *down*<sup>?</sup> 11, *idol* 8, *woman* 7, *women* 5, *angel* 4, *out*<sup>?</sup> 3, *angels* 2, *off*<sup>?</sup> 2, *over*<sup>?</sup> 2

Finally, the present participle of *fall* offers the following associations in the EAT:

FALLING

down 21, cliff, dream 4, drop, leaves, over, sleep 3, dropping, free, height, help, off, rock, space, tree, tumbling 2

As with the past participle, the present participle also elicits a good deal of noun reactions. Still, the Direction FE *down* seems to form the strongest associative bond with the stimulus. The reaction *cliff* seems to indicate a possible Source FE, as does *height*. However, the reaction *height* may also be an association based on experience, and not as a beginning point of motion. The noun (or verb) *dream*, however, does not seem to relate to any FE. It is possible that instead it points to the specific situation in which one experiences such motion, for which reason it is categorized as a connotation based on experience. The same may be said of *sleep*. The reactions *drop/dropping* show once again that synonymous relation is commonly evoked in all forms of *fall*. Another lexeme that falls into the same frame as *fall* is *tumbling*, also with synonymous relation. Potential Theme FEs are not very salient, but of those that can be discerned, *leaves*, *rock* and *tree* fit into this role. Reactions *over* and *off* are consistently present in most forms of *fall*. Of the more obscure reactions, *space* presents a conundrum. On one hand it could be considered that it presents an Area FE (core) or Place (non-core) but it is too vague to truly be interpreted as such. It also cannot be excluded that it

may have been elicited as a part of a song title, *Falling into Space* (by Don Dilego). Because of this, it has been put into category Undetermined, as no firm interpretation of this association can be established.

FALLING: Motion\_directional

**Frame elements:**

Direction: *down*<sup>2</sup> 21, *over*<sup>2</sup> 3,

Source: *cliff* 4, *height*<sup>2</sup> 2, *off*<sup>2</sup> 2

Theme: *leaves* 3, *rock* 2, *tree* 2

**Connotations:**

experience: *dream* 4, *sleep* 3, *height*<sup>2</sup> 2, *help* 2

**LUs within the same frame**: *drop* 3 (synonym), *dropping* 2 (synonym), *tumbling* 2 (synonym)

**Phrasal relations**: *down*<sup>2</sup> 21, *over*<sup>2</sup> 2, *off*<sup>2</sup> 2

**Undetermined**: *space* 2

So far, we have seen that all forms of the verb *fall* evoke in speakers the Motion\_directional frame. The most evident indicators of this are the frame elements and other lexical units that also relate to the same frame. However, it must be emphasized that it is not possible to exclude the possibility that other frames may be included through metaphorical extension (such as for example, Change\_position\_on\_scale frame). However, for this to be remotely plausible there would need to be surrounding context – which is deliberately not provided in the free associations experiment. Therefore, it is quite credible to say that decontextualized verb *fall* evokes the frame which relies on its prototypical context – that of a physical entity, often animate, going through a downwards motion that results in gaining injury. This aspect may evoke negative emotions such as fear, elements that directly relate to the setting of the motion (situation, circumstances, place, etc.). If compared to the corpus analysis, it may be observed that there is no direct reference to the aspect of lack of control, which was very prominent in the corpus analysis. However, to say that it is not present would not be quite true – it is only that it is not consciously perceived as a primary attribute.

The data for Russian network of associations comes from the Russian Associative Thesaurus (*Русский ассоциативный словарь*) available online. There is one significant difference in approach to the Russian verbs analyzed here – they will be analyzed only in their infinitive form. Rather than a matter of deliberate decision or convenience, this constraint is imposed by the RAT (at least in its online form); there is no available data on the inflectional forms of verbs *падать*, *пасть* and *упасть*. Nevertheless, this should not present any major

differences in the interpretation of the data offered in the two thesauruses, nor in the perception of the verb itself.

Let us then examine the following associations:

#### ПАДАТЬ

вниз 14; с высоты 8; быстро, в обморок, высота, навзничь 3; боль, больно, в снег, в яму, вниз головой, вставать, высоко, камнем, на землю, обрыв, пропасть, с лестницы 2

Similarly to its English counterpart, the most common reaction to the stimulus *падать* is the explication of the PATH element, namely the Direction FE *вниз* ('downwards, down')<sup>34</sup>. Also prominent is the Source FE *с высоты* ('from a height'); the noun *высота* ('height') is therefore also included in this category, though, just as in the previous case, it could be a connotation based on experience. What stands out is the significant amount of Goal and Manner FEs. Although neither has large amount of frequency, the amount of different reactions within these categories suggest that Goal and Manner play a more important role in the perception of the verb *падать*. Of the Goal FE, the reactions *в снег* ('into snow'), *в яму* ('into the pit'), *на землю* ('onto the ground') can be included, and possibly the noun *пропасть* ('the abyss'). However, depending on the stress<sup>35</sup> *пропасть* may also refer to the verb meaning 'to disappear', which might then instead be related to the perceptual experience of seeing someone falling. The Manner FE includes the reactions *быстро* ('fast'), *навзничь* ('on one's back', 'backwards'), *вниз головой* ('headfirst') and *каменем* ('like a rock'). Just as in English, the common association with the falling motion is pain, as indicated by the reactions *боль, больно* ('pain', 'painful'). This also indicates the likelihood of an animate entity in as the Theme FE. Of the relations with the lexical units of the same frame, the only lexical unit elicited is the antonym *вставать* ('rise'). Lastly, the reaction *в обморок* is related to the verb as a constituent in the phrasal expression *падать в обморок* ('to fall unconscious').

---

<sup>34</sup> The translations are primarily my own, but they rely on the *Русско-английский словарь Смирнитского* (2004). The translations for idiomatic expressions are provided by *Вольшой русско-английский фразеологический словарь* (2004). Both dictionaries are available in online form.

