Up and Down:
On Some Concepts of Path in Korean Motion Verbs

Götz Wienold

1. Typology of Lexicalizations

What can be said in one language can in many cases be expressed in another language without difficulty.[1] Nevertheless, languages vary considerably in what is expressed in individual lexemes. Consider English modal verbs and their Korean counterparts as an example. It is not at all difficult to express the obligation in English sentences like

(1a) I must write a letter to my friend.
(1b) I have got to go back to Switzerland next week.
(1c) He is obliged to honour his commitments.

in Korean:

(1'a) na–nŭn ch'ingu–ege p'yŏnji–rŭl ssŏya handa.
(1'b) na–nŭn naeju–e sŭwisŭ–e toragaji anhŭmyŏn andoenda.
(1'c) kŭ–nŭn i ir–e ch'aegim–ŭl chiji anŭl su ŏpta.

But among these English and Korean expressions of obligation *have got to, be obliged to, must* and *–ya hada, –chi anhŭmyŏn andoeda, –chi anŭl su ŏpta* only English has specific lexical items containing the notion of obligation: *oblige* and *must*, and among those only one, i.e. *must*, expresses that a

---

[1] I deliberately refrain from stating that anything which can be expressed in one language can also be expressed in any other language. E. g., it is rather hard to imagine that the meanings expressed by Korean honorification can be *expressed* in English in normal discourse. There are, of course, ways of *explaining* in English the meanings expressed by Korean honorifics but that is quite different from expressing them in normal English discourse. I, again deliberately, do not introduce the concept of translation here, as translations as they occur are subject to quite a number of ways of accomodating to situations.

certain obligation is incumbent on the person referred to by the subject of the sentence. I will use the concept of *lexicalization*, that is I will call **lexicalization** the fact that a notion – or often, as we will see later, a set of notions – is expressed in a specific lexical item in a language. 'Lexicalization' is also used in different senses, i. e.

— to indicate that words in a given syntactic construction are not used freely but as a fixed expression;
— to indicate that a morphological derivation is not formed freely on the spot but has been fixed previously and has been learnt as such.

These various concepts of lexicalization, I presume, reflect different aspects of the same basic process in language. Languages provide their speakers with fixed ways of expression which are stored in memory ready for use, and we have come to call this store house 'lexicon' or 'dictionary'. Among the items stored there some have an internal syntactic structrure (fixed syntactic expressions), some have an internal morphological structure (compounds, derivations), and some have neither internal syntactic nor internal morphological structure, that is, they are unanalyzable in these terms, they are **monomorphematic**.

Monomorphematic lexicalizations like English *must* are particularly interesting from a typological point of view. The concept of monomorphematic lexicalization places the strongest possible constraint on lexemes: If one wants to discover typological principles of lexicalization in human languages, it is best to start with an area restricted so strongly that systematic differences may be discovered easily.[2] To return to our example: The difference in lexicalization of obligation between English and Korean is not an idiosyncratic one. It is not idiosyncratic in several ways:

1. With regard to other modal notions English has specific monomorphematic lexicalizations, e.g. *may* vs. *(muŏtmuŏt hae) do chot'a, can* vs. *(muŏtmuŏt ha)l su itta*. That is, there is a patterning of expression in both languages, English has developed a class of monomorphematic words, the so-called modal auxiliary, Korean prefers analytical expression of modal no-

---

[2] I do not mean to suggest that there may not be typological restrictions on what can be a morphological derivation in languages and on how notions may be lexicalized in morphological derivations.

tions.

2. The difference is not a fact of just the two languages English and Korean. If we look at the expression of modal notions in other languages we will find languages which have monomorphematic lexicalizations for the notions of 'obligation', 'permission', 'ability' and so on, e.g. German and Thai, and we will find other languages which prefer analytical expressions for these notions, e.g. Japanese.

(2a) English: I *must* write a letter to my friend.
(2b) German: Ich *muβ* meinem Freund/meiner Freundin einen Brief
            schreiben.
(2c) Thai: p'òm *t'oŋ* k'ien cɔ̀tmàai sɔ̌ŋ pai p'ɯ̂ən.
(2d) Korean: na–nŭn ch'ingu–ege p'yŏnji–rŭl ss*ŏya handa.*
(2e) Japanese: watasi–wa tomodachi–ni tegami–o ka*kanakereba naranai.*[3]

German and Thai, just like English, have a set of lexicalizations of modal notions (for Thai: cf. Noss (1964: 114ff)) – albeit with individual differences in what notions are included in each language's set – Korean and Japanese do not.

3. In the three languages with lexicalizations of obligation, permission, ability etc., the lexicalizations belong to a specific syntactic class and the respective syntactic classes of English, German and Thai exhibit a great many similarities, such that we can consider them to belong to the same word class in a comparative perspective: modal auxiliaries. That is: monomorphematic lexicalization patterns are tied up with other patternings in these languages connecting with syntax and morphology. Korean and Japanese, on the other hand, again employ quite similar patterns of analytical constructions, connected with the syntax and morphology of verb modification in the two languages (on the typology of this cf. Lehmann (1973)).[4]

---

[3] The sentences from the five languages are used as examples of expressing the same modal notion with respect to a cognitively similar situation. They are not translations of each other for all referents and all pragmatic circumstances.

[4] If Korean and Japanese lexicalize modal notions at all in monomorphematic lexical items they have nouns functioning as modal expressions in connection with the copula or other verbs, e.g. Japanese *tsumori, hazu, yoo, koto* and the like, Korean

I used lexicalization of modal notions as an example to introduce the concept of lexicalization and its relevance to the typology of languages. Therefore I have treated the topic only in a perfunctory manner. Before I leave it let me add one more observation. Both Korean and Japanese have lexicalizations of modal notions in conjunction with negation, e.g. Korean – *mot*, Japanese *kaneru* both expressing the negation of ability.

    (3a) na–nŭn p'yŏnji–rŭl mot ssŭnda.
    (3b) watashi–wa tegami–o kakikaneru.

(The Japanese expression sounds quite formal and cannot be used pragmatically as freely as Korean *mot*.) Again, this is not an isolated fact. Both languages have a number of expressions incorporating negation in a monomorphematic lexical unit, i.e., Korean *malda, silt'a and ant'a* (*ant'a* historically derives from *an–hada*, but has become one unit no loger derivable by productive rules). Japanese: *kirai* (and *kirau*), *chigau*. Östen Dahl in his typology of negation has pointed out that incorporation of negation in a monomorphematic lexical unit is found in Tungusic languages (Dahl (1979)).

    Needless to say, it is neither a merit nor a demerit of a language to have lexicalizations of a certain nature or not to have them. It is just a fact of interest in studying the structure of languages.

