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0. Method

In linguistic typology\(^1\) two methodological tendencies can be observed. The first aims at representativeness in the selection of the languages studied. We will call it the strategy of representativeness. In order to obtain a non-biased sample, various kinds of relationships between languages are examined for “genetic affiliation”, “areal contact” and “recognized typological grouping”. In addition, the number of languages in the sample has to be quite large in order to prevent accidental biases (e.g. Bell 1978, Perkins 1980, 1992, Bybee 1985, Ramat 1987). In this approach, data is often collected by relying on secondary sources such as grammars, dictionaries, field reports and the like, which are supplemented by interviewing informants with questionnaires. Obviously, on this approach it is hardly possible for researchers to have active and detailed knowledge of all the languages contained in the sample. One may risk misjudging or not recognizing relevant details or features of various languages. Statements in the sources may be misleading or wrong, relevant facts may have been overlooked. It is this disadvantage which the second approach attempts to avoid. We will call it the strategy of depth and complexity. It emphasizes depth with regard to the languages analyzed. Data are collected by observing, for each language, a wide range of contexts and conditions under which the linguistic properties studied occur. Of course, the researchers will also make use of all available sources of information. But since the researchers either speak or learn the languages, they also have direct access to them. They are thus in the position to investigate linguistic phenomena within various systematic contexts and to aim at a fairly complete coverage of relevant facts. Morphological detail, diachronic strata, levels of usage and variation, and so on, may also be taken into consideration, if the researchers are specializing in the languages. The price to pay is a considerable restriction of the number of languages actually studied, even if several researchers with different specializations join hands. The selection of languages must be well motivated here, too.

\(^1\)The present paper is an extended and completely reformulated version of Wienold & Schwarze (1989).
– The authors wish to thank Bruce Mayo, who kindly read the paper and suggested many improvements in wording and style.
Typological studies of lexicalization based on secondary sources will at best provide more or less reliable lists of relevant lexical items. For example, in the context of MOTION events, an entry for the Japanese verb *agaru* in a Japanese-German dictionary may list as German equivalents: ‘hochgehen’, ‘hinaufsteigen’, ‘steigen’, ‘aus ... kommen’, ‘hereinkommen’, while for such contexts an entry for the Korean verb *orada* in a Korean-German dictionary may list ‘steigen’, ‘aufsteigen’, ‘besteigen’, ‘an Bord gehen’, ‘sich einschiffen’, ‘auftreten’, ‘einsteigen’. Once an analyst knows that in the context of MOTION events both of these verbs should be classified as verbs expressing a movement upwards (cf. e.g. Wienold 1992), the glosses can be easily compared and equated. Not having performed such an analysis, one may wonder what mixture of PATH and MANNER concepts should be ascribed to them. It is not easy, then, to simply sample entries and glosses in dictionaries in a typological analysis of lexicalization.

We think that both approaches are complementary and will profit from whatever result the other methodology has achieved. At present, the strategy of representativeness seems to be more developed and more widely followed, at the expense of the strategy of depth and complexity. In our present research, we shall follow the second strategy, thus hoping to contribute to a more realistic pursuit of typological studies.

1. **Various types of verbs of MOTION**

Talmy (1985, 2000) gives a typology which distinguishes various ways of lexicalizing events of MOTION\(^2\). Some languages, like English or German, typically lexicalize the MANNER of MOTION in a monomorphematic verb and leave it to word formation or to the syntactic context to specify the other aspects of the event of MOTION. In other languages, like Spanish, the verb typically lexicalizes what Talmy calls the PATH of the MOTION. In Atsugewi, to give another example, the verb lexicalizes the FIGURE, that is, the object in MOTION. There are also verbs which lexicalize the GROUND with respect to

---

\(^2\) The basic semantic notions in Talmy's model assign descriptions of MOTION events a rough and plain general structure. For more finely tuned semantic investigations, one would want to introduce differentiations, e.g. in the category FIGURE, one would want to distinguish individual, collective and mass. As a matter of course, we would then also apply the machinery developed in lexical semantics and especially in the semantics of space (cf. e.g. Wunderlich/Herweg 1991). For the present study, however, we restrict the discussion to the basic notions of Talmy's model.
which a movement is described, e.g. E. *to land, to embark, to shoulder* etc. So far, no language which typically lexicalizes the GROUND in a verb of MOTION has been discovered.

Japanese and Korean (Wienold 1987, 1989, 1992, 1995, 1996) belong to the second of Talmy's types, the one that lexicalizes aspects of PATH in the verb. That is, in that respect, Japanese and Korean are similar to Romance, although, according to a common typological parameter, namely the linear order of meaningful elements, they are quite different in other respects. Here, we encounter a situation in which these four languages share a type. We are not looking for a link between movement verbs and Greenberg's typology of syntactic ordering. As a matter of fact, there are SVO languages which are stricter than Italian and French with regard to Greenberg's predictions and which also have PATH verbs. Examples are Thai and Bahasa Indonesia (Wienold 1995). Still it seems worthwhile to have a closer look at those means of expression which Japanese and Korean on the one hand, and Italian and French on the other make available for the description of events of MOTION. Our discussion of movement verbs in the four languages is based on lists which we consider practically complete. For Korean and Japanese such lists have been provided in Wienold 1995. As an appendix to the present paper, we add the lists for French and Italian.

French and Italian are genetically closely related, as they have been in long lasting contact and emerged amidst a large area of MANNER languages, as Indo-European languages traditionally belong to, including Latin, from which the Romance languages originated. French and Italian are totally unrelated to Japanese and Korean. Some scholars assume the latter to be genetically related to each other, but this has not conclusively been proven. Structurally, however, they show many similarities and must have been in contact for many centuries (cf. Wienold 1989).

Looking at these languages in depth, we have been led to a number of observations which seem to support the following hypotheses:

- If languages prefer the same lexicalization pattern, they tend to develop very similar conceptual systems, even if they are different with respect to other typological
parameters.

- These conceptual systems are not confined to one part of speech; that is, they will show up not only in verbs. But part of speech is an important parameter for typological classifications.

- The preference for a given lexicalization pattern has consequences for what is explicitly conveyed or only implied, and hence also for translation from or into languages of a different type.

- There may be interaction between typological properties in the course of the development of a language.