<sup>35</sup> Unfortunately, the RAT gives no indication to the place of the stress. From the amount of similar reactions such as *в бездаль, в пропасть* ('into the abyss/chasm'), even if their frequency is 1, I am inclined to think *пропасть* is meant as a noun. Also, if the verb should be elicited it is more likely to include imperfective form (though not necessarily). Still, the possibility that *пропасть* is meant as the verb 'to disappear' cannot be excluded.

ПАДАТЬ: Motion\_directional

**Frame elements:**

Direction: вниз 14

Source: с высоты 8, высота<sup>?</sup> 3, обрыв 2, с лестницы 2

Goal: в снег 2, в яму 2, на землю 2, пропасть<sup>?</sup> 2

Theme: [animate entity]

Manner: быстро 3, навзничь 3, вниз головой 2, камнем 2

**Connotations:**

experience: боль 2, больно 2, высота<sup>?</sup> 3, высоко 2, пропасть<sup>?</sup> 2

**LUs within the same frame**: вставать 2,

**Phrasal relation**: в обморок 3

The stimulus *пасть* elicits the most radically different associations. This is mostly due to the homonymous relation between *пасть* (v. perf., ‘to fall’) and *пасть* (n., ‘mouth of animals, jaws’). Therefore, it is not so surprising that the majority of associations are related to animals (this includes the words *волчья*, *волк*, *льва*, *лев*, *зверь*, *зверя*, *животное*, etc.). All of these are therefore sorted into the category Unrelated, as they have no connection to the verb of motion. However, it is quite significant that the reactions to the noun are more prevalent than to the verb. Still, the reaction with the highest frequency, what seems to be an Area FE *низко* (‘low’), relates to the verb. It is also possible that the reaction *низко* is related to the phrasal expression *низко пасть* (‘to sink low’). Another certain phrasal relation is *духом* which has also appeared in the corpus analysis – it comes from the expression *пасть духом* (‘to fall in spirits’). Also present is the Goal FE *в пропасть* (‘into the abyss’) as well as *пропасть* (with the same ambiguity as previously noted). The reaction *опуститься* (‘to descend’) is a close synonym of the verb stimulus. It is notable to mention that, even though metaphorical extension cannot be retrieved with any certainty, all of the reactions to the *verb* stimulus *пасть* could easily cross into the metaphorical domain. The same cannot be said for other verb stimuli in this analysis. Whether this is due to the lack of reactions to the verb (instead of the noun) or due to the perception of *пасть* as a more metaphorical form than *упасть*, cannot be determined.

ПАСТЬ

низко 14; волчья 7; волка, льва 6; духом, зубы 4; зверь, зверя, лев 3; в пропасть, волк, животное, крокодил, крокодила, опуститься, пропасть, собаки, тигра... 2

ПАСТЬ: Motion\_directional

**Frame elements:**

Area : *низко*<sup>?</sup> 14,

Goal: *в пропасть* 2, *пропасть*<sup>?</sup> 2

**Connotations:**

experience: *пропасть*<sup>?</sup> 2

**LUs within the same frame:** *опуститься* 2 (synonym)

**Phrasal relation:** *низко*<sup>?</sup> 14, *духом* 4

**Unrelated:** *волчья* 7, *волка* 6, *льва* 6, *зубы* 4, *зверь* 3, *зверя* 3, *лев* 3, *волк*, 2, *животное* 2, *крокодил* 2, *крокодила* 2, *собаки* 2, *тигра* 2

Finally, the following stimulus shows reactions to the perfective form *упасть* as provided by RAT:

**УПАСТЬ**

*в пропасть* 36; *встать* 32; *больно*, *в яму* 28; *в лужу* 20; *в обморок*, *пропасть*, *с крыши* 13; *в грязь*, *вниз*, *на пол*, *навзничь* 12; *боль* 10; *в глазах*, *на землю*, *удариться*, *низко* 8; *духом*, *подняться*, *со стуля*, *яма* 7; *камень*, *разбиться*, *с лестницы...* 6

Unlike the majority of the verb forms above, the most prominent association is the already familiar Goal FE *в пропасть* ('into the abyss'). Among Goal FE can also be included reactions *в яму* ('into the pit'), *в лужу* ('into a puddle'), *на пол* ('on the floor'), and *на землю* ('on the ground'). The reaction *пропасть* may also be interpreted as such. Another very prominent association is *встать* ('rise') which, as with its imperfect form, forms an antonymic relation to the stimulus in the same frame. Similar case is with the verb *подняться* which also means 'to rise, to get up'. Of other frame elements, Source, Theme and Manner can be discerned. Source FE includes reactions *с крыши* ('off the roof') *со стуля* ('off the chair') and *с лестницы* ('off the ladder'). Manner FE includes *навзничь* ('on one's back'). As for the Theme FE, the only explicit association is *камень* ('stone, rock'), but as before, the connotations related to pain (*боль*, *больно*, *удариться* – 'pain,' 'painful,' 'to hit oneself') allow for an animate entity as well. One other difference is the presence of another connotation, *разбиться* ('break') which supports that this stimulus includes both animate and inanimate entities as Theme FE. The reactions *в обморок*, *в грязь*, *в глазах* and *духом* are all related to idiomatic expressions. The association *низко* is treated the same as in the previous section.