2. Movement Verbs

    Korean is a language rich in verbs expressing the path of a movement in a monomorphematic verb: *tŭlda* 'to move into (s.th.)', *nada* 'to move out (of s.th.)', *orŭda* 'to move up (s.th.)', *naerida* 'to move down (s.th.)', *kŏnnŏ da* 'to move across (s.th.), *nŏmta* 'to move across (s.t., which under some circumstances presents an impediment)', *tolda* 'to move around s.th', *chinada* 'to move through s.th. (an area))', *kŏch'ida* 'to move through s.th. (a point)', *putta* 'to move up to s.th.', *ttŭida* 'to move away from s.th.', *irŭda*

---

[4] continued
sem, kŏt, tŭt. A comparison of such Japanese "modal nouns" and German "modal verbs" is attempted in Wienold (1991). As these Japanese and Korean nouns link up with the whole system of nominalizations in both languages, I do not want to go any further into this at the present time.

and *tadarŭda* 'to move towards s.th. representing the goal', *pik'ida* 'to move out of the way of s.th.', *ttarŭda* 'to move along s.th.', *omta* 'to move from one thing to another', *tanida* 'to move to and fro between two or more things'. Often these Korean verbs of motion are used in connection with the deictic verbs *kada* and *oda* (as in *tŭrŏgada/turŏoda, kŏnnŏgada/kŏnnŏoda* and so on). But what I call the path of a motion – and I will be more specific on this concept presently – is contained in the base part of *tŭrŏgada, tŭrŏoda, kŏnnŏgada, kŏnnŏoda* and so on, that is in *tŭro–* and *kŏnnŏ–* respectively. Thus we may rightly speak of monomorphematic verbs of motion expressing a path. *kada* and *oda* are also used with a different group of motion verbs in Korean, verbs expressing the manner of motion, like *kŏtta*, (e.g. *kŏrŏgada, kŏrŏoda*). Thus, the use of *kada* and *oda* with motion verbs in Korean is something more general than the incorporation of a path in motion verbs and has to be characterized on its own (cf. Wienold/Dehnhardt/Kim/Yoshida (1991: 43ff.)). And, therefore, we may also include *tagagada, tagaoda* 'move close to s.th.' (from *tagŭda* plus *kada/oda*) hardly ever used without the deictic component verbs, and we may include *naagada* 'to move forward on s.th.' for which in the present language no simple word exists. Again, *tagagada/oda* and *naagada/oda*, although   not   occuring without *kada* (and *oda*) respectively, have notions of a path contained in the base alone. Thus we may rightly consider them lexicalizations of path notions (For a list of Korean path verbs cf. Wienold/Dehnhardt/Kim/Yoshida (1991: 24ff.)).

The glosses for the verbs are rough glosses. More precise semantic characterizations for some of the verbs will be given in sections 3–5. The rough glosses given so far all contain a phrase of the type 'up s.th.' and so on. The 'up'/'into'/'away from' – part of these glosses indicates the path. But the path connot be indicated without reference to some object. In English, the typical expression for the path a movement takes is a preposition. And an English preposition – when functioning as a preposition – always takes a noun phrase as an argument. In that respect Korean verbs like *tŭlda, naerida, kŏnnŏda* are like the English prepositions *into, down, across*. They require a noun phrase, which in Korean, however, can be suppressed when the linguistic or situational context supplies the referent. But, semantically, Korean path verbs do require the specification of an object with respect to which the path is indicated. Notions contained in *tŭlda, chinada, orŭda* can only be understood with regard to an object. Those objects – let us call them

the 'ground' of a motion or 'reference objects'– supply the base for the path
to be indicated. Without objects there is no 'in' or 'out' or 'around'.

I have taken the notions of 'path' and 'ground' from Leonard Talmy's ty-
pological discussion of motion verbs. As by now probably is quite well
known, Talmy has suggested a typology of lexicalization in motion verbs. In
this typology he employs a model description of motion events, distin-
guishing

— the figure which moves (the subject of an intransitive motion verb, or
   the object of a transitive motion verb)
— the fact of motion vs. localization
— the ground with regard to which a motion is described
— the path which the motion takes with respect to that ground
— the manner in which the motion is performed
— the cause of the motion (or the absence of a cause).

In the Korean sentence

(4) kŭ–nŭn ch'aeg–ŭl sangja–e nŏnnŭnda.
    'He puts (the) book(s) into (the) box'

ch'aek represents the figure, *sangja* the ground, *nŏt'a* the fact of movement
as well as the path, *kŭ* represents the cause, a manner is not indicated. *nŏt'a*
encapsulates the fact of movement as well as the path of the movement in
a morphologically unanalyzable lexical unit. It is a monomorphematic path
verb.

All the notions used in the model are semantic notions. Figure refers to
an object partaking in an event in which it changes its location completely,
it dose not mean 'subject of a sentence' or something like this. 'Manner' re-
fers to something inherent to the performance of the motion (rather than
aspects of the figure, the ground, the cause), 'manner' does not mean
'adverb or adverbial phrase of manner'. Similarly for the other notions.

In this typology, Talmy distinguishes three types:
— figure languages,
— manner languages,
— path languages,

Figure languages incorporate the figure moving in a motion verb. Talmy's
primary example is Atsugewi, an American Indian language. Manner lan-

guages incorporate the manner of movement in the motion verb. Talmy's primary examples are German and English. English *walk, run, rush, stomp, hop* and so on are all verbs indicating the manner of a motion. Path languages typically incorporate the path of a motion in the motion verb. Talmy's primary examples are Spanish, French and Italian (cf. also Schwarze (1985), Wienold/Schwarze (1989)). It is not required that a language has only verbs of a certain type. The preponderant, most commonly used verbs have to be of that type.[5]

Korean and Japanese are also path languages. They both do have manner motion verbs (like Korean *kŏtta, ttwida, tallida, (ch'um) ch'uda, nalda* and so on. But the number of manner verbs is limited when compared to the rich array of such verbs in English or German and when compared with the wealth of distinction in Korean (and Japanese) path verbs. Lists of Korean (and Japanese) manner verbs can be found in Wienold in print a. In several papers, I have dealt with Korean as a path language and with various aspects of this typological classification as well as given specific analyses of certain path verbs (Wienold (1987, 1989), in print a, in print b, Wienold/Schwarze (1989); Wienold/Dehnhardt/Kim/Yoshida (1991)). Thus, in the present paper, I want to concentrate on the concept of path in Korean path verbs.

With regard to three recent books by Korean linguists on Korean motion verbs

— Chŏn Su–T'ae, *Kugŏ idongdongsa–ŭi ŭimiyŏn'gu* (Chŏn (1987))
— Hong Chai–Song, *Syntaxe des verbes de mouvement en coréen contemporain* (Hong (1985))
— Kim Ŭngmo, *Kugŏ p'yŏnghaeng idong chadongsa nammalpat* (Kim (1989))

my approach, I take it, is closest to Chŏn Su–T'ae's treatment. As opposed to Hong who following Maurice Gross employs a syntactic definition of motion verb, Chŏn Su–T'ae just as myself sets out from a semantic definition of motion: the figure – in Talmy's terminology – has to change its location completely. Apart from the general difference that I in the present research only deal with monomorphematic motion verbs which follows from my

---

[5] Contrary to Talmy I find that there are manner languages without (or practically without) path verbs, like German, But I have not yet found path laguages without manner verbs. Cf. Wienold in print a.

typlogical interest, there are some other points of diversion which I might
mention. I do not consider a motion event what Chŏn Su–T'ae calls abstract
motion – *mulka–ga ollaganda* 'prices rise' (Chŏn (1987: 85f.)) and the like –
nor do I feel that change of possession should be included in motion events.
Both represent systematic cases of polysemy in motion verbs and, of
course, have to be recognized as such (cf. Wienold/Dehnhardt/Kim/
Yoshida (1991), Wienold in print a). But when I talk about 'path' as incor-
porated in a motion verb, that will refer only to cases of figures changing
their location.[6]