2. **PATH aspects in verbs of MOTION**

Japanese, Korean, Italian and French have a common core of concepts which lexicalize **PATH** aspects in **MOTION** verbs; cf. the following list:\(^3\):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jap.</th>
<th>Kor.</th>
<th>It.</th>
<th>Fr.</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>agaru</td>
<td>orùda</td>
<td>salir</td>
<td>monter</td>
<td>move up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oriru</td>
<td>naerida</td>
<td>scendere</td>
<td>descendre</td>
<td>move down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hairu</td>
<td>tûlda</td>
<td>entrare</td>
<td>entrer</td>
<td>move into</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deru</td>
<td>nada</td>
<td>uscire</td>
<td>sortir</td>
<td>move out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tooru</td>
<td>chinada</td>
<td>passare</td>
<td>passer</td>
<td>move through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wataru</td>
<td>kônôda</td>
<td>attraversare</td>
<td>traverser</td>
<td>move across</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned at the beginning, German and English behave quite differently in this respect. Both languages have a large set of monomorphematic verbs specifying the **MANNER** of **MOTION**, e.g. German: *laufen, eilen, rennen, rasen, sausen, hasten, schleichen, steigen, hüpfen, hopsen* etc.; English: *run, haste, hurry, rush, race, slide, stomp, hop, skip* etc. German, to be sure, has very few monomorphematic verbs lexicalizing the **PATH** a **MOTION** takes (e.g. *passieren* as in *die Grenze passieren* ‘to pass the border’). However, English, besides very few commonly used **PATH** verbs of Germanic origin such

\(^3\) In actual use, the verbs as given for Korean, particularly when they describe **MOTIONs** of animate beings, often combine with *kada* ‘go’ or *oda* ‘come’ respectively. Such complementation is not infrequent in Japanese either (that is, by *iku* ‘go’, *kuru* ‘come’). In Korean, however, it seems to be obligatory for animate beings with the verbs listed above. This is how we get: **ollagada/-oda, naery ògadal-oda, târõgadal-oda, nagadal-oda, chinagadal-oda, kônôgadala-oda.** Japanese has more than one verb for ‘move up’ and
as *rise* and *leave*, has a richer inventory of *PATH* verbs, all of Romance descent: *cross, descend, ascend, enter, exit, penetrate, pierce* etc. In that respect, English participates in Romance lexicalization patterns as well. But the basic, commonly used *MOTION* verbs are mostly *MANNER* lexicalizations. Thus English can still be validly said to represent the type of a language lexicalizing the *MANNER* of a *MOTION* in a monomorphemic *MOTION* verb.

Japanese and Korean, as well as French and Italian, each have a certain supply of *MANNER* lexicalizations (for Japanese and Korean, see the list in Wienold 1996). But the preponderant type of monomorphemic *MOTION* verbs is one which expresses the *PATH* of a *MOTION*. By ‘preponderant’ we understand that a *PATH* language may have a considerable number of *MANNER* verbs, but it will not use them as freely and easily as a *MANNER* language would do. Thus French and Italian each have about 30 *MANNER* verbs (see Appendix, 5.2), but only about half of them govern obliques specifying the *GROUND* for the *PATH*. If there is a prepositional phrase, it is an adjunct, not a governed function. To give an example, *dans le jardin* in (2) and *nel giardino* in (3) cannot mean ‘into the garden’, but only ‘in the garden’:

(2) Fr. Les enfants marchent dans le jardin
(3) It. I bambini camminano nel giardino
   ‘the children are walking in the garden’

It must be added that French and Italian each have a *MANNER* verb which governs a direct object specifying the *GROUND* for the *PATH*:

(4) Fr. Le voleur a escaladé le mur
(5) It. Il ladro ha scavalcato il muro
   ‘the thief climbed the wall’

All this is very different from the unrestricted use of *MANNER* verbs with governed functions in languages like English and German.

---

*move down*. A complete list of Korean and Japanese *PATH* verbs is given in Wienold 1995.

4 Slobin 1996, 1997a, 1997b has analyzed a cross-linguistic corpus of narrative texts, including elicited oral speech as well as original literary texts and their translations, with respect to the use of *MANNER* verbs and *PATH* verbs. He shows that differences in the strategies for describing *MOTION* events actually originate from different lexical types defined on the basis of the *PATH*-MANNER distinction. He extensively discusses data from English and Spanish, but his study also includes three more *MANNER* languages and
As to Japanese and Korean, the system of MANNER verbs is far less elaborate: their monomorphematic MANNER verbs are fewer in number (eighteen in Japanese, thirteen in Korean), and they make fewer conceptual distinctions (Wienold 1996). Conversely, Japanese and Korean differ from our two Romance languages in that they have more PATH verbs. French and Italian do not have underived intransitive verbs such as

(6)

Japanese

yoru ‘move close to an object’
hanareru ‘move away from an object’
tsuku ‘move into contact with an object’
mawaru ‘move (partially) around an object’
meguru ‘move (in a complete circle) around an object’
kuguru ‘move while turning against an object’
sakarau ‘move while turning against an object’

Korean

tagagada ‘move close to an object’
tтанада ‘move away from an object’
putta ‘move as close as to contact an object’
tolda ‘move around an object’
tуртда ‘move in a circle around an object’
k축уртда ‘move while turning against an object’

One might be tempted to say that these differences between our two pairs of languages are consequences of different degrees of typological homogeneity. In fact, Korean and

PATH languages respectively, namely German, Dutch and Russian on the one hand, and French, Turkish and Hebrew on the other.

5 French tourner, Italian girare may be used for describing a circular movement, but their basic meaning is rather ‘changing one’s direction’. This explains why they typically are accompanied by prepositional phrases which specify the circular movement around an object: French tourner autour de q.c., Italian girare intorno a q.c.

6 Korean tagagada or tagaoda again show a verb base complemented by kada or oda. A verb tagada does not exist in contemporary Korean independently. There are, however, several compound verbs having taga as first component (cf. Wienold/Dehnhardt/Kim/Yoshida 1991:80f., 85).

7 Korean tolda – which again may be complemented by kada-oda : toragada-oda – and Japanese mawaru do not require the movement around an object to be completed. For tolda or mawaru to apply, it suffices that someone/something moves for some distance on a line which leads around the object. The complete movement around is expressed by Korean туртda and Jap. meguru.