**УПАСТЬ:** Motiom\_directional

**Frame elements:**

Direction: *вниз* 12

Goal: *в пропасть* 36, *в яму* 28, *в лужу* 20, *пропасть*<sup>?</sup> 13, *на пол* 12, *на землю* 8

Source: *с крыши* 13, *со стуля* 7, *с лестницы* 6

Area: низко<sup>?</sup> 8

Theme: камень 6, [inanimate and animate entities]

Manner: навзничь 12

**Connotations:**

experience: больно 28, пропасть<sup>?</sup> 13, боль 10, удариться 8, разбиться 6

**LUs within the same frame**: встать 32 (антоним), подняться 7(антоним)

**Phrasal relation**: в обморок 13, в грязь 12, в глазах 8, низко<sup>?</sup> 8, духом 7

As with English, the Russian equivalent of *fall* activates the Motion\_directional frame. There are slight differences between Russian and English prototypical context of the falling motion – namely that Goal and Manner tend to be more pronounced in Russian – but overall, there are striking similarities down to the types of Sources evoked (height and cliff, for example) and the aspect of gaining injury. As for differences of *надать*, *пасть* and *унасть* between corpus analysis and analysis of the associations, it is once again shown that perception of the falling motion can change and transform depending on the surrounding context. The only concrete evidence of this among associations is the amount of phrasal relations in which the verb is re-contextualized. However, phrasal relations evoke much different frames, which is beyond the topic of this study.

It is time now to turn to the other verb of analysis, *run*. This verb offers the following associations in the EAT:

RUN

walk 29; fast 11; race 7; away, jump 5; stop 4; rabbit 3; home, life 2

As with *fall*, the frame evoked is of the primary meaning, namely, the Self\_motion frame. The most prominent association evoked is the contrasting verb *walk*, which belongs to the same frame. The presence and considerable frequency of *walk* indicates that the running motion is primarily seen as *not-walking*, the ‘other’ motion that includes some features of walking but is not quite the same. In this sense, *walk* can be considered to be in antonymic relation to the stimulus *run*. Another salient feature is speed, as seen in the reaction *fast* which represents the Manner FE. This also includes the reaction *race* which as a verb holds a synonymous relation to *run* and evokes the aspect of competition. The aspect of competition in *race* may also arise from the noun referring to the event in which a competition is held. Of other associations that share the same frame, the word *jump* presents a connection that may be



based on the aspect of the configuration of feet against the ground – namely that two feet must be off the ground at one point. The reaction *stop*, on the other hand is related not related to the Self\_motion frame. Instead it is opposed to the stimulus on the basis of motion as activity. Frame elements that can be found among reactions include Source FE *away*, Goal FE *home* and Self\_mover FE *rabbit*. It is possible that the Source FE *away* may also give rise to the Fleeing frame. However it cannot be established with certainty as there is no context to support it. One other interesting association, though much weaker than others, is *life*. It is likely related to the idiom *to run one's own life* (Merriam Webster). It is also the only instance in which *run* is perceived as a transitive verb.

RUN: Self\_motion, Fleeing<sup>?</sup>

**Frame elements:**

Source: *away*<sup>?</sup> 5 [Fleeing<sup>?</sup>]

Goal: *home* 2

Self\_mover: *rabbit* 3

Manner: *fast* 11

**Connotations:**

event: *race*<sup>?</sup> 7

**LUs within the same frame:** *walk* 29 (antonym), *race*<sup>?</sup> 7 (synonym), *jump* 5

**LUs of other frames:** *stop* 4 [Activity\_stop]

**Phrasal relation:** *away*<sup>?</sup> 5, *life* 2

The past simple form of the verb offers similar reactions:

RAN

walked 15; run 6; race 5; away, fast 4; up, walk 3; about, jump, out, quickly, rain, rush, street 2

The association *walk* is still has the strongest bond with the stimulus, and the reactions *race*, and *fast* are also fairly strong. Other associations include Source FEs *away* and *out*, Direction FE *up*, Area FE *about* and Path FE *street*. More obscure association is *rain* which may indicate a situation which prompts one to run. Still, as this is the only instance in which this particular association appears (and with quite low frequency too), the nature of it is rather unclear. Another synonym is elicited among the reactions, namely *rush*.

RAN: Self\_motion, Fleeing<sup>?</sup>

**Frame elements:**

Direction: *up*<sup>?</sup> 2

Source: *away*<sup>?</sup> 4 [Fleeing<sup>?</sup>], *out*<sup>?</sup> 2 [Fleeing<sup>?</sup>]

Area: *about* 2

Path: *street* 2

Manner: *fast* 4, *quickly* 2

**Connotations:**

event: *race*<sup>?</sup> 5

circumstance: *rain* 2

**LUs within the same frame**: *walked* 15 (antonym), *run* 6, *race*<sup>?</sup> 5 (synonym), *walk* 3 (antonym), *jump* 2, *rush* 2 (synonym)

**Phrasal relation**: *away*<sup>?</sup> 4, *up*<sup>?</sup> 3, *out*<sup>?</sup> 2

Lastly, the present participle of *run* offers a slightly different batch of associations. While the reactions *fast*, *walking* and *race* still make some of the most prominent associations with the running motion, there are a few reactions that indicate a change in perception of the verb. The most obvious one is *water*, which suggests a Self\_mover FE. However, the motion of fluid entities does not belong to the Self\_motion frame but Fluid\_motion (FrameNet), in which case the *water* represents the Fluid FE. Also connected to this frame is likely *time* through metaphorical extension. Of the Self\_motion frame elements, present are Source FE *away*, Direction FE *down*, Manner FE *fast*, Path FE *track*. Note that there is a possibility that the *track* points to the pseudotransitive feature of lexeme *run*. The reaction *man* indicates a likely Self\_mover FE, but it cannot be excluded that it is evoked in relation to the title of several media contents *The Running Man*. Finally, this stimulus provides the highest amount of connotations based on experience, including *breathless*, *speed* and *tired*. The association *free* is rather difficult to place; it may refer to the experience or the sensation based on emotion, or it may be related to some sort of Manner FE, but it is too general to truly determine.