Another point, where I take a somewhat different approach, is that I, fol-
lowing Talmy, employ rather broad categories in the distinction between
path and manner. Chŏn Su–T'ae distinguishes between

panghyang	— direction
kyŏngno	— route
kwajŏng	— course[7]
and sangdaewich'i	— relative position

all of which I consider one catgory: path of movement with regard to some
object of reference. Again when it comes to what I, following Talmy, call
manner Chŏn Su–T'ae distinguishes between

sokto	— velocity
maengyŏlsŏng	— ferocity
t'aedo	— manner
yangt'ae	— mode[8]
subanhwan'gyŏng	— accompanying circumstances
sudan	— means
konggan	— space (that is, the kind of material space, which

---

[6] If one works with the basic assumptions of referential semantics that is if one
studies the conditions under which a proposition is true and analyses what individ-
ual morphemes or lexemes contribute to such a meaning, then, I take it, one is
obliged to recognize all cases under which the basic definition of movement as lo-
comotion is not satisfied as cases of polysemy which require separate analyses. Cf.
e.g. Chŏn (1989: 141ff.)

[7] I am not sure that I understand Chŏn's distinction between *kyŏngno* (route)
and *kwajŏng* (course).

[8] I have not been able to understand the distinction between mode and manner,
cf. Chŏn (1989).

	is used in a motion like air when flying···)
idongt'ae	— moving body (that is, in my terminology, figure: Chŏn implies here that certain movement verbs are restricted to a certain class of moving figures, e.g.*nalda* 'fly' goes with *pihaengi* 'airplane', *tchirŭda* 'to sting' goes with *panŭl* 'needle')[9]

All these are instances of one broad manner category (which, by the way is also employed along the same lines in a semantic study of German movement verbs by Gerling/Orthen (1979)).

3. Kor. *orŭda* as a Path Verb and its Path Concept

The concept of path in the semantic analysis of motion verbs can, I submit, best be understood as a set of conditions which a description of a motion event containing a specific motion verb has to fulfil to be true. 'Path' in this sense does not refer to the concrete path a given motion event takes (with regard to a ground). Every path verb in descriptions of motion events can be instantiated by a very large class of actual paths taken. Consider descriptions of motion events containing the verb *orŭda*.

(5) ai ses–i kyedan–ŭl ollaganda.
    'Three children are moving up the staircase'[10]

does not imply any more than the three children referred to are moving to some extent upwards on the staircase referred to. We do not know where the movement starts and where the movement ends. Particularly, they do

---

[9] But of coures, the use of *nalda* is not restricted to only *pihaenggi*, the use of *tchirŭda* not to *panŭl*. Korean *nalda* and *tchirŭda* are not figure verbs in Talmy's sense. Otherwise, we would probably have to call all manner verbs figure verbs, as *kŏtta*, e.g., normally implies humans as figure and so on.

[10] The English sentences here as well as later on should be read as glosses rather than translations. A translation of the Korean sentence under specific conditions might well have verbs like 'go' or 'walk' or even 'run' (or as we will see later 'fly'). The gloss with 'move' is given to stay as close as possible to the implications of the Korean sentence. Here, as well as later on, I will do this only with regard to semantic aspects touched upon in this paper otherwise the glosses would become too cumbersome.

not have to move up to the top of the staircase for the proposition to be true. The statement that with respect to the sentence *ai ses–i kyedan–ül ollaganda* we do not know where the movement starts needs some comment. Suppose, the sentence read

(5′) ai ses–i kyedan–e ollaganda.

Here, we also do not know where the movement starts, but we do know for sure that the movement described in the sentence starts from an area outside the staircase. The sentence with *kyedan–ül* might also refer to a motion event starting outside the staircase, but we do not know this for sure. It may as well not. So, this is a point of case selection. But, to repeat for emphasis, also in the case of (5′) *kyedan–e* we do not know any more than that the movement starts outside the area called *kyedan*. It may also help to add a comment to the statement that we do not know where the movement ends. There is a way in Korean to be somewhat more precise about that point, that is by adding to *kyedan* a specification of an area. Suppose we use *kyedan(–üi) wi* with *(üi) wi* as such a specification of an area. In this case, the sentences

(5″) ai ses–i kyedan wi–rül ollaganda.

and

(5‴) ai ses–i kyedan wi–e ollaganda.

both express movements up a staircase ending somewhere on the staircase, but preferably in an upper region of the staircase. They may also refer to movements up the staircase ending in an area above the staircase. If one wants to be more specific on the last point, then, maybe instead of *kyedan wi–e* one may say *kyedan wi–rö*. The sentence

(5⁗) ai ses–i kyedan wi–rö ollaganda.

is more likely to be construed to refer to a movement ending in an area above the staircase and not being a part of the staircase. But, in principle, both the sentences with *kyedan* as an expression of the ground of the movement as well as those with *kyedan wi* as an expression of the ground of the movement receive the same interpretation with regard to *orüda* (or *ollagada*). *orüda* expresses a movement upwards in the region referred to by the ground–NP. *kyedan* refers to the whole region called *kyedan*. *kyedan wi* re-

fers to a region on the staircase (preferably, but not necessarily, in a higher area of it) or to a region above the staircase. *orŭda,* by itself, does not say anything about this. This whole discussion, so far then, substantiates the initial claim that *orŭda* expresses nothing more than a movement upwards with regard to a certain region.

I have to add one further comment. When I started I said the sentence

(5) ai ses–i kyedan ŭl ollaganda.

"does not imply any more than that the three children referred to are moving to some extent upwards on the staircase referred to". Now, reading this English explanation one may think that the sentence implies: that the children perform the entire movement upwards always in contact with the staircase. And, of course, it does. But it does so only in a pragmatic understanding, not by the meanings specified in the lexical items in the sentence and its syntactic structure. It does so only because we assume that children moving up a staircase will move up the staircase while always in contact with it. The Korean sentence, however, could well be understoood to refer to children flying up the staircase, provided we knew (or surmised) that those children had the capacity of flying, as indicated by the sentences

(6) hellik'opt'ŏ–ga han dae san–ŭl ollaganda.
'One helicopter is moving up the mountain.'

or

(6) nae ch'ingu–ga hellik'opt'ŏ–ro san–ŭl ollaganda.
'My friend is moving up the mountain by helicopter.'

Here, by the way we have an interesting distinction between Korean and Japanese. Japanese has two path verbs for expressing motions upwards. One, *noboru,* implies that the figure is moving always in contact with the ground, whereas the other one, *agaru,* does not carry such an implication. Thus, *noboru* may not be used in the case of a helicopter moving up a mountain unless it was moving up on wheels or similar equipment.

So far, I have given examples only with *kyedan* or *san* as ground or as reference objects. *kyedan* and *san* refer to objects that have an extension in a vertical direction of a certain length. They are high enough for a human being or a vehicle used by humans to move up on or along this extension in

a vertical direction. Suppose, we use *ch'aeksang* 'table' to indicate the
ground or reference object.