8 In Korean, there is no lexemic equivalent for Jap. kuguru. One has to say -чи мит’їл chinada ‘to pass through under (sth.)’. Japanese allows for that expression, too: -no shita-o tooru ‘to pass through under (sth.)’. Thus, one may say either hashi-no shita-o kuguru or hashi-no shita-o tooru for ‘pass through under a bridge’. For a closer analysis cf. Wienold/Kim 1993:29ff.
Japanese seem to be ‘better’ PATH languages than Italian and French; cf. Fig. 1, in which our languages are shown, together with German and English, on a scale the poles of which are hypothetical pure PATH and MANNER languages. The white field indicates the amount of PATH verbs in a given language, the grey field the amount of MANNER verbs.

A purely quantitative view of the number of PATH and MANNER lexicalizations, however, obscures a fundamental effect of the typological distinction: a given type of lexicalization implies not only differences in the lexical inventories, but also in the syntactic properties of each lexicalization pattern. Moreover, the speakers of a PATH language strongly tend to prefer PATH expressions to MANNER expressions, leaving aspects of MANNER implicit or vague. Speakers of a MANNER language, on the other hand, are forced to specify MANNER even in situations where the communicative purpose would not require this.

As mentioned above, Korean and Japanese, to date, have not been shown to be genetically related. It is well known, however, that morpho-syntactically they behave very similarly. The lists given in (1), (6) and (7) show that lexicalization patterns of the two languages are also very much alike. Further evidence for this will follow.

In this context, it should be mentioned that Romance can compensate gaps in the inventory of PATH verbs by reflexivizing verbs of causative MOTION; cf.:
The inventory of causative verbs of MOTION is richly developed in Italian and French (for French, see Schwarze 1991:349f., 1993:117). It would be worthwhile to study the compensative effect of reflexivization in detail.

3. Describing additional aspects of MOTION events

As indicated before, speakers of languages which lexicalize PATH aspects in the verb tend not to specify other aspects of the MOTION event, unless they have a special reason to do so. E.g., Kor. san-ôl orùda, Jap. yama-o agaru just express moving upwards on a mountain; a German translation will be obliged to say something like auf den Berg steigen, auf den Berg klettern or use yet other verbs. Whatever verb is used, it will be a MANNER verb. Similarly, Kor. san-ôl naerida, Jap. yama-o kudaru express no more than movement on a mountain downwards. However, a translation like den Berg heruntersteigen or den Berg herunterklettern, besides expressing a PATH in herunter, is forced to express a MANNER of MOTION by using steigen or klettern.

Enforcing the specification of a PATH in Japanese and Korean can be exemplified when we now move from intransitive to transitive MOTION verbs. This, in addition, will allow us to pay some attention to the concept of CAUSE, also introduced in Talmy’s model. Let us look at the way in which speakers of Italian, French, Japanese and Korean typically describe MOTIONS in which lifting or holding up an object is involved. We will discuss two situations, one in which an adult lifts a child into a swing, and another one in which an adult lifts a child over a fence. In both cases, there is an AGENT causing a FIGURE to MOVE along a PATH upwards, the MANNER being application of force from underneath. In the first case, the movement ends on a GROUND upwards from the original position, in the second the movement continues beyond that point and then turns to a GROUND below.
Representative situations are described in Italian and in French respectively by:

(8) It. La mamma mette il bambino sull'altalena
    'the mother puts the child on the swing'

(9) Fr. La mère pose l'enfant sur la balançoire
    'the mother places the child on the swing'

Both (8) and (9) use very general verbs of positioning which open an argument position for PATH (the prepositional phrase). There is no expression of MANNER.

Japanese and Korean also use verbs of positioning, e.g. noseru and t'aeuda. These, however, incorporate a concept of placing something on an object that serves as a means of transportation; cf. (10) and (11):

(10) haha-wa kodomo-o burankō-ni noseru
    mother-TOPIC child-ACC swing-LOC put-on-a-vehicle-PRES

(11) òmọni-nun kkoma-rùl kùne-e t'aeunda
    mother-TOPIC child-ACC swing-LOC put-on-a-vehicle-PRES

In such cases, both languages may also use a causative 'to make someone sit (on something)', Japanese suwaraseru (from suwaru 'to sit'), Korean anch'ida (from anch-ta, phonologically antta 'to sit'). The latter expressions, however, sound less straightforward. They do not have the implication of further movement once the child is sitting on the swing.

The fence situation would be described by

(12) Fr. La mère fait passer l'enfant par-dessus la haie
    the mother make-PRES pass-INF the child over the fence

(13) It. La mamma aiuta il bambino a passare il recinto
    the mother help-PRES the child to pass-INF the fence

In (12) and (13), we have causative constructions of PATH verbs (the infinitives) which lexicalize the concept of moving through, across or past something. In French, information concerning the PATH is completed by a preposition (par-dessus) which indicates a movement over an object. The Italian verb governs a direct object denoting the
GROUND, and additional information about the PATH can be inferred from the nature of the
GROUND. MANNER is not expressed in (12) and (13). Korean, in this case, uses an
expression like (14a) or (14b):

(14a) òmòni-nûn kkoma-rûl ult'ari nèmò-e nounda
    mother-TOPIC child-ACC hedge/fence position-beyond-LOC place-on-PRES
(14b) òmòni-nûn kkoma-rûl ult'ari nèmò-ro nounda
    mother-TOPIC child-ACC hedge/fence position-beyond-DIR place-on-PRES

Here, nômò is used like a noun, as it takes locative case suffixes, but is derived
from a PATH verb nômta ‘to move across an impediment or a barrier’ (also more spe-
cifically ‘to jump over something’). But it is noteworthy that nômò is a nominalized verbal
form which by itself expresses a MOTION in space and has lexicalized the PATH taken in
space. nômò, thus, functions like a relational noun of location, which in a number of uses
renders the functions of a preposition in English, German, or also in Italian and French.9
The relational nouns will be commented on below. Again, in Korean MANNER is not
expressed.