**RUNNING**

*fast* 11; *walking*, *water* 10; *man* 6; *race* 4; *track* 3; *away*, *breathless*, *down*, *free*, *jumping*, *ran*, *speed*, *time*, *tired* 2

**RUNNING**: Self\_motion, Fluidic\_motion, Fleeing<sup>?</sup>

**Frame elements:**

Source: *away* 2 [Fleeing<sup>?</sup>]

Direction: *down*<sup>?</sup> 2

Path: *track* 3

Manner: *fast* 11

Self\_mover: *water* 10 [Fluidic\_motion], *man*<sup>?</sup> 6, *time* 2 [Fluidic\_motion]

**Connotation:**

experience: *breathless* 2, *speed* 2, *tired* 2

**LUs within the same frame:** *walking* 10, *race* 4, *jumping* 2, *ran* 2

**Phrasal relation:** *man*<sup>?</sup> 6, *down*<sup>?</sup> 2

**Undetermined:** *free* 2

Just as with *fall*, the verb *run* primarily evokes the prototypical frame, in this case Self\_motion. Along with it, the aspect of meaning most prominently connected with the running motion is the notion of speed which, aside as being evoked as a Manner FE, is contrasted with the verb *walk* in the same frame. The contrast with *walk* can also indicate the implied configuration of feet against the ground, which would be supported also by the association *jump* (which is more similar to *run* in this respect). However, unlike the verb *fall*, the verb *run* can evoke other frames, though much less pronounced. This primarily refers to the Fleeing frame which is strongly dependent on the Source FE, in this case primarily *away*, *off* and *out*. However, it cannot be established whether the Fleeing frame is truly evoked as there is no supporting context. The present participle of *run* strongly evokes another frame, in this case Fluidic\_motion, which is evident from the type of entity related to it. When compared to the corpus analysis, the most obvious difference is the complete lack of associations related to *run* as a transitive verb (the only exception being the association *life*, which, then again, may be more of a phrasal relation). This indicates that the aspects of meaning of *run* such as control and power as well as the transitivity of the verb are only activated in surrounding context.

The verb *бегать*, as we will see, offers quite similar associations as its English counterpart:

БЕГАТЬ

быстро 87; прыгать 52; босиком 22; наперегонки 13; по кругу 11; по утрам, трусцой 10; кросс 9; по лужам, по улице 8; вприпрыжку 7; от инфаркта, спорт, ходить 6; впуски, по траве, утром 5

As before, the most frequent association with the running motion is the aspect of speed, and it is often expressed by the adverb *быстро* ('fast'). The second most frequent reaction is a lexical unit that belongs to the same frame, Self\_motion, namely *прыгать* ('to jump'). Just like before, this points to the primary features of the running motion, i.e. the speed and the configuration of feet against the ground. There is a considerable amount of reactions relating

to the manner of running, namely *босиком* ('barefoot'), *наперегонки* ('racing'<sup>36</sup>), *трусцой* ('jogging'), *вприпрыжку* ('with a hop'), and *взапуски* ('chasing, racing'). Also present are Path FEs, *по кругу* ('in a circle'), *по лужам* ('across puddles'), *по улице* ('on the street') and *по траве* ('on the grass'), and non-core FE Time *по утрам, утром* (both meaning 'in the morning'). Of the connotations related to the verb *бегать*, they are related to the competition aspect of the verb – both refer to sports, one literally *спорт* ('sport'), the other specifying the kind of racing sport – *кросс* ('cross, cross-country'). The only other lexical unit within the same frame that appears among reactions (aside from *прыгать*), is the verb *ходить* ('to go, to walk'). Just as in English, this verb can be seen as antonym to *бегать*. Finally, of the reactions based on phrasal relations, there is the expression (*бегать*) *от инфаркта* which is another term for 'jogging'.

**БЕГАТЬ:** Self\_motion

**Frame elements:**

Path: *по кругу* 11, *по лужам* 8, *по улице* 8, *по траве* 5

Manner: *быстро* 87, *босиком* 22, *наперегонки* 13, *трусцой* 10, *вприпрыжку* 7, *взапуски* 5

Time: *по утрам* 10, *утром* 5

**Connotations:**

competition event: *кросс* 9, *спорт* 6

**LUs within the same frame:** *прыгать* 52, *ходить* 6 (antonym)

**Phrasal relations:** *от инфаркта* 5

The unidirectional verb *бежать* offers a very large amount of associations with a quite wide range. The most prominent reaction is, as before, speed – *быстро* ('fast') – with a remarkably high frequency. The association *вперед* ('forward') is also significant, especially because it seems to affirm the notion that a unidirectional verb already possesses a schematic PATH (Nesset 2008). The reactions *идти* ('go, walk') and *лететь* ('fly') also support such a view as they too are unidirectional (though not necessarily – as it has already been mentioned, a stimulus tends to elicit other verbs in the same grammatical form, or in this case the category of (non-)unidirectionality). Another association that belongs to the same frame is *спешить* ('to hurry') which can be considered as a synonym. There are two lexical units that

---

<sup>36</sup> This is essentially the same meaning as the English verb *to race*, which was established as a lexical unit of the same frame. In Russian, *наперегонки* is an adverb describing the manner of the motion verb. As we can see, the aspect of competition and speed is treated as a Manner FE whereas in English this notion is lexicalized. The closest example of how this would be illustrated in English is the expression *to run competitively*. However, the verb *to race* encapsulates the meaning much more closely. The same holds for *взапуски*, which has approximately the same meaning, and *трусцой*, which in English is lexicalized as 'jogging'.

are related to different frames: *стоять* ('to stand') which is evokes the Posture frame (FrameNet) and is evidently opposed to the notion of movement, and *догонять* ('catch up with, run down') which belongs to the Cotheme frame (FrameNet), which retains the aspect of running motion. Of frame elements, we can discern Manner FE *быстро* ('fast'), *вприпрыжку* ('with a hop') and with emphasis on speed, *бегом* ('by running'), Direction FE *вперед* ('forward'), Path FEs *по дороге* and *дорога* ('on the road,' 'road'), Source FE *отсюда* ('from here'), Goal FEs *домой* ('home'), *куда-то* ('somewhere') and *в никуда* ('to nowhere'), Area FE *далеко* ('far') and the non-core element Duration *долго* ('long, for a while'). The connotations include *кросс* ('cross, cross-country') and *погоня* ('chase'). These imply the potential presence of Competition and Cotheme frames respectively. Finally, this stimulus elicits considerably many associations related to phrasal expressions<sup>37</sup>.