(7) ai ses-i ch'aeksang-ül ollaganda.

says that the children are moving up on the table. The movement cannot
end in some area within the vertical extension not being the top. The move-
ment has to end on the top. Thus, we may entertain the idea that *orüda* re-
ceives two different interpretations, one stipulating that the movement ends
somewhere along the vertical extension of the object including the top, but
not necessarily so, and the second one stipulating that the movement will
end on the top and that the two readings will be context-dependent. If the
ground indicates an object with a vertical extension usable for movements
of human beings or vehicles or the like, then in this understanding interpre-
tation rule (1) will apply, if the ground indicates an object with a vertical
extension not usable for movements of human beings or vehicles—e.g. noun
phrases with *ch'aeksang* 'table', *sangja* 'box', *'üija'* 'chair', as head noun—
then interpretation rule (2) will apply. But, let us stop for a moment before
actually commiting ourselves to assuming two interpetation rules for *orüda*.
Suppose our sentence read

(7') pölle se mari-ga ch'aeksang-ül ollaganda.
       'Three worms are moving up the table.'

In this case the sentence may very well refer to a movement on the verti-
cal extension of a table not ending on its top but even well below that.
Thus, the two different interpretations, again, are interpretations under as-
sumptions in consonance with a certain knowledge about our world.[11] If, in
some world, humans were small enough and tables big enough such that hu-
mans might move upwards on their vertical extension not reaching the top,
then a sentence like

(7) ai ses-i ch'aeksang-ül ollaganda.

---

[11] Chón (1987: 141) actually distinguishes *orüda*[1] and *orüda*[2] in the fashion
dicussed right now. Apart from that our analyses are alike as far as sentences
with *orüda* referring to events of locomotion are concerned. There are also a few
other analyses of motion verbs in Chón (1987) which distinguish readings which I
feel are not differences in readings due to the motion verb but differences in read-
ing due to other factors.

may very well be understood with regard to the end of the motion quite similarly with

(7′) pŏlle se mari–ga ch'aeksang–ŭl ollaganda.

If in a description of a motion event employing *orŭda* a ground is not used for the path during the movement, then a surface of the ground will provide the end point of the movement. Our semantic analysis for *orŭda*, then, ends up with: *orŭda* expresses a movement upwards on or along a region in its vertical extension, starting on or below it outside of it and ending higher upwards than where it started. Whatever else we understand from actual sentences containing *orŭda* is a result of case particles, relational nouns (like *wi*) and our knowledge of or assumptions about the world.

The path indicated by *orŭda* in a given sentence, then, fulfils the conditions stated right now, nothing more. We, therefore, have to be quite careful in using the word and concept 'path', handy as it comes. In specific readings of specific sentences we may have a much richer interpretation such that we know much more about the actual path taken. The path encapsulated in the lexical item *orŭda*, however, is just that quite brief set of conditions. (To repeat in order to avoid misunderstandings: This whole discussion refers only to *orŭda* in its sense of locomotion. Other uses like *kaps–i ollaganda* 'prices go up' have to be treated with a different model of analysis.)

4. More Korean Path Verbs Indicating a Movement Upwards

Our discussion of the meanning of *orŭda* in the previous section has been rather lengthy, paying attention to several specific points which have to be observed in the analysis of any path verb. One has to sort out what in the meaning of a sentence results from the path verb itself, while considering contributions of cases and of relational nouns and specifications of meaning resulting from whatever knowledge we have or assumptions we entertain about the specific figures and grounds. From now on, I will be much briefer in the discussion of individual verbs to achieve some more generality.

Besides *orŭda*, Korean has two other monomorphematic motion verbs with the figure as subject indicating a path upwards, sotta (morphologicallly: *sos–ta*) and *ttŭda*. *Sotta* expresses movement upwards not along a

vertical extension of an object in contact with it or ending on it or on top of the object. That means that the ground for *sotta* is quite restricted(most often the air or what we call the sky). In most cases it will not be express-ed but rather understood. That is, when a speaker of Korean utters

(8) hae—ga sonnŭnda
'The sun rises'

or

(8a) saemmur—i sonnŭnda
'The source rises'

or

(8b) yŏn'gi—ga kulttug—esŏ sonnŭnda
'Smoke rises from the chimney'

it is quite clear in what region the movement upwards is taking place. Prob-ably by implication, *sotta* indicates a movement upwards in a rather verti-cal direction. *Orŭda* in *sanŭl orŭda* or *ŏndŏg—ŭl orŭda* may indicate move-ments upwards quite some angle deviating from a strict vertical direction. *ttŭda* is still more restricted. In many uses *ttŭda* does not necessarily ex-press a motion at all, it means something like English *float*, a state in whch some objects may more or less rest in water or in the air, no distinctive lo-comotion (change of location) being perceivable. If the object is in the air, however, an understanding of *ttŭda* expressing a movement upwards in the air is possible as in :

(9) yŏn—i *ttŭnda.*
'The kite rises'

or

(9a) mohyŏng pihaengi—ga *ttŭnda.*
'The model plane rises'

ttŭda, then, actually is border—line case of a motion verb. As far as intransi-tive verbs are concerned, basically, in Korean we have to recognize a lexicalization of a concept 'motion upwards' of rather wide use: *orŭda.* It can refer to motions in contact with or along a vertical extension of specific objects of various sizes and shapes and can express movements ending in regions made up of surfaces of such objects, again in quite various ways, or

regions not contained in a surface of the object but somehow specified with regard to the object (particularly, its surfaces). *sotta* and *ttŭda* on the other hand are restricted in that objects quite specifically varying as to size and shape in the vertical extension cannot be the ground. *sotta* always implies a motion upwards, *ttŭda* not necessarily so. But if *ttŭda* implies a recognizable motion, then it will be a motion upwards. That is the reason for including it in the present discussion at all.

Although *sotta* and *ttŭda* in uses as movement verbs mostly occur without ground–NPs I think it is safe to consider them path verbs. In the sentences (8)–(8b) and (9)–(9a) it is not just any kind of ground with respect to which the movement upwards takes place, rather it is quite specific grounds which the native speaker will be able to supply. Moreover, although in many cases it is difficult to think of an appropriate ground–NP, there are some examples at least for *sotta*:

(8c) taegigwŏn–ŭl sokko innŭn chŏ rok'et'ŭ–nŭn yurŏb–ŭi ariane ida.
    'That rocket there, which goes up through the atmosphere, is the European Ariane'

(8d) punsudae–rŭl sokko innŭn chŏ mur–ŭn kkaekkŭthada
    'The water rising in the fountain is clean'

Among Korean transitive path verbs indicating a movement upwards there are two – *ŏnta* (morphologically: *ŏnch–ta*) and *tŭlda* – which are underived monomorphematic verbs and two – *ollida* and *ttŭiuda* – derived from intransitive verbs (*orŭda* and *ttŭda*). I will start with *ŏnta* and *tŭlda*. As the movement upwards expressed in *ollida* and *ttŭiuda* is contained in the monomorphematic base, I will also add some remarks on these two.[12] As with all transitive movement verbs the figure is the object of the verb(Chŏn Su–T'ae (1987) therefore calls such verbs 'object movement verbs' (*kaekch' e idongdongsa*)), *ŏnta* indicates that some agent moves the figure of the motion event to a higher position not only with regard to the previous position of the object but also to a higher position with regard to the body of the