Japanese has several ways of translating (12) or (13). Rather like Korean, it may
use a nominalization, koshi ‘position beyond’, derived from the verb kosu ‘move across
(an impediment or barrier)’10. Thus we get

(15) haha-wa kodomo-o toriagete kakinegoshi-ni watasu
    mother-TOPIC child-DIR-Obj. lift-up -CONJ. F, fence-LOC. move-across

watasu is the causative of wataru, given in (1). But (15) may only be used in a context
where someone is ready to pick the child on the other side of the fence. watasu implies this
condition. In a different case, to express ‘lift a child across a fence and put it there’ – which
the Korean sentence (14) expresses –, Japanese has to use something like (16) or (17):

---

9 not’a is the verb for ‘placing an object on something (to remain there)’. Also a compound verb omgyô-
not’a, built out of not’a and omgida (morphemically: olm-ki-da ‘to make something move from one place to
another place’), can be used. -ki- is a variant of the causative morpheme.
10 goshi is a phonological alternant of koshi in a compound whose first constituent is a noun. There is a
similar use in madogoshi-ni miru (’to look through a window’, with mado ‘window’ and miru ‘look’). Cf.
also Martin 1988:110.
11 CONJ. F = ‘conjoined form’ or ‘conjunctional form’ of a verb. Comments on uses of this morphological
form will follow below (cf. 13ff.).
(16)  kodomo-o toriagete kakine-no mukoogawa-ni orosu
    ‘child-OBJ. lift-up -CONJ. fence-GEN. other-side-LOC. put-down’

(17)  kodomo-o toriagete kakine-no mukoogawa-ni koesaseru.
    … make-move-across-(an-impediment)

orosu, as in (16), is the causative of oriru ‘to move down’ (as given in (1)). koesaseru
(17) is the causative of koeru ‘to move across an impediment’, a variant of kosu, men-
tioned before\footnote{Causative formation in Japanese and Korean is, as may have been noticed, a frequent morphological
process. Besides a very regular morphemic (in Japanese) or morphosyntactic pattern (in Korean), there is a
rich repertoire of lexicalized causatives which involve slightly irregular correspondences to non-causatives
in both languages. There are also some differences in interpretation of regular formations and irregular}. The Japanese examples (16) and (17) can have - as replacements for toriagete -
various other expressions: kakaegete, dakiagete, mochiagete. All four of them are
compound verbs involving ageru ‘make something move upwards’ and a second verb, the
last three belonging to the verbs expressing ‘holding something for moving’; the first one is
a general verb for ‘take from, take away’. Thus we notice that Japanese as well as Korean
employ verbs of MOTION, causative or non-causative, lexicalizing either the PATH of the
MOTION or aspects of the location arrived at after the MOTION.

Actually, the situation is yet more complicated, since orosu, as used in (16), does
not pay heed to the nature of the space where the child is placed after it is lifted across the
fence. If the specific location was such that the fence surrounds a house, in place of orosu,
it would be quite natural in Japanese to use ireru ‘to move into’ in case the child is put
inside, that is between fence and house, or dasu ‘to move outside of’ in the opposite case.
As we have shown above, a MANNER language like German forces a speaker to specify a
MANNER aspect when describing a MOTION event. Japanese and Korean, being PATH
languages, enforce specifications of PATH.

We went into the details of alternative expressions in Korean and Japanese in order
to show that these languages quite naturally provide a more complete description of the
PATH component of MOTION events. We conclude that both ranges of lexical inventory
and syntactic properties induce speakers to specify aspects of MOTION events to a
different degree of completeness. (More evidence for this is given in a study on translation
from Japanese into English and German in Wienold 1990).

If the situation makes it necessary for the speaker to express additional aspects of the MOTION event, there are different ways of doing so. Speakers of French or English may use an adverb, a prepositional phrase or an embedded sentential construction.

Adverbs are typically used in order to specify certain aspects which are not constitutive for the event, such as

- speed (‘fast’, ‘slowly’, …)
- sensory qualities (‘loudly’, ‘silently’, ‘smoothly’, …)
- intensity (‘slightly’, ‘heavily’, ‘violently’, …)
- esthetic quality (‘beautifully’, ‘elegantly’, …).

In Romance, and especially in Italian, there are also local adverbs, like

(18) avanti   ‘forward’
indietro  ‘back’
su       ‘up’
giù      ‘down’

These adverbs convey information about aspects which are constitutive of the MOTION event; cf. e.g.:

(19) spingere avanti
     ‘push forward’
(20) andare su
     ‘go up’

They may also be used pleonastically, as in

(21) scendere giù
     ‘move-down down’
(22) ci sono entrato dentro
     ‘it-LOCATIVE I-am enter-PAST-PARTICIPLE in’.

The inventory of these adverbs, however, is rather restricted; cf. the following table:

---

Japanese and Korean do not have adverbs of this kind. Instead, the most common class of expressions in this area are compound verbs. Actually, both languages are very rich in compound verbs. The process is productive in both languages, and several thousands can be found in both of them. (A succinct characterization of Japanese compound verbs may be found in Ishii 1987; cf. also Hasselberg 1996). The compound verbs which concern us in the present discussion are verbs which use as the second compound a verb of MOTION lexicalizing the PATH of MOTION or the location arrived at after the MOTION. Thus we find, e.g. Japanese

(24)  tobiagaru  ‘to fly upwards’
      tobioriru  ‘to fly downwards’
      tobimawaru  ‘to fly around’
      taresagaru  ‘to hang downwards’
      tsurisagaru  ‘to hang downwards’
      hikisagaru  ‘to pull downwards’

But there are also constructions containing the conjunctional form of a verb (the -te form) plus a verb of MOTION lexicalizing the PATH:

(25)  tonde koeru  ‘to fly across’
      tonde modoru  ‘to fly back to the point from which one started’
      tonde kaeru  ‘to fly back to one’s home’

Examples of compound verbs involving a verb of location based on a concept of PATH would be:

(26)  kakiireru  ‘to write into’
oshiireru  ‘to insert by pressing’
kaireru  ‘to take in by buying’ (as, e.g., a second hand shop would)
hikiireru  ‘to pull into’
kakekomu  ‘to jump into/onto’ (as, e.g., on a train before the doors close for the departure)
tobikomu  ‘to jump into’
uekomu  ‘to insert (a plant) into (the soil) planting it’

Prepositional phrases are used very efficiently, in Romance, in order to complete the description of the event given by the verb. Like local adverbs, they may convey information about constitutive aspects of MOTION events; cf. the following It. examples:

(27) Il gatto esce da sotto il tavolo
the cat moves-out from under the table
‘the cat appears from under the table’

(28) L’uccello è entrato dalla finestra
the bird enter-PAST from the window
‘the bird came in through the window’

The Romance languages, very much like English or German, have quite elaborate sets of prepositions, which additionally have a great flexibility of interpretations (cf. the uses of Fr. dans ‘in’, as analyzed in Hottenroth 1986). Furthermore, both Romance languages have numerous complex prepositions, derived from nouns or adverbs; cf. the following list of French complex prepositions:

(29)