### БЕЖАТЬ

быстро 112; вперед 17; без оглядки, кросс, по дороге 16; домой 15; идти, от себя 12; далеко, прыгать 11; сломя голову 10; лететь 8; догонять, отсюда 7; бегом, дорога, куда глаза глядят, спешить, стоять 6; в никуда, вприпрыжку, долго, куда-то, погоня 5

**БЕЖАТЬ:** Self\_motion

#### Frame elements:

Manner: *быстро* 112, *бегом* 6 *вприпрыжку* 5

Direction: *вперед* 17

Path: *по дороге* 16, *дорога* 6

Source: *отсюда* 7

Goal: *в никуда* 5, *домой* 15, *куда-то* 5

Area: *далеко* 11,

Duration: *долго* 5

**LUs within the same frame:** *идти* 12 (антоним), *прыгать* 11, *лететь* 8 (синоним), *спешить* 6 (синоним)

**LUs of other frames:** *стоять* 6 [Posture], *догонять* 7 [Cotheme]

#### Connotations:

event: *кросс* 16 *погоня* 5

**Phrasal relation:** *без оглядки* 16, *от себя* 12, *сломя голову* 10, *куда глаза глядят* 6

<sup>37</sup> As before, the phrasal expressions are not analyzed, but to give a brief overview: [*бежать*] *без оглядки* ('[run] without looking back'), [*бежать*] *от (самого) себя* ('to proceed against one's own wishes'), [*бежать*] *сломя голову* ('[run] like mad'), [*бежать*] *куда глаза глядят* ('[run] where one's feet will take one'). As we can see, they mostly relate to Self\_motion frame and possibly Fleeing frame with strong emphasis on urgency.

When it comes to the prefixation of *бегать* and *бежать* with a PATH prefixes, there is a slight change in the reactions<sup>38</sup>. The main difference is the much smaller amount of Manner FEs; the stimulus *прибежать* elicits only one Manner FE *бегом* ('by running'), and the verb *убегать/убежать* offers *быстро* ('fast') as the prevalent Manner FE. More pronounced are the elements relating to spatial orientation – for *прибежать* more prominent are the Goal FEs such as *домой* ('home') with the highest frequency, but also *финиш*, *к финишу* ('finish,' 'to the finish') and *на работу* ('to work (n)'). The verb *убежать/убегать* is predictably more closely related to Source FEs, which includes *от погони* ('from chase, pursuit'), *от собаки* ('from the dog'), *от врага* ('from the enemy') *от опасности* ('from danger') and *из дома* ('out of the house'). As before, the presence of Source FE may also evoke the Fleeing frame, which is especially evident with sources such as *от врага* ('from the enemy') and *от опасности* ('from danger'). Another frame s evoked by the verb *прибежать*, in this case the Competition frame (FrameNet), as can be seen from the core element Rank *первым* ('first'). The Goal FEs *финиш* and *к финишу* also supports the presence of this frame. Another reaction that is connected to a different frame is *скрыться* ('to hide') which is prompted by the stimulus *убежать*. The frame in question is Eclipse (FrameNet), which is likely connected to the Fleeing frame of the verb.

#### ПРИБЕЖАТЬ

домой 19; первым 10; финиш 5; убежать 3; бегом, вовремя, из дома, к финишу, на работу 2

ПРИБЕЖАТЬ: Self\_motion, Competition

#### Frame elements:

Goal: *домой* 19, *финиш* 5, *к финишу* 2, *на работу* 2

Source: *из дома* 2

Manner: *бегом* 2

Time: *вовремя* 2

Rank: *первым* 10 [Competition]

**LUs within the same frame**: *убежать* 3 (antonym)

#### УБЕГАТЬ

быстро 40; от себя 26; от погони 24; догонять 18; от собаки 17; от врага 14; далеко 12; от опасности 10

УБЕГАТЬ: Self\_motion, Fleeing

<sup>38</sup> The RAT does not provide the counterpart of *прибежать* in the imperfect aspect. It is not clear why.

**Frame elements:**

Manner: *быстро* 40

Source: *от погони* 24, *от собаки* 17, *от врага* 14, *от опасности* 10

Area: *далеко* 12

**LUs of other frames**: *догонять* 18 [Cotheme]

**Phrasal relation**: *от себя* 26,

**УБЕЖАТЬ**

от себя 49; далеко 38; из дома 30; быстро 18; домой 17; в лес 16; от врага 14;  
из дому 13; скрыться 11; прибежать 7

УБЕЖАТЬ: Self\_motion, Fleeing

**Frame elements:**

Manner: *быстро* 18

Source: *из дома* 30, *от врага* 14, *из дому* 13

Goal: *домой* 17, *в лес* 16

Area: *далеко* 38

**LUs within the same frame**: *прибежать* 7 (antonym)

**LUs of other frames**: *скрыться* 11 [Eclipse]

**Phrasal relation**: *от себя* 49

From these associations it can be established that the primary frame that *бегать*, *бежать*, and their directional counterparts *прибежать*, *убегать* and *убежать* evoke is the Self\_motion frame. As with English, the most prominent association is related to the speed aspect of meaning. It is interesting to note that the contrasting verb *идти/ходить* ('walk') is much less prominent among reactions, whereas *прыгать* ('jump') has higher frequency. This might indicate that the running motion is perceived more in terms of similarity with the jumping motion than contrast of the walking movement. The verbs of running motion also seem to be closely related to the aspect of competition, which is mostly clear from the Manner FEs and especially with the verb *прибежать* which evokes the Competition frame among reactions. Another frame that is closely related is the Fleeing frame, which is apparent in the specific type of Source FE related to the verb (namely *от врага*, 'from the enemy' and *от опасности*, 'from danger'). Also related is the Cotheme frame in similar way as it was in the corpus analysis. There is slight difference between *бегать* and *бежать*; mainly that the unidirectional verb evokes more associations based on the directional configuration. The same holds for the prefixal verbs *прибежать*, *убегать* and *убежать*, all of which have greater range of FEs that pertain to spatial relations and much less associations related to manner (still, the aspect of speed is also the most common association). When compared to the corpus

analysis, the perception of these verbs is much closer to their use within context – same frames are evoked, and the same aspects of meaning are present.