[12] 'Derived', here means 'historically derived', not 'derived by a process operative at present'. *ollida* is derived from *orŭda*, by the well–known *i/ki/li/hi*–Suffix forming causatives (and passives). *ttŭiuda*, I presume, is derived by first applying the same suffix (in its *i*–allomorph) which contracted with the vowel *ŭ* of the base to *ŭi* and then applying the suffix *u* (also forming causatives).

agent. The agent, in most cases, will be a human being. So the figure in many cases will end up in a position somewhat higher than the belly area of the human agent. A further condition is that the figure will come to rest on the surface of a different object. *tŭlda* on the other hand indicates only a movement of a figure by an agent upwards from its previous position. It has no implication with regard to the vertical extension of the agent's body nor does it imply that it is positioned on a different object. Thus

(10) ai-ga mugŏun tor-ŭl sŏnban-e ŏnnŭnda
     'A child lifts a heavy stone up onto a board'

will imply that the figure (*tol*) comes to rest somewhere without the child holding it. Whereas

(11) ai-ga mugŏun tor-ŭl tŭnda
     'A child lifts a heavy stone'

will have the child holding the stone after lifting it until we get further information. *ollida* is non-distinctive with regard to the condition discussed last. *ollida* can express movements of figures by an agent with the figure ending up positioned on a different object and it may express movements which do not necessarily end up this way. Thus we may have both

(10′) ai-ga mugŏun tor-ŭl sŏnban-e ollinda
and
(11′) ai-ga mugŏun tor-ŭl ollinda.

Ttŭiuda, finally, indicates movement upwards in the air or the sky originating in the activity of an agent but without contact with the body of the agent (which is implied in *ttŭda*). Thus, we have

(12) ai-ga yŏn-ŭl nop'i ttŭiunda
     'The child makes the kite rise high'
and
(12a) ai-ga yŏn-ŭl kŏmmul wi-ro ttŭiunda.
      'The child makes the kite rise above the building'

Having got so far the reader may notice that my discussion of intransitive path verbs for the movement upwards left out *ŏnch'ida* and *tŭllida* as in

(13) saeroun kiwa-ga chibung-e ŏnch'inda
       'New tiles are placed on the roof'
and

(14) tor-i chŏmjŏm tŭllinda
       'A stone is rising gradually'

This leads to the interesting question why some verbs in our group 'move-ment verbs expressing a path upwards' have their basic lexicalization as in-transitive verbs – *orŭda, sotta, ttŭda* – and why some have their basic lexicalization as transitive verbs (requiring an agent of causer) – *ŏnta* and *tŭlda*. I have only preliminary suggestions with regard to this question. An important condition for *orŭda* is that it allows for contact with the ground during the motion. It also allows for contact with the ground after the end of the motion. The first condition, I presume, is the decisive one. Many mo-tion events not originating in an outside source will for the figure to be able to move at all require the presence of an object on which to move. That, for instance, will be true for human beings. Movements originating in an out-side source, however, often will not require this condition at all, but they may require that the object comes to rest on a ground after the movement. Thusly, the concept configuration contained in *orŭda* comes out basically as intransitive, the concept configuration contained in *ŏnta* comes out basically as transitive.[13] If a motion upwards does not at all require contact with a ground during the motion nor afterwards, it has to have a figure capable of doing so without falling down. Thus we have figures like birds, rockets or astronomical bodies as subject figures for *sotta* and kite and model plane as figures for *ttŭda*. Other objects moving upwards without contact with and support by a ground require an agent. Thus we get a basic transitive lexicalization in *tŭlda*. Looking, then, at the primary distinction–lexica-lization in a non-derived monomorphematic verb–we find a distinction be-tween allowing for contact while and after moving as against not allowing for it (*orŭda* vs. *sotta/ttŭda*) in intransitive verbs and a distinction between

---

[13] Japanese does not have a word 'to move an object into a higher region with respect to the agent's body and place it onto a different object there', but has a verb *kazasu* 'move an object and hold it there (for further use)'. Thus it is not necessary that the action referred to by a transitive verb ends up in placing the object. The use of *kazasu* is rather restricted.

requiring contact and support by a ground after the movement against not requiring it in transitive verbs (*ŏnta* vs. *tŭlda*).

More interesting things with regard to what we consider basic concepts in the verbs mentioned may come up when we look at compound verbs containing our path verbs, e.g. *ttwiŏorŭda* 'to jump up'. But I have not been able yet to go into a detailed analysis of such verbs. The first component of the compound verbs limits the range of interpretation.[14] *ttwiŏorŭda* indicates a movement upwards as far as can be allowed by *ttwida*. *pup'urŏorŭda* 'to swell up' does not express a movement at all, but only a change in the extension of an object upwards as *pup'ulda* 'to swell' does not express a movement but a change of extension. The first component of the compound verb, thus, in this case assigns a reading 'change of extension in an upward direction' which is not possible for the simplex *orŭda* by itself.

A further interesting discussion might take us into comparing path verbs for the movement upwards (as we find them in Korean) with prepositions (or local particles) which – in languages like English or German – can express a movement as e.g. in

(15) He jumped on the table.
(15a) He put the glass on the table.
(15b) He ran up the hill.
(15c) The birds flew up.
(15d) He lifted up the suitcase.

It seems the distinction goes into the direction of *up* allowing for contact with the ground during the movement but not requiring it and *on* requiring contact with the ground after the movement. But there is neither an association with the intransitive/transitive distinction so interesting in Korean, nor with a notion of a motion upwards without contact. In English again, this seems to be expressible only in verbs like *rise/raise/lift*. Again, this is an area requiring much more detailed analyses and cross–linguistic compar-

---

[14] Even stronger than the first component of a compound verb is the figure. *kap* 'price' in *kaps–i ttwiŏorŭnda* 'prices go up rapidly, prices jump up' excludes a reading of a motion event. *kae* ('dog')–*ga ttwiŏ–orŭnda* may refer to a motion event of a dog/dogs jumping up. Should in a specific context, however, *kae* receive the interpretation of *kae kap* 'price of dogs', this choice of the interpretation of the figure will rule out the reading of a motion event.

ison. I leave the point with just a suggestion of the direction of inquiry.

5. Upwards and Downwards

A further generalization on the lexicalization of path concepts in motion verbs may be sought by moving on to other concepts. Thus I will look, however briefly, at Korean movement verbs expressing the concept downwards. There are in contemporary standard Korean, as far as I can see, three monomorphematic underived verbs in this group: *naerida, chida* and *sukta*. *Naerida* in present-day standard Korean can be used both for movements downwards with the figure as subject and the figure as object. One dictionary (Lee (1982 : 613) mentions a dialect form *narida* and suggests that *naerida* derived from   *narida*. *Naerida*, then, originally would have been the transitive path verb downwards.[15] Besides *sukta*, which is intransitive, we have the transitive – and derived – form *sugida*. A further possible candidate for the group 'path verbs downwards' is *ttölda* , this one a transitive monomorphematic underived verb. The reason why I hesitate to include it is that there are few cases with clearly the figure being the object as in *p'aip'ŭ-ŭi chae-rŭl ttölda* 'to shake the ash out of a pipe' whereas in expressions like *tamnyo-rŭl ttölda* 'to shake the dust out of a wollen blanket' an expression which possibly might be a ground (although I am not sure about this point either) is the object and what might be considered a figure of a motion event is not expressed at all. *p'aip'ŭ-ŭi chae-rŭl ttölda* , moreover, may refer to downward movement in shaking the ashes out of the pipe but it could just as well be used for shaking the pipe horizontally.[16] Thus, *ttölda* cannot be taken to contain an element 'down'. Chön Su-T'ae (1987), who discusses *ttö-röjida* derived from *ttölda* does not include *ttölda* (as well as he does not include

---

[15] I am told, in a contemporary popular song one can hear *nun-i narine* 'the snow is falling'. – Cf. the much clearer case of *chinaeda* (historically the transitive counterpart of *chinada* and derived from it with *i* which contracted with the preceding *a* to *ae*). *Chinaeda* as a path verb nowadays can be used only for the intransitive case with the figure as subject. For the case of figure=object one has to use *chinagage hada* or *t'ong hage hada* (formed from *t'onghada* with a Sino-Korean base plus *hada*).