à côté de  ‘alongside’
à travers  ‘across’
au-dedans de  ‘inside’
au-dehors de  ‘outside’
au-delà de  ‘beyond’
au-dessous de  ‘below’
auprès de  ‘with’
au large de  ‘off’
autour de  ‘around’
aux alentours de  ‘in the’

aux environs de  ‘surroundings of’
du côté de  ‘in, from the direction of’
en bas de  ‘down’
en deça de  ‘on this side of’
en face de  ‘in front of’
loin de  ‘far from’
par-delà  ‘beyond’
par-dessous  ‘under’
par-dessus  ‘over’
par-devant  ‘in front of’

13 komu (komeru) often replaces ireru in compound verb formations. As independent verbs komu means ‘to be replete with’, komeru ‘to put into a place, filling it’ (the use of which is rather restricted).
près de  ‘close to, near’  à droite de  ‘on the right-hand side of’
proche de  ‘close to’
vis-à-vis de  ‘in front of’  en marge de  ‘on the margin of’
à proximité de  ‘close to’  en tête de  ‘at the head of’
au milieu de  ‘in the middle of’  le long de  ‘along’
en direction de  ‘toward’  en aval de  ‘downstream of’
à gauche de  ‘on the left-hand side of’  en amont de  ‘upstream of’
à droite de  ‘on the right-hand side of’

On the other hand, Japanese and Korean have locative case particles and relational nouns which specify location. The former are quite general in meaning. They allow for distinguishing between the place where an object is and the scene where an event takes place.

The relational nouns specify local relationships, but they do not have the flexibility of Romance (or English, or German) prepositions. Relational nouns of such nature are:

(30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Korean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘on top’ or ‘above’</td>
<td>ue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘under’</td>
<td>shita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘behind’</td>
<td>ushiro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘in front of’</td>
<td>mae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘to the side of’</td>
<td>yoko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘next to’</td>
<td>soba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘in the general area of’</td>
<td>hoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘inside’</td>
<td>naka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Korean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘on top’ or ‘above’</td>
<td>ui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘under’</td>
<td>mit’, arae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘behind’</td>
<td>tui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘in front of’</td>
<td>ap’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘to the side of’</td>
<td>yop’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘next to’</td>
<td>kyot’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘in the general area of’</td>
<td>chok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘inside’</td>
<td>an, sok</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are different kinds of restrictions. In quite a few instances, the European languages discussed in this paper have prepositions to specify scenes of an event, whereas Japanese and Korean do not have relational nouns with such meanings. Instead, they have to use verbs lexicalizing the PATH:

(31)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Korean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘through’</td>
<td>tooru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘across’</td>
<td>wataru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘across (implying an impediment)’</td>
<td>kosu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘at = in contact with’</td>
<td>tsuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘at = in the direction of, facing’</td>
<td>mukau, mensuru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘against’</td>
<td>sakarau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Korean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘through’</td>
<td>chinada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘across’</td>
<td>kënnoda (kënnogada/-oda)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘across (implying an impediment)’</td>
<td>nëmta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘at = in contact with’</td>
<td>putta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘at = in the direction of, facing’</td>
<td>myënhada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘against’</td>
<td>kësårada</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 A rather complete list and characterization of Japanese and Korean relational nouns of local interpretation can be found in Wienold/Dehnhardt/Kim/Yoshida 1991.

15 Japanese mensuru, Korean hyanghada, myënhada are denominalized formations involving a noun borrowed from Chinese, plus a verb ‘make, do’ (Jap. suru, Korean hada). In general, in this paper we do not go into Sino-Korean and Sino-Japanese vocabulary, as it is more or less marginal with regard to the questions concerned. But a more detailed discussion would lead to some interesting modifications (cf. Wienold 1995:326).
A further restriction is that the use of the Japanese and Korean relational nouns is restricted when compared to French and Italian – or German and English, for that matter. Thus, ‘there is a flower in the vase’ may be rendered by using Jap. *naka* and Korean *an*:

(32) Jap. kabin-no naka-ni hana-ga sashite aru
(33) Kor. huabyŏng (-e/ũi) an-e kkŏt'i kkochyŏ issŏ yo

Furthermore, many relational nouns either do not have metaphorical uses at all, or do so only in a rather limited way. Again, verbs of MOTION lexicalizing a PATH will be used frequently (as, e.g., Japanese *kooryo-ni ireru* ‘to take into consideration’: *kooryo* is a Sino-Japanese compound, the example indicating one of the interactions between expressions of MOTION and location and this important part of Japanese vocabulary. (The same holds for the exact Korean equivalent: *koryŏ-e nŏta*).

Aspects of MOTION events may also be expressed by embedded sentential constructions. Japanese and Korean, as well as Romance, have special constructions at their disposal, the heads of which are non-finite forms of the verb, the conjunctional or conjoined form, which generally express information about the event described by the matrix verb. From the perspective of a speaker of English or German, using such a construction seems to conceptually split up a complex event into a central and a peripheral aspect.

Romance basically has two possibilities of expressing this kind of additional aspect by an embedded verbal construction: the infinitive of finality and the gerund. The former is used whenever the additional aspect is related to the result of the action. Thus, if the aspect of lifting is important in the communicative situation, instead of (13), a speaker of Italian might say:

(34) sollevare il bambino per aiutarlo a passare il recinto
‘lift the child in order to help him pass the fence’

---

16 Interestingly enough, instead of just saying *naka-ni aru, an-e iss-ta* ‘to be inside of’, both languages additionally use a verb of location specifying the place reached at the end of the MOTION: *sasu, koj-ta* ‘to insert, (in order to be held within something)’. (Japanese *sasu* has been listed in (4). Korean *kkotta, morphemically kkoj-ta, does not have that use.) But, for saying ‘there is a break (or rupture) in the vase’, *naka/an* may not be used.
The second construction available in Romance is the gerund; cf. e.g.:

(35) Il ladro fuggì salendo sul tetto
    'the thief escaped by climbing on the roof'

Japanese and Korean have similar constructions for expressing 'to help a child across a fence', both languages have two renderings, again with quite striking parallels:

Korean

(36) kkoma-rùl towasô ul’tùri nòmò-e no(h)hayo
    child-OBJ. help-CONJOINED fence other side-LOC. put-PRES.
(37) kkoma-ga ul’tùri(rùl) nòmànìn kòs-ūl towachùùyò
    child-SUBJ. fence-OBJ. move-across-ATTRIBUTE thing-OBJ. help-PRES.