## CONCLUSION

This study has observed how two verbs of motion are used in a contextualized environment, the way surrounding words affect their aspects of meaning, and compared it to the way these verbs are consciously perceived on their own, without a surrounding context. Through frame semantics it has been established that the verbs *fall* and *run*, as well as their counterparts *падать*, *пасть*, *упасть* and *бегать* and *бежать*, all evoke more than one frame in a contextualized setting. As such, the verb *fall* evokes six separate frames in this study (this number however is not definite): *Motion\_directional*, *Change\_position\_on\_a\_scale*, *Experience\_bodily\_harm*, *Conquering*, *Endeavor\_failure* and *Becoming*. The frame *Motion\_directional* is the primary frame which implies the prototypical context in which the verb is found. The other frames arise through metaphorical extension or interaction with other frames. The Russian equivalents *падать*, *пасть*, and *упасть* evoke the same frames (except for *Becoming* which for English arises due to syntactic properties). The most prominent aspects of meaning of verbs related to falling motion includes the aspect of lack of control, vertical motion (which gives rise to orientational metaphors) and the aspect of gaining injury. The analysis of associations evoked by the same verbs reveals that the verb is perceived primarily as part of *Motion\_directional* frame. However, in a decontextualized environment it is not possible to discern whether there is a possibility that it may evoke some of the frames that arise from metaphorical extension (such as *Change\_position\_on\_a\_scale*, for example). The aspects of meaning that can be interpreted from associations also reflect those found in the corpus analysis.

The verb *run*, on the other hand shows significant difference between both the languages and the way it is perceived by the native speakers. English verb *run* shows a great range of meanings; in the corpus analysis nine separate frames, including *Self\_motion* (the prototypical frame), *Fleeing*, *Competition*, *Being\_operational*, and so on. The crucial element for transformation of meaning of the verb is transitivity. As such, the frames listed are all connected to the intransitive *run*, which is its prototypical use. The frames *Cause\_motion*, *Cause\_to\_perceive*, *Operating\_a\_system* and *Leadership* all pertain to the transitive *run*. Native speakers perceive decontextualized *run* almost exclusively as an intransitive verb; all associations evoked by the verb include potential frame elements that are found in the *Self\_motion* frame. This suggests that transitivity of the verb is only evoked in a contextualized setting. The main features of the intransitive *run* include the manner of motion, in this case speed and configuration of feet against the ground, as well as having a body and

using energy. The transitive *run*, on the other hand, is more related to the aspect of having power and control over something. The Russian equivalents *бегать* and *бежать* are exclusively intransitive and therefore evoke frames similar to the intransitive *run*, such as Self\_motion (prototypical), Fleeing, and also Cotheme. The difference between *бегать* and *бежать* primarily lies in the highly schematic PATH that is expressed in the latter; this is especially visible among associations, as *бежать* offers more reactions relating to spatial positioning. The satellites do not transform the meaning of the verb drastically; they are, however, often the element that gives rise to metaphorical extension (this is particularly evident with the Source FE that is strongly related to the Fleeing frame).

Taking all these findings into account, it can be said that there is firm evidence that the way native speakers conceptualize is coherent with the prototypical context of the verb. However, the range of meanings that is found in contextualized settings far exceeds those that are indicated in the speaker's conscious understanding of it. This opens a window for a future study to inquire about how native speakers would grade the meanings of these verbs in and out of context. The difference of the conceptualization of the falling and running motion between English and Russian is also prominent. The main point of departure for running motion is the transitivity feature of the English verb. However, the conceptualization of falling motion is strikingly similar; the question remains whether this is only due to the syntactic feature of the verb *fall* and its Russian counterparts, or whether the elements of PATH and MANNER also play a role. For this to be investigated, more verbs that possess of each property ought to be analyzed. Nevertheless, the significant departure in the pool of meanings between English and Russian for the verb *run* points to a departure in conceptualization of the particular activity; in English especially there is a certain abstraction of the concept that is not found in Russian (at least according to the data provided by the corpora). But as maintained by the cognitive view, this reflects a broader difference in experience and cultural understanding of the concept within the two language communities, which is not only bound by the knowledge of the world and of the language, but also bound to the presence of context.