[16] Instead of *ttölda*, in the examples given often *tölda* is used.

[17] Chön (1987), in principle, undertakes an exhaustive analysis of Korean motion verbs. But in his discussion he frequently adds "and so on" to a list of verbs. Thus I take it that when a verb is not listed in his book that will not by itself suggest that Chön Su-T'ae does not consider such a verb a motion verb.

ttŏrŏjĭda)[17] *ttŏrŏjĭda* and *ttŏrŏttŭrida* should both, I think, be considered
motion verbs. We will return to *ttŏrŏjĭda* at a later point.

naerida is a good counterpart to *orŭda/ollida*. *naerida* also allows for con-
tact between the figure moving and the ground, but does not require it.
Thus, we have cases like

(16) chadongch'a–ga ŏndŏg–ŭl naeryŏganda
       'The car descends down the hill'

(16') pae–ga kang–ŭl (*or* kang–ŭl ttara) naeryŏganda
       'A boat goes down the river'

with the figure in contact the ground and we have cases like

(16'') ai–ga hana ch'a–esŏ naerinda
       'A child gets down from a car'

without contact with the reference object while moving down. Again, it is
interesting to note that Japanese lexicalizes the distinction: *oriru* allows
for, but does not require contact with the ground while moving downwards,
whereas *kudaru* does require contact, quite similar with the distinction be-
tween *agaru* and *noboru*.

Looking at the cases for the NP functioning as the ground we notice that
–(*r*)*ŭl* only expresses that the ground (the reference object) provides the
region for the movement downwards, but there is no implication as to
whether the movement ends within the confines of the ground or not. –*esŏ*,
on the other hand, indicates that the figure leaves the ground. The move-
ment indicated by *naerida* ends outside of the ground. While with *orŭda* and
–(*r*)*ŭl* we have nondistinctiveness of whether the movement **starts** inside
or outside of the region referred to by the ground–NP, in the case of
naerida and –(*r*)*ŭl* it is the question of the **end point** of the motion being in-
side or outside of the region of the ground–NP.

While with *orŭda* and –*e* or *(ŭ)ro*, respectively, we know that the move-
ment starts outside the region referred to by the ground–NP, with *naerida*
and –*esŏ* we know that the movement ends outside the region referred to by
the ground–NP. Both with *orŭda* and with *naerida* the ground–NP indicates
a region critical for the path. The movement has to go upwards or down-
wards with regard to that region. With a case different from –(*r*)*ŭl*, howev-
er, the ground–NP in *orŭda* has an implication of a different origin, the

ground–NP itself leans towards indicating the goal of the movement. With *naerida*, on the other hand, a case selection other than – *ül* for the ground–NP has an implication of a goal/end–point which is different from the ground region. Thus, *naerida* in the NP referring to the ground leans towards indicating the source of the movement. *orüda* goes with *tülda* 'move into s.th.', both lean towards the end–point of the motion. *Naerida* goes with *nada* 'move out of s.th.': Both, in the specification of the ground–NP, lean towards the source/the point of origin of the motion. Looking at ground–NPs containing a relational noun again a similarity with *orüda* emerges. A relational noun can extend the region referred to by the ground phrase. In the sentence

(17) ai–ga kyedan(–ül) wi–esŏ naeryŏonda

the expression *kyedan(–üi)wi* may refer to the top or the upper region of a staircase but also may refer to an area outside, if that is above the staircase. Again, in the case of

(18) ai–ga kyedan arae–e/arae–ro naerinda[18]

the end point of the movement will be outside the staircase. These are just facts explained by general interpretation rules for ground–NPs with relational nouns, as relational nouns assign regions to an object which are not (or not necessarily) part of the object (Wienold/Dehnhardt/Kim/Yoshida (1991: 28ff.)).[19]

Thus, *naerida* can be considred to require the following condition to hold

---

[18] Actually, *kyedan arae–e/–ro* is a somewhat exceptional case for a ground phrase for *naerida*. Without the relational noun an expression like *kyedan–e naerida* suppresses the ground phrase. We have to know — from some linguistic or situational context — with regard to what object the movement is a movement downwards. There must be something higher up than the staircase with some kind of vertical extension which allows to specify the path of the motion as a motion downwards, a motion to be expressed by *naerida*. This cannot be understood from *kyedan* in *kyedan–e naerida*. In *kyedan arae–e/ro naerida* however we may understand that the movement is a movement taking a path downwards with respect to the staircase. This needs further thought which has to include more path verbs and ground expressions than we have covered (and are able to cover) in the present paper.

[19] Generally, in Korean case particles assigned to an NP expressing the ground may be *–e, esŏ, –ro, –kkaji, but'ŏ(–robut'ŏ, –esŏbut'ŏ)* and *–(r)ül*. With transitive verbs, however, *–(r)ül* cannot be used for the ground–NP.

for a description of a motion event containing *naerida* to be true: *naerida* indicates a movement downwards on or along a region in its vertical extension starting in that region and ending in an area further downwards in or below the region functioning as ground. Whatever else we understand from actual sentences containing *naerida* is a result of case particles, relational nouns and our knowledge of or assumptions about the world.

chida is a verb similar to *sotta* in that it does not allow for contact with a ground while moving downwards. The class of figures is very restricted. E. g., comparing the figures usable with *sotta rok'et'ŭ* 'rocket', *yŏn* 'kite' *'yŏn'gi* 'smoke', *saemmŭl* 'source', *p'ungsŏn* 'balloon', *k'eib'ŭlk'a* 'cable car' are not allowed with *chida*. *Hae* 'sun', however, is possible.

(19) Hae–ga chinda.
       'The sun sets.'

A doubtful case is

(19a) Namunip'–i chinda.
        'Leaves fall.'

as it refers to a property of leaves rather than to a specific motion event. In the latter case, one should rather use the non–monomorphematic verb *ttŏrŏjida*:

(19b) Namunip'–i ttŏrŏjinda.
        'Leaves fall.'

At any rate, the figure of *chida* is not located on a surface before starting to move as is the case for *naerida*. However, the figure of *chida* may, as (19a) shows, be fixed in a location before the movement sets in.

sukta is very restricted, it expresses a movement downwards but does not imply beginning or end points by itself. The realm of figures for *sukta* seems to be restricted to parts of the human body like *kogae/mŏri* 'head' or *mom* 'body':

(19) kŭ mar–ŭl tutko na–nŭn chŏjŏllo kogae–ga sugŏtta.
       'When I heard these words, automatically my head went downwards.'