Japanese

(38) Kodomo-o tasukete kake呼-o koesaseru
    child-OBJ. help-CONJOINED fence-OBJ. move-across-CAUS.-PRES.
(39) Kodomo-ga kake呼-o koeru-no-o tasukeru
    child-SUBJ. fence-OBJ. move-across-NOMINALIZATION-OBJ. help-PRES.

(37) and (39) use an embedding construction which nominalizes the embedded clause by means of the nominalizers Kor. kòt (<kòs) and Jap. no, with the help of a direct object case particle dependent on the verb of the matrix sentence. (36) and (38) use a construction in which the first clause appears in a specific verb form that indicates conjoining propositions. The conjoined forms indicate that the formulation of the preceding proposition is completed; the whole sentence, however, continues. Except when sentences are left incomplete, the use of a conjoined form requires a continuation. Conjunctional forms typically occur in SOV languages (cf. Masica 1976).

Notice that there is a striking similarity between the Romance gerund and the Japanese conjoined form, at least on the level of syntax. This similarity may easily be obscured by the difference of word order. If Italian were an SOV language fulfilling Greenberg's typological predictions for SOV languages\(^\text{17}\) (cf. Greenberg 1966), then (35) would run like (40); cf. Korean (41), and Japanese (42):

---
\(^{17}\) There are SOV languages, such as Persian, which do not fulfill all of Greenberg's predictions. On that issue cf. Comrie 1989 and Masica 1976.
(40) ladro-il tetto-sul salendo fuggì
thief-TOPIC roof-on-TOPIC climb-GER flee-PAST

(41) todug-i chibung-ûl t'ago tomangch'ossô yo
thief-SUBJ. roof-OBJ. climb-CONJOINED flee-PAST

(42) doroboo-ga yane-o tsutatte nigeta
thief-SUBJ. roof-OBJ. move-along-CONJOINED flee-PAST

Korean *t'ada* has been commented on before. Japanese has a special verb *tsuta* ‘be in contact with an object (while moving along)’ besides *sou* ‘move along an object, (not being in contact with it)’.

Having established the close similarity of gerund and conjoined constructions, it is necessary to have a closer look at what these constructions may express. In Romance (as Pusch 1980 shows for Italian; French is similar), gerunds essentially express instrumental and modal aspects of events; cf. e.g.:

(43) Mi risollevai penosamente aggrappandomi al muro
I painfully got up again clutch-GER the wall

(44) Il tram correva sferragliando
the streetcar run roar-GER

(45) Correvano scivolando nell'erba alta
they run glide-GER in the high grass

Japanese and Korean also use the conjoined verb to express additional or instrumental information (by the conjoined verb). But they differ from Romance in a significant way, since they conceptually split up the MOTION itself, as in:

(46) kare-wa himo-o tsutatte orita
he-TOPIC rope-OBJ. be-in-contact-CONJOINED descend-PAST
‘he descended by a rope’

Romance would not naturally use a gerund in similar cases. It would add a prepositional phrase:

---

(47) Scese con una fune
   descended-PAST-3D PERSON with a rope

But this prepositional phrase refers to the rope as to an instrument; its literal meaning conveys no local information, so there is no splitting up of the MOTION itself. Consider also:

(48) Taroo-wa kawa-ni sotte aruita
   Taroo-TOPIC river-LOC. move-along-CONJOINED walk-PAST
   ‘Taroo moved along the river’

(49) kù yōja-nun kang-úl ttara-sò kòrégassòyo
   that woman-TOPIC river-OBJ. move-along-CONJOINED walk-go-PAST

Further examples of a similar kind have been given before, see (15) - (17), (41) and (42).

Altogether, there are many uses of this nature in both languages, many of which have been discussed in Wienold 1991. To add here just one more in Korean (50) and Japanese (51):

(50) ton-úl sòrab-e nò-k’o chamguèssòyo
   money-OBJ. drawer-LOC. put-in-CONJOINED lock-PAST

(51) okane-o kinko-ni ire-te kagi-o kake-ta
   money-OBJ. safe-LOC. put-in-CONJOINED key-OBJ. hang-PAST

The most natural English rendering would use a simple verbal expression plus a preposition: ‘to lock money in something’.

Thus, the use Japanese and Korean make of the conjoining construction confirms what we observed concerning the inventories of the verbs that lexicalize PATH aspects: Japanese and, to a slightly lesser extent, Korean draw more radical consequences from being languages of the PATH verb type. And again, the high degree of elaboration of the Japanese and Korean verb lexicon may be due to the fact that, given the absence of PATH concepts among the relational nouns and the absence of European type prepositions, much more information has to be expressed by verbs.

---

20 This construction is reserved for inanimate objects. Animate objects locked in require a different expression in Japanese as well as in Korean.
4. Some perspectives

The term ‘PATH verb’ may suggest that there are verbs which describe actual PATHS. Of course this would be an erroneous understanding: those verbs only specify relevant aspects of actual PATHS. Or, more precisely: PATH ‘means that a movement fulfills certain conditions with regard to the spatial extension of the GROUND. The GROUND has to satisfy certain prerequisites so that these conditions can be fulfilled’ (Wienold 1995:310). These conditions, for each verb, are very few in number: mostly one, in some cases two. E.g. E. exit, Jap. deru, Kor. nada require a space having an interior with regard to some other space; referring to a MOTION from such an interior to a place outside of it motivates a use of these verbs. Again, E. cross, Jap. wataru, Kor. kŏnnŏda require a space bounded on two sides by other spaces; referring to a movement beginning outside the bounded space, entering it and leaving it on the other side will motivate the use of these verbs. The communicative purpose can easily require more aspects to be specified. This can be attained on the level of text, or, on the level of the simple sentence, by words belonging to classes other than the verb, i.e. prepositions or nouns. The choice, for each language, depends on its general syntactic structure. Japanese and Korean, which do not have prepositions or postpositions proper, express additional aspects of location by relational nouns, as mentioned above. These are nouns which combine with NPs to form NPs. Unlike French nouns like l’intérieur ‘the interior’ or le devant ‘the front side’ (cf. Schwarze 1991:354), Japanese and Korean relational nouns refer not only to parts of objects, but also, and preferably, to adjacent areas (see the list given in (30)). The two Romance languages, on the other hand, inherited prepositions from Latin and developed PP syntax further as a consequence of their reorganization of the way they realize grammatical functions: as is well known, they replaced case inflection by prepositions. Thus there was no reason for them to develop relational nouns of the Japanese and Korean type.