## List of references:

- Dalpanagioti, Thomai. (2022). “Motivated patterns of phrasal verbs and learner’s dictionaries.” In *Lexis* [Online], 19 | 2022. Accessed June 27, 2022. URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/lexis/6186>; DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/lexis.6186>
- Fillmore, Charls J. (1971) “Types of Lexical Information.” In *Semantics: An Interdisciplinary Reader in Philosophy, Linguistics and Psychology*, ed. D.D. Steinberg, L.A. Jakobovits, Cambridge University Press
- Fillmore, Charles J. (1982). “Frame Semantics.” In *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*, ed. Linguistics Society of Korea. 111 – 137. Seoul: Hanshin Publishing Company
- Fillmore, Charles J. (2006) “Frame Semantics.” In *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*, ed. Keith Brown. 613 – 620. Elsevier Ltd.
- Foote, Irwin P. (1967). *Verbs of Motion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Goethe, Johann W. (1797). *The Bride of Corinth*. Tanslated by Edgar Alfred Bowring (1853). Project Guttenberg: <https://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/1287/pg1287.html>
- Gor, Kira, S. Cook, V. Malyushenkova, T. Vdovina. (2010) “Russian verbs of motion: Second language acquisition and cognitive linguistics perspectives.” In *New Approaches to Slavic Verbs of Motion*, eds. Victoria Hasko, Renee Perelmutter. 361 – 381. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing
- Gregory Y. Titelman, (1996). *Random House Dictionary of Popular Proverbs and Sayings*. New York: Random House Reference
- Hasko, Victoria. (2010). “Semantic composition of motion verbs in Russian and English: The case of intra-typological variability.” In *New Approaches to Slavic Verbs of Motion*, eds. Victoria Hasko, Renee Perelmutter. 198 – 224. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company
- Ikegami, Yoshihiko. (1969). *The Semological Structure of the English Verbs of Motion*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press
- Jakobson, Roman. (1971). “Relationship between Russian Stem Suffixes and Verbal Aspects”. In *Selected Writings. 2. Word and Language*. 198–202. The Hague/Paris: Mouton
- Janda, Laura A. (2007). “Aspectual Clusters of Russian Verbs”, *Studies in Language* Vol. 3, No. 13. 607–648.
- Janda, Laura A. (2008). “Motion Verbs and the Development of Aspect in Russian.” *Scando-Slavica* Vol. 54, No. 1. 179–197.
- Lakoff, George, Mark Johnson. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

- Langacker, Ronald W. (1987). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, Vol. 1: Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press
- Langacker, Ronald W. (2002). *Concept, Image, and Symbol: The Cognitive Basis of Grammar*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter
- Levin, Beth. (1993). *English Verb Classes and Alternations: A Preliminary Investigation*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press
- LU Zhi, SUN Juan. (2015). "A View of Research on English Polysemous Phrasal Verbs." In *Journal of Literature and Art Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 8. 649 – 659. David Publishing Company
- Kövecses, Zoltan. (2010). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mahota, William J. (1996). *Russian Motion Verbs for Intermediate Students*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press
- Morgan, Pamela S. (1997). "Figuring out *figure out*: Metaphor and the semantics of the English verb-particle construction." In *Cognitive Linguistics*, Vol. 8, No. 4. 327 – 358. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Nesset, Tore. (2000). "Iconicity and prototypes: A new perspective on Russian verbs of motion." In *Scando-Slavica*, Vol. 46, No. 1. 105 – 119.
- Nesset, Tore. (2008). "PATH and MANNER: An Image-Schematic Approach to Russian Verbs of Motion." In *Scando-Slavica*, Vol. 54, No. 1. 135 – 158
- Slobin, Dan I. (2004). "The many ways to search for a frog: Linguistic typology and the expression of motion events". In *Relating Events in Narrative: Typological and Contextual Perspectives*, eds. S. Strömquist and L. Verhoeven. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
- Slobin, Dan I. (2005). "Linguistic representations of motion events: What is signifier and what is signified?" In *Iconicity Inside Out: Iconicity in Language and Literature 4*. 307 – 322. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins
- Talmy, Leonard. (1985). "Lexicalization patterns: Semantic structure in lexical forms". In *Language Typology and Lexical Description: Vol. 3. Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*, ed. T. Shopen. 36-149. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Talmy, Leonard (1991). "Path to realization: A typology of event conflation". *Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 17: 480-519
- Talmy, Leonard. (2000). *Toward a Cognitive Semantics, Vol. II: Typology and Process in Concept Structuring*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press

Ufimtseva, Natalya V. (2014). "The Associative Dictionary as a Model of Linguistic Picture of the World." In *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences* Vol. 154. 36 – 43.

Wade, T. (1992). *A Comprehensive Russian Grammar*. Oxford: Blackwell

Žic Fuchs, Milena. (1991). *Znanje o jeziku i znanje o svijetu: semantička analiza glagola kretanja u engleskom jeziku*. Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet

## Список литературы:

- Гете, Иоганн. (1797). *Коринфская Невеста*. Перев. А. К. Толстой.  
[https://poems.net.ua/poet/%D0%93%D0%B5%D1%82%D0%B5\\_%D0%98%D0%BE%D0%B3%D0%B0%D0%BD%D0%BD\\_%D0%9A%D0%BE%D1%80%D0%B8%D0%BD%D1%84%D1%81%D0%BA%D0%B0%D1%8F\\_%D0%9D%D0%B5%D0%B2%D0%B5%D1%81%D1%82%D0%B0](https://poems.net.ua/poet/%D0%93%D0%B5%D1%82%D0%B5_%D0%98%D0%BE%D0%B3%D0%B0%D0%BD%D0%BD_%D0%9A%D0%BE%D1%80%D0%B8%D0%BD%D1%84%D1%81%D0%BA%D0%B0%D1%8F_%D0%9D%D0%B5%D0%B2%D0%B5%D1%81%D1%82%D0%B0)
- Зализняк, Анна А., А. Д. Шмелев. (1997). *Лекции по русской аспектологии*. München: Verlag Otto Sagner
- Исаченко, Александр В. (1960). *Грамматический строй русского языка: Морфология*. Братислава : Словацкая акад. наук
- Корчик, Людмила С. (2012). «Глаголы движения в русском языке и особенности их преподавания в китайской аудитории.» В *Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов*, No. 1. 84 – 91.
- Падучева, Елена В. (2002). «Дейктические компоненты в семантике глаголов движения.» В *Логический анализ языка: семантика начала и конца*, ред. Д. Арутюнова. 121 – 136. Москва: Индрик
- Стефановић (2005): Марија Стефановић, „Од асоцијативног речника према асоцијативној граматици“. Предраг Пипер, Рајна Драгићевић, Марија Стефановић, *Асоцијативни речник српскога језика (I део; од стимулуса ка реакцији)*. 23–55. Београд: Београдска књига – Службени лист СЦГ – Филолошки факултет у Београду,
- Шмелев, Алексей Д. (2002). «Из пункта А в пункт В» В *Логический анализ языка: семантика начала и конца*, ред. Д. Арутюнова. 181 – 194. Москва: Индрик

## Online sources:

FrameNet: <https://framenet.icsi.berkeley.edu/fndrupal/>

“fall.” n.d. Accessed Jun 26, 2022.