In some respects *sukta* seems to be quite like Japanese *sagaru. sagaru* does not require or at least allow for the figure being located on some surface before starting to move downwards. (This is the case for Jap. *oriru*,

kudaru and Korean *naerida*). *sagaru* just requires that the figure moving downwards is somehow held in a position in a region higher up with regard to the reference object than later when it has started to move. Thus a gondola outside a building moving up and down may perform a motion called *sagaru*. The same is true of a curtain in a theater or of a balloon. But while in Japanese we may say

 (20) fuusen–ga sukoshi shita–ni sagaru.
  'The balloon is moving somewhat downwards.'

this can't be expressed by *sukta* in Korean.

 (20') *p'ungsŏn–i yakkan mit'–ŭrŏ sungnŭnda.

does not seem to be allowed. One has to say:

 (20'') p'ungsŏn–i yakkan mit'–ŭro naeryŏonda.

Still, with the additional restriction in mind, one may say *sukta* is similar to *sagaru* in that the figure is just held in place in an area higher up in the region functioning as ground before starting to move, it is not located on some surface. (There is also *sugŭrŏjida* identical in meaning with *sukta*. As transitive counterparts to *sukta* both *sugida* and *sugŭrida* occur.) Thus the Korean intransitive verbs for the path downwards seem to be rather alike the intransitive verbs for the path upwards in the conditions they imply. Looking for counterparts among transitive verbs, *naerida* seems to be a good equivalent of *ollida*. But there is nothing like *ŏnta* or *tŭlda*, probably because actions as placing something on a lower level with regard to the body of an agent or "lifting", if one may say so, something towards a lower position and hold it there are not interesting concepts for human activities in our normal world. (Japanese has *sageru* for carrying something letting it hang downwards. This is however only one of the uses of *sageru*. Korean uses *tŭlda* here.) However, there is a whole group of words for a movement downwards through space without being held or being supported, words corresponding to English *fall* in one way or the other: *ttŏrŏjida , munŏjida, hŏmurŏjida, ssŭrŏjida, nŏmŏjida, ppajida.*[20] None of them, however, is

---

[20] This is not a complete list of Korean verbs corresponding to English *fall*. E. g. there is also *chappajida* which can be used like *nŏmŏjida*, there is the Sino–Korean verb *chŏnsahada* 'to fall (die) in action' and so on.

monomorphematic and non-derived. While in English we have one basic
lexicalization *fall* which can be further differentiated into *fall out of, fall
down, fall apart, fall into pieces, fall over, fall into*, Korean has distinctive
lexicalizations for all these, but none of them is basic nonderived mono-
morphematic (cf. also Wienold (1989: 437)). This needs further thought.
One idea which I have been pondering for some time is that English *fall*
should not be considered a path verb, but a manner verb expressing a man-
ner of motion which can only be performed while moving downwards as op-
posed to *sink*, which again I would suggest is a manner verb expressing a
motion only performed while moving down. Whereas for Korean verbs like
sotta a ground–NP, although rare, is not entirely impossible, English *fall*
and *sink* require a preposition as a connector for a ground–NP (e.g. *sink in
the ocean, fall through space*) or a particle (e.g. *sink down in the ocean, fall
apart* and so on). (Interestingly enough, the Korean equivalent *karaanta*
again is not monomorphematic and is non-derived.) Furthermore, this sug-
gestion says that Korean being rather limited in manner verbs does not
have a primary, monomorphematic lexicalization for this manner category.
One would then consider concepts like *fall* and *sink* manner concepts, and a
path language like Korean would have to make up for missing elements in
the manner category by various derivations. (Again, compare the list of
Korean manner movement verbs in Wienold in print b.) This, however,
dose not explain, why we have so many of them as opposed to the one En-
glish *fall*.[21] A partial answer to this question is that some of the Korean
verbs at least in some uses specify a path.[22] *ttŏrŏjida* always implies that
the figure separates from contact with the location where it is before the
movement, also not necessarily a movement downwards. Only in the latter

---

[21] In my understanding, the whole manner category in Talmy's typology needs
further thought. In Wienold in print a I suggest, that there are two different
"manner categories", one expressible by adverbs and one not expressible by
adverbs. 'fall' and 'sink' go with the second group. All this, as yet, is quite tenta-
tive and speculative.

[22] *hŏmŭrŏjida* and *munŏjida* express that a composite object like a wall, a dam, a
ceiling of a room and so on comes apart with (the) parts falling down. Some
movement verbs – path movement verbs as well as manner movement verbs –
have readings where only a part of the figure has to leave the original location.
The most common case is mass nouns as figures. Thus, *hŏmŭrŏjida* and *munŏjida*
have to be dealt with in a systematic treatment of such readings.

case it corresponds to a use of English *fall*. *ppajida* in some uses indicates falling into a space which has an interior (e.g., *kumŏng-e ppajida* 'to fall into a hole'). *nŏmŏjida* 'fall over' and *ssŭrŏjida* could be understood along the lines of Claudia M. Brugman's description of English *The lamp fell over*. Brugman says, the position of the lamp after it has fallen over is compared to its original position and thus it is to be regarded as background for itself (Brugman(1983: 72ff)).[23]

6. Further Extensions

I hope the present paper has shed some light on path notions as contained in Korean motion verbs and also shown that there is quite some systematicity involved across individual verbs, across verbs relating to the same or a similar concept as well as across languages. In a study of Korean and Japanese path verbs pertaining to movements into s.th., up to or close to s. th., out of s.th., and away from s.th. (Wienold/Dehnhardt/Kim/Yoshida (1991)) we found that Korean as well as Japanese have monomorphematic non-derived lexicalizations for movements into and up to as well as close to but not for a movement just nearer to a ground (without necessarily getting close to it, e.g. Korean *kakkawajida* (*kakkawŏjida*)). On the other hand, both languages have monomorphematic non-derived lexicalizations for movements out of and away from being in contact with as well as away from being close to an object. But they do not have such lexicalizations for a movement away from (but not necessarily away from a position close to the object of reference, i.e. Korean *mŏrŏjida*). Both *kakkawajida* and *mŏrŏjida* are derived, non-monomophematic. Again, then, we notice that there is a systematic patterning across individual lexical items, across groups of words and across languages.

Another interesting finding of similar interest in Wienold et al. (1991) is that both Japanese and Korean in lexicalizations of path verbs often distinguish between being in contact with the ground and not being in contact

---

[23] *nŏm (nŏmŏ)*–in *nŏmta, nŏmŏjida* shares important readings with Englisth *over*, in particular readings analyzed as central for *over* in Brugman (1983) (cf. also Wege (1991)). A comparative description of *nŏm (ŏ)* and *over* would shed interesting light on the question whether focal readings or set of readings for the lexicalization of path concepts can be identified crosslinguistically.

with the ground. In the group of verbs discussed in this paper this fact is il-
lustrated by the Japanese *noboru* vs. *agaru* and *kudaru* vs. *oriru*. The Japa-
nese linguist Takashi Sengoku in a recent paper pointed out that the dis-
tinction between being in contact with a ground or not being in contact
with it is quite basic for German prepositions (e.g. *auf* vs. *uber*, *an* vs. *bei*)
(Sengoku (1991)). German prepositions can indicate the path of a motion
just as Korean path verbs do. And there are other interesting parallels be-
tween German (and English) prepositions on the one hand and Korean
(and Japanese) path verbs on the other hand. Korean (and Japanese) rela-
tional nouns, however, ·do not make such a distinction. That is again, we
have systematic patterning across individual lexical items and across lan-
guages. Here, when we compare languages of different lexicalization types,
we notice similarities even across word classes.