As in many Indo-European languages, most Latin prepositions were used, with identical meaning and phonological shape, as prefixes in complex verbs. These prefixes gradually fused with the verb stem, initiating the typological change from MANNER-
PATH-languages. To give an example, Lat. *ex-ire* ‘to go out’ fuses to It. *uscire*, OFr. *eis-sir*. Fusion could cause lexical substitution: Lat. expressed the opposition of upwards vs. downwards movement by prefixes, e.g. *a-scendere* (< *ad-scandere*) ‘to go up’ vs. *descendere* ‘to go down’. The fading away of verb prefixation made the distinction formally unclear, so *ascendere* was replaced (Fr. *monter*, It. *salire*).

Thus two processes of typological change, the loss of case inflection and the weakening of verb prefixation, interact in such a way as to strengthen the role of prepositions in the grammatical system. The development of the PP system in Romance beyond its extent in Latin, on the other hand, probably prevented a further extension of the subsystem of PATH verbs in Romance. Thus we suggest that the differences in inventories between Japanese/Korean and Italian/French are due to interactions between independent typological characteristics.

For the East-Asian pair of languages, we further suggest an analogous idea about an interaction between independent typological characteristics. In the literature discussing Greenberg’s hypothesis it is quite common to equate prepositions and postpositions, except for their position relative to the noun phrase. A cover term for both, including also circumpositions, is sometimes used: ‘adpositions’ (e.g. Comrie 1989:85ff., 91, 100ff.). If one identifies the Korean and Japanese relational nouns with Greenberg’s postpositions (which, incidentally, seems the only possible interpretation of his statements, since cases – case particles in Korean and Japanese also follow nouns – are treated separately in Greenberg’s typology), one will notice that the Japanese and Korean ‘postpositions’ (i.e., their relational nouns) do not exactly behave like prepositions\(^{21}\). The main difference is that the relational nouns as nouns carry a case particle that lets them fill an argument position opened by the verb they occur with. Prepositions and other postpositions, on the other hand, provide a position for an argument additional to the argument allowed by the verb they occur with. Our study seems to indicate that it is precisely the nominal quality of the Korean and Japanese relational nouns which calls for some other linguistic means to express certain additional aspects of MOTION events. And it is in these functions that we

\(^{21}\) In some presentations, Greenberg’s ‘postpositions’ are identified with Japanese (and Korean) case particles, e.g. Kuno 1986.
find PATH verbs (in conjoined verb constructions). Japanese and Korean share relational nouns and PATH verbs with Thai and Bahasa Indonesia. The latter two languages do not have inflectional cases and very few adpositions, which, as the two languages are SVO, show up as prepositions (cf. Wienold/Rohmer 1997:165ff.). Again, it seems that it is the nominal quality of the relational nouns which calls for PATH verbs.

5. Appendix: French and Italian verbs of MOTION

This appendix gives an overview of verbs of MOTION in French and in Italian. In order to provide a useful basis for typological analysis, it is restricted to verbs which are synchronically monomorphematic and meet Talmy’s definition of PATH and MANNER verbs. Moreover, the lists given below are restricted to non-causative verbs, i.e. verbs with the FIGURE (more precisely, the object which undergoes MOTION) appearing in the function of a subject. It follows from these restrictions that we are not giving the full picture of how French and Italian have lexicalized concepts of MOTION.

All verbs are classified according to conceptual types as well as to syntactic properties, the latter being expressed in terms of grammatical functions. For the reader’s convenience, an English gloss is provided for each verb.

---


23 Verbs such as Fr. décoller ‘to take off’, which are analyzable into morphological segments, but have no compositional semantics, are regarded as synchronically monomorphematic.

24 Causative verbs of MOTION, i.e. verbs where the FIGURE appears in the function of a direct object, such as ‘to bring’, ‘to push’ are not considered here. Furthermore, verbs prefixed with re- ‘again, back’ generally are not mentioned, if their meaning is transparent from the base, as in Fr. redescendre ‘to move down again’.

25 The English translations given under ‘meaning’ are only approximations. Hence, when the same gloss is given for more than one verb, their meanings may not be fully identical; cf. e.g. It. salire and montare, which both are glossed by ‘to move up’, but differ with respect to continuity and duration of the MOTION events they refer to (Moneglia 1997), or Fr. entrer and s'introduire, for both of which ‘to enter’ is given as a gloss, but which differ on the level of presupposition. - The Engl. verb to move is used for all kinds of non-deictic MOTION concepts, regardless of whether the translation is idiomatic in English. - Polysemy within the domain of MOTION (cf. Fr. rentrer ‘to enter’ and ‘to move back’) is accounted for by multiple mention. Non-local readings of polysemous verbs are not considered.
Conceptual classes

In the present overview, the major conceptual types are PATH verbs and MANNER verbs. PATH verbs are subclassified into

- verbs which refer to a region of the localizing object or to a dimension, e.g. ‘to enter’
- verbs which refer to the distance between FIGURE and GROUND, e.g. ‘to approach’
- verbs which merely refer to the source or the goal as such, e.g. ‘to arrive’
- verbs which refer to the front vs. back opposition, e.g. ‘to advance’
- verbs which specify changes of direction, e.g. ‘to turn’
- verbs which refer to a second moving object, e.g. ‘to pass (a vehicle)’.

MANNER verbs are subclassified with respect to the animate vs. inanimate and the individual vs. substance oppositions. Three types can be distinguished:

- verbs which typically relate to an individual, animate FIGURE, e.g. ‘to walk’
- verbs which relate to an individual, inanimate FIGURE, e.g. ‘to fall’
- verbs which typically relate to a FIGURE which is a substance, e.g. ‘to flow’.

Syntactic classes

All verbs are characterized with respect to the following syntactic classes:

- subject only, e.g. Fr. marcher ‘to walk’ (under the heading SUBJ)
- subject and oblique, e.g. Fr. aller quelque part ‘to go some place’ (under the heading OBL)
- subject and direct object, e.g. Fr. monter l'escalier ‘to go up the stairs’ (under the heading OBJ).