[https://framenet.icsi.berkeley.edu/fndrupal/framenet\\_search](https://framenet.icsi.berkeley.edu/fndrupal/framenet_search)

“run.” n.d. Accessed Jul 28, 2022.

[https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/run\\_1](https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/run_1)

Farlex Dictionary of Idioms: <https://idioms.thefreedictionary.com/>

"fallen woman." n.d. Aug 27, 2022.

<https://idioms.thefreedictionary.com/fallen+woman>

Lapalme, Guy. (2017, November). *Edinburgh Associative Thesaurus*. Recherche appliquée en linguistique informatique.

[http://rali.iro.umontreal.ca/rali/sites/default/files/resources/eat/sr\\_concise](http://rali.iro.umontreal.ca/rali/sites/default/files/resources/eat/sr_concise)

Macmillan Dictionary: <https://www.macmillandictionary.com/>

“run.” n.d. Accessed Jul 28, 2022.

[https://www.macmillandictionary.com/dictionary/british/run\\_1](https://www.macmillandictionary.com/dictionary/british/run_1)

Merriam Webster.com Dictionary: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/>

“fall.” n.d. Accessed Aug 27, 2022. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/fall>

“run.” n.d. Accessed Jul 28, 2022. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/run>

Oxford English Dictionary: <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/>

“fall.” n.d. Accessed Jun 26, 2022. <https://www.lexico.com/definition/fall>

“run.” n.d. Accessed Jul 28, 2022.

[https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/run\\_1?q=run](https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/run_1?q=run)

## Sketch Engine:

Adam Kilgarriff, Vít Baisa, Jan Bušta, Miloš Jakubíček, Vojtěch Kovář, Jan Michelfeit, Pavel Rychlý, Vít Suchomel. (2014). “The Sketch Engine: ten years on.” In *Lexicography*, 1: 7 – 36.

Adam Kilgarriff, Pavel Rychlý, Pavel Smrž, David Tugwell. (2004) “The sketch engine.” *Proceedings of the 11th EURALEX International Congress*. 105-116.

Suchomel, Vít. (2020). *Better Web Corpora For Corpus Linguistics And NLP*. Available also from: <https://is.muni.cz/th/u4rmz/>. Doctoral thesis. Masaryk University, Faculty of Informatics, Brno. Supervised by Pavel RYCHLÝ.

Jakubíček, M., Kilgarriff, A., Kovář, V., Rychlý, P., & Suchomel, V. (2013, July). “The TenTen corpus family.” In *7th International Corpus Linguistics Conference CL*. 125 – 127.

Suchomel, V., & Pomikálek, J. (2012). Efficient web crawling for large text corpora.  
In Proceedings of the seventh Web as Corpus Workshop (WAC7). 39 – 43.

Available link: <http://www.sketchengine.eu/>



Список источников в Интернете:

Ефремова Т. Ф. (2000). *Новый словарь русского языка. Толково-словообразовательный.* – М.: Русский язык.

«падать.» <https://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/efremova/207853>

Лубенская, С. И. (2004) *Большой русско-английский фразеологический словарь.* АСТ-Пресс

Караулов Ю.Н., Ю.А.Сорокин, Е.Ф.Тарасов, Н.В.Уфимцева, Г.А.Черкасова. (1988-1997). *Русский ассоциативный словарь. Ассоциативный тезаурус современного русского языка. В 3-х частях, 6-ти книгах / Прямой словарь: от стимула к реакции.* <http://thesaurus.ru/dict/>

Смирницкий, А. И. (2004). *Русско-английский словарь.* Лист Нью.  
[https://smirnitsky\\_ru\\_en.academic.ru/](https://smirnitsky_ru_en.academic.ru/)

## APPENDIX: Abbreviations

Act – Activity  
Agt – Agent  
Area – Area  
Cir – Circumstances  
Comp – Competition  
Con – Conqueror  
Diff – Difference  
DNI – Definite null instantiation  
Dur – Duration  
Exp – Explanation  
End – Endeavor  
Ent – Entity  
Finq – Final quality  
Goal – Goal  
gov – Governed  
Harm – Harmful\_situation  
Item – Item  
lea – Leader  
Manner – Manner  
Obj – Object  
ope – Operator  
Partic-1 – Participant\_1  
Partic-2 – Participant\_2  
Path – Path  
Patient – Patient  
Perceiver – Perceiver  
Phenomenon – Phenomenon  
Place – Place  
Prize – Prize  
Rank – Rank  
Result – Result  
Road – Road  
SMov – Self\_mover  
Src – Source  
sys – System  
Thm – Theme  
Thm\_c – Cotheme  
val1 – Initial\_value  
val2 – Final\_value

Karla Kosić rođena je 13. studenog u Zagrebu. Tamo pohađa XIII Gimnaziju te istovremeno Glazbenu školu Franje Lučića u Velikoj Gorici. Godine 2015. upisuje studij Anglistike te Ruski jezik i književnost na Filozofskom fakultetu u Zagrebu. U 2020. zajedno s kolegama izdaje prijevod članka Borisa Grojsa „Rusija kao podsvjesno Zapada“ («Россия как подсознание Запада») u časopisu *Sic: Journal of Literature, Culture and Literary Translation*: <https://www.sic-journal.org/Article/Index/635>