We may hope that further study of more path verbs, more path concepts
and more langages of the same and of different types will deepen our un-
derstanding not only of motion verbs, path concepts as expressed in lan-
guages and lexicalization types, but hopefully of the whole nexus of con-
cepts, words and language types. To this purpose I would like to extend my
studies in several directions. 1) A greater range of lexical items should be
considered. Besides movement verbs, prepositions (or postpositions) and lo-
cational relational nouns this should include lexemes expressing extension
(including dimension) and change of extension as well as lexemes for loca-
lization and for positioning objects. 2) The descriptive language used in se-
mantic analysis should be standardized. 3) Compositionality of descriptions
of motion events, facts of extension and localization and of changes in such
facts should be studied from a typological point of view. 4) Also the study
of polysemies of a large range of vocabulary should be included in semantic
typology.[24]

References

Brugman, Claudia M. (1983) *Story of* over. L.A.U.T. (=Linguistic Agency, University of Trier), Ser. A., No. 102, July 1983.

Chŏn, Su-T'ae (1987) *Kugŏ idongdongsa-ŭi ŭimiyŏn'gu*, Seoul: Hanshin.

Dahl, Ŏsten (1979) 'Typology of Sentence Negation,' in: *Linguistics* 215/216: 79-106.

Gerling, Martin, und Norbert Orthen (1979) *Deutsche Zustands-und Bewegungsverben: Eine Untersuchung zu ihrer semantischen Struktur und Valenz*, Tübingen: Narr.

Hong Chai-Song (1985) *Syntaxe des verbes de mouvement en coréen contemporain*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Kim Ung-Mo (1989) *Kugŏ p'yonghaengidong chadongsa nammalpat*, Seoul: Hanshin.

Lee, Hŭi Sŭng (1982) *Kugŏ Taesajŏn*, Seoul: Minjungsŏrim.

Lehmann, Winfred P. (1973) 'A Structural Principle of Language and its Implication,': *Language* 49: 47-66.

Noss, Richard B. (1964) *Thai Reference Grammar*, Washington, D. C.: Department of State, Foreign Servive Institute.

Schwarze, Christoph (1985) 'Uscrire'e 'andare fuori': Struttura sintattica e semantica lessicale,' in: A. Franchi de Bellis und L.M. Savoia (Hrsg.), *Sintassi e morfologia della lingua italiana d'uso: Teorie e applicazioni descrittive*, Roma: Bulzoni, pp. 355-371.

Sengoku, Takashi (1990) 'Bashofuhenkashi (Lokalpartikel)-no kihonimi-kooza-toyohoo-no tenkai: bashorirontekishiten-kara ["The fundamental semantic structure of local particles and the development of their use: From a localist point of view"],' in: *The Proceedings of the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, College of Arts and Sciences, University of Tokyo*, 38, No. 1: 1-45.

Talmy, Leonard (1985) 'Lexicalization Patterns: Semantic Structure in Lexical Forms,' in: Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, vol. III: *Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*, Cambridge [etc.]: Cambridge University Press, pp. 57-149.

Wege, Barbara (1991) 'On the Lexical Meaning of Prepositions: A Study of *above, below* and *over*,' in: Gisa Rauh, (ed.) *Approaches to Prepositions*, Tübingen: Narr, pp. 275-296.

Wienold, Götz (1987) 'Strukturelle Zusammenhänge zwischen Lexikon, Syntax und Morphologie in typologischer Sicht: Englisch und Deutsch im Vergleich mit Japanisch und Koreaisch,' in: Rudolf Böhm und Henning Wode (ed.), *Anglistentag 1986 Kiel*, Gießen: Hoffmann, pp. 327–349.

Wienold, Götz (1989) 'Parallele sematische Strukturen im Japanischen und Koreanischen,' in: Irmela Hijiya–Kirschnereit und Jürgen Stalph (ed.), *Bruno Lewin zu Ehren: Festschrift aus Anlaß seines 65. Geburtstages* (Bochum: Brockmeyer), I, pp. 425–453.

Wienold, Götz (1991) 'Nominale gegenüber verbaler Modalität,' in: Eijiro Iwasaki (ed.), *Akten des VIII. Internationalen Germanistenkongresses Tokyo, 1990*, München: Iudicium, vol. 4, pp. 237–243.

Wienold, Götz, in print a. 'Lexical and Conceptual structures in Expressions for Movement and Space (with reference to Japanese, Korean, Thai and Indonesian, compared to English and German),' in: Peter Pause, Christoph Schwarze and Götz Wienold (eds.), *Lexical Meaning and Conceptual Structure*, Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Wienold, Götz, in print b. 'Semantic Functions of Korean Motion Verbs Expressing a Path in Typological Perspective,' in: Eung–Jin Baek (ed.), Papers from the Conference on Korean Linguistics, Osaka 2–5 August 1990.

Wienold, Götz, Annette Dehnhardt, Chin–Do Kim und Mitsunobu Yoshida (1991) *Lexikalische und syntaktische Bewegungsverben*, Fachgruppe Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Konstanz, Arbeitspapier No. 29, 1991.

Wienold, Götz und Chin–Do Kim (1992) *Lexikalische und syntaktische Struktur japanischer und koreanischer Bewegungsverben*, Fachgruppe Sprchwissenschaft Universität Konstanz, Arbeitspapier 47.

Wienold, Götz. und Christoph Schwarze (1989) *Lexical Structure and the Description of Motion Events in Japanese, Korean, Italian and French*, Fachgruppe Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Konstanz, Arbeitspapier Nr. 5.

ABSTRACT

Up and Down:
On Concepts of Path in Some Korean Motion Verbs

Götz Wienold

Monomorphematic lexicalizations seem to provide the most restricted kind of evidence for typological constraints in lexicalization patterns. The article starts off by illustrating this point with lexicalization patterns for concepts of modality.

The remaining part of the article examines lexicalization patterns in motion verbs. Following Talmy's well-known typology, Korean is classified as a path language, that is as a language which incorporates the path or a motion in a monomorphematic verb (as opposed to manner languages like English and German of figure languages). 'Path' is defined as a set of conditions which the motion or a moving figure takes with respect to some ground. The meaning of a particular path verb is a specific set of such conditions. For semantic analysis along these lines, Korean verbs which express motion along a path upwards or downwards are selected. The contribution of cases (*-ül, -e, -ro,-esò*) and of relational nouns (*wi, araé, mit* and so on) to the description of motion events are also considered. Semantic analysis shows a strong correspondence of the concepts lexicalized in Korean verbs for movement upwards and downwards. There is also a high degree of systematicity in the lexicalizations of intransitive and transitive verbs and in the field of Korean path verbs in general.

Incidentally, verbs which express events of 'falling' are given some attention.

German Department
Faculty of Foreign Languages
Dokkyo University
1-1 Gakuencho
Soka-shi, Saitama-ken 340
Japan