26 There are virtually no verbs which combine MANNER and PATH concepts. Fr. accourir ‘to come running’, s'envoler ‘to fly away’ and survoler ‘to fly over’, where MANNER is expressed by the stem and PATH by a prefix, are isolated remainders of the once pervasive Latin prefix verbs, most of which either disappeared (e.g. Lat. inire ‘to move into’) or became opaque (e.g. Fr. descendre ‘to move down’).
27 This group includes the concepts ‘to move up’ and ‘to move down’ when they apply to the general notion of verticality, rather than to an object.
28 For a semantic analysis of Fr. verbs belonging to this class, cf. Schpak-Dolt 1991.
Reflexivized verbs, such as Fr. *s’en aller*, It. *andarsene* ‘to leave’, Fr. *s’approcher*, It. *avvicinarsi* ‘to approach’ lexicalize a large domain of *motion* concepts. They have not been listed here, given that they are not monomorphematic.

### 5.1 PATH verbs

#### 5.1.1 Verbs which refer to a region of the localizing object or to a dimension

**French**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJ</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>OBJ</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>entrer</td>
<td>entrer</td>
<td>'to enter'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rentrer</td>
<td>rentrer</td>
<td>'to enter'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pénétrer</td>
<td>sortir</td>
<td>'to move out'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monter</td>
<td>monter</td>
<td>'to move up, upon'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>descendre</td>
<td>descendre</td>
<td>'to move down'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passer</td>
<td>passer</td>
<td>'to pass'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traverser</td>
<td>traverser</td>
<td>'to pass'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>longer</td>
<td>rasent</td>
<td>'to skim'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Italian**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJ</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>OBJ</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>entrare</td>
<td>entrare</td>
<td>'to enter'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uscire</td>
<td>uscire</td>
<td>'to move out'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salir</td>
<td>salir</td>
<td>'to move up, upon'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>montare</td>
<td>montare</td>
<td>'to move up, upon'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scendere</td>
<td>scendere</td>
<td>'to move down'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passer</td>
<td>passer</td>
<td>'to pass'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valicare</td>
<td>valicare</td>
<td>'to pass'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attraversare</td>
<td>attraversare</td>
<td>'to pass alongside’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>costeggiare</td>
<td>rasantare</td>
<td>'to skim'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.1.2 Verbs which relate to the distance between *Figure* and *Ground*

**French**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJ</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>OBJ</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>approcher</td>
<td>approcher</td>
<td>'to approach'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1.3 Verbs which merely relate to the source or the goal as such

**Italian**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJ</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>OBJ</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abbordare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to approach’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**French**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJ</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>OBJ</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>partir</td>
<td>partir</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to leave’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arriver</td>
<td>arriver</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to arrive’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rentrer</td>
<td>rentrer</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to return’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retourner</td>
<td>retourner</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to return’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rejoindre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to join’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gagner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to reach’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atteindre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to reach’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quitter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to leave’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.4 Verbs which refer to the front vs. back opposition

**French**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJ</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>OBJ</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>avancer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to move forward’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reculer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to move backward’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Italian**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJ</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>OBJ</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>avanzare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to move forward’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indietreggiare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to move backward’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.5 Verbs which specify changes of direction

**French**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJ</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>OBJ</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tourner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to turn’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
circuler 'to circulate, to move on'
évoluter 'to move about'
contourner 'to pass round'
arpenner 'to pace up and down'

Italian
SUBJ OBL OBJ MEANING
girare OBL OBJ 'to turn'
circolare 'to circulate, to move on'
aggirare 'to pass round'

5.1.6 Verbs which refer to a second moving object

French
SUBJ OBL OBJ MEANING
dépasser 'to pass (a vehicle)'
distancer 'to leave behind'
croiser 'to pass (an oncoming vehicle)'
devancer 'to get ahead of'

Italian
SUBJ OBL OBJ MEANING
sorpassare 'to pass (same direction)'
distanziare 'to leave behind'
incrociare 'to pass (opposite direction)'
superare 'to get ahead of'

5.2 MANNER verbs

5.2.1 Verbs which typically relate to an individual, animate

French
SUBJ OBL OBJ MEANING
marcher 'to walk'
naviguer 'to sail, to fly'
galoper 'to gallop'
trotter 'to trot'
trottiner 'to jog along'
dancer 'to dance'

29 The list does not include borrowings which belong to specialized terminologies, such as Fr. dribbler 'to dribble', crawler 'to swim the crawl'. These verbs behave syntactically like the majority of this group, i.e. they do not specify PATH aspects via obliques.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJ</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>OBJ</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>camminare</td>
<td>navigare</td>
<td>galoppare</td>
<td>'to walk'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trottere</td>
<td>guizzare</td>
<td>guizzare</td>
<td>'to limp'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zoppicare</td>
<td>ballare</td>
<td>passeggia</td>
<td>'to limp'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strisciare</td>
<td>nuotare</td>
<td>guadare</td>
<td>'to swim'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trottere</td>
<td>volare</td>
<td>scalare</td>
<td>'to glide'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saltare</td>
<td>saltare</td>
<td>saltare</td>
<td>'to jump'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>balzare</td>
<td>balzare</td>
<td>balzare</td>
<td>'to jump'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>volare</td>
<td>volare</td>
<td>volare</td>
<td>'to fly'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.2 Verbs which typically relate to an individual, inanimate Figure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJ</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>OBJ</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>flotter</td>
<td>tomber</td>
<td>rouler</td>
<td>'to float'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glisser</td>
<td>glisser</td>
<td>rouler</td>
<td>'to slide'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Italian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJ</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>OBJ</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>galleggiare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to float’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cadere</td>
<td>cadere</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to fall’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cascare</td>
<td>cascare</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to fall’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>piombare</td>
<td>piombare</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to fall’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rimbalzare</td>
<td>rimbalzare</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to bounce’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rotolare</td>
<td>rotolare</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to roll’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ruzzolare</td>
<td>ruzzolare</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to roll’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scivolare</td>
<td>scivolare</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to slide’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.3 Verbs which typically relate to a **figure** which is a substance

### French

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJ</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>OBJ</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>couler</td>
<td>couler</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to flow’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ruisseler</td>
<td>ruisseler</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to stream’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suinter</td>
<td>suinter</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to ooze out’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filtrer</td>
<td>filtrer</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to filter through’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jaillir</td>
<td>jaillir</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to gush forth’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Italian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJ</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>OBJ</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>scorrere</td>
<td>scorrere</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to flow’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colare</td>
<td>colare</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to flow’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fluire</td>
<td>fluire</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to flow’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gocciolare</td>
<td>gocciolare</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to trickle’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grondare</td>
<td>grondare</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to stream’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filtrare</td>
<td>filtrare</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to filter through’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zampillare</td>
<td>zampillare</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to gush forth’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgorgare</td>
<td>sgorgare</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to gush forth’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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