LEXICAL STRUCTURES CONCERNING MOVEMENT AND SPACE IN SOME ASIAN LANGUAGES

Götz Wienold
Professor Dr. phil.
Fachgruppe Sprachwissenschaft, Universität Konstanz
Postfach 5560, D-7750 Konstanz, Germany

I

The main thesis of this paper is that Thai belongs to a class of languages which lexicalize the path of a movement in a monomorphematic verb, e.g. verbs like long 'to move down', k'ûn 'to move up' in long bandai 'to go down the staircase' or k'ûn bandai 'to go up the staircase' express a path with regard to the staircase. Such languages are rather common in East and in South East Asia. In earlier papers I have mainly dealt with Japanese and Korean as path languages. In the present paper I will concentrate on Thai, but I will do so in a typological perspective. I also want to show that Thai movement verbs incorporating a path carry important functions in the languge. Typological facts of lexicalization, thus, are tied to other structural properties. The type as I said is rather common in South East Asia, although there is no survey of the languages concerned. E.g. also in Malay/Indonesian there is a fair amount of path incorporation in movement verbs. As the type can be found in languages of different genetic background and with different typological affiliations in other domains, one can study the interaction of lexicalization type in movement verbs with other typological features, such as presence/absence of morphological marked cases or presence/absence of prepositions or postpositions. One thing that all languages of the path type in East or South East Asia share is relational nouns with local interpretation like Thai nâa 'area in front', tâi 'area below'. At least in East Asia and South East Asia path incorporation in movement verbs seem to be in structural interaction with relational nouns.

In Thai we find sentences like

(1) weelaa   fǒn   tòk   saidɯɜn   ʔɔ̀ɔk
     'time' 'rain' 'fall' 'earthworm' 'move out'

     càak   din
     'separate'   'soil'

     'When rain falls, earthworms (will) come out of the
     soil'

(2) c'aawpramoŋ   naam   rɯɜ   ʔɔ̀ɔk   t'àlee
     'fisherman'   'take' 'boat'   'move out' 'lake'
     'Fishermen take the boat out of the lake'

In (1) ʔɔ̀ɔ k corresponds to something which can be
rendered by a verb in English whereas in (2) ʔɔ̀ɔ k seems
more readily translatable by a preposition. There are
many similar cases. Consider

(3) rótfay cà   t'ɯ̌ɯŋ   kruŋtêep pruŋníi   c'áaw
     'train''will''arrive''Bangkok''tomorrow' 'morning'
     'The train will arrive in Bangkok tomorrow morning'

(4) t'áhâan   k'âas ɯ̌ k t'ɔ̌y   t'ɯ̌ɯŋ   k'eetdɛɛn
     'soldier' 'enemy'   'retreat' 'arrive' 'frontier'
     'The enemy's soldiers retreated to the border'

(5) k'ǎw   càak   pay naan   lɛɛw
     'he/she''move away''go' 'long (of time)''already'
     'He left (=passed away) a long time ago'

(6) k'ǎw   pay càak   thîi   níi   naan lɛɛw
     'he/she''go''move away''place''this''long''already'
     'he left here a long time ago'

t'ɯ̌ɯŋ and càak in (3) and (5) behave very much the
way a verb is expected to behave in English whereas the
very same t'ɯ̌ɯŋ and càak in (4) and (6) rather seem to
behave like English prepositions.

Another usage of a movement verb in two different
functions may be observed in the following cases: First,
consider the uses of loŋ in (7) and (8).

(7) p'ǒm loŋ   pay k'âaŋlâaŋ   sɯ́ɯ nǎŋsɯ̌ɯp'im
     'I' 'move down''go' 'area at the   'buy' 'newspaper'
                          bottom of s.th.'
     'I go downstairs to buy a newspaper'

(8) p'ŏm kràdòot loŋ   (nay) mɛ̂ɛnáam
     'I'   'jump'   'move down' 'in'   'river'
     'I jump (down) into the river'

loŋ can be used as an independent verb and as such means
'move downwards' 'move towards a position lower than the
position before the movement starts'. As such it may be
used in a simple utterance like p'ŏm loŋ 'I go down' or
p'ŏm cà loŋ 'I will go down'. This is the use we also
encounter in (7), pay in (7) is used the same way as
càak in (6) which we said resembled the use of an
English preposition. Note that pay might be left out in
(7) and we would still have a grammatical, albeit less
idiomatic sentence.

(7a) p'ŏm   loŋ k'âaŋlâaŋ sɯ́ɯ nǎŋsɯ̌ɯ p'im
      'I go down to buy a newspaper'

In (8) we see loŋ joined to the verb kràdòot 'jump'.
Here loŋ may be likened to the English use of a verbal
particle as in go down, jump down, run down and so on.
In (8) loŋ cannot be dropped.

(8a) *p'ŏm kràdòot nay mɛ̂ɛnáam

would be ungrammatical whereas English I jump into the
river is perfectly acceptable. Similar uses can be
observed in the following pairs of sentences with the
path verbs k'ɯ̂n 'move up', k'âw 'move into' and k'âam
'move across'.

(9) k'ǎw   k'ɯ̂n   k'rɯ̂əŋ bin
     '(s)he' 'move upwards' 'airplane'
     'She/he goes aboard an airplane'

(10) ŋuu   lɯ̀əy   k'ɯ̂n   tônmáy
      'snake' 'crawl' 'move upwards' 'tree'
      'A snake crawls up a tree'

(11) k'ǎw   k'âw   bâan
      '(s)he' 'move into' 'house'
      'He/she enters/goes into the house'

(12) nók   bin   k'âw   maa   nay hɔ̂ɔŋ
      'bird' 'fly' 'move into' 'come' 'in' 'room'
      'A bird flies into the room' (where the person
      observing the event is located, hence the use of
      maa 'come').

(13) p'ǒm k'âam   sap'aan
     'I' 'move across' 'bridge'
     'I crossed a bridge'

(14) rótyon lɛ̂ɛn   k'âam   sap'aan
     'car' 'drive' 'move across' 'bridge'
     'A car drove across the bridge'

Also ʔɔ̀ɔk 'move out' which we observed in sentences (1)
and (2) can be used conjoined to another verb as in

(15) karunaa   ʔaw   nǎŋsɯ̌ɯ ʔɔ̀ɔk   maa
     'please' 'take/bring' 'book'   'move out' 'come'
     'Please bring the book' (taking it out of the thing
     in which it is contained when the sentence is being
     uttered).

just as k'âam 'move across' may be used in ways
resembling an English preposition similar to sentences
(2), (4) and (6) as in

(16) k'on   t'ay   cà   sâaŋ   sap'aan
     'human being' 'Thai' 'will' 'build' 'bridge'

     k'âam   mɛ̂ɛk'ǒŋ
     'more across' 'Mekong'

     'The Thai people will build a bridge across the
     river Mekong'

This multiple use of verbs is not restricted to movement
verbs expressing a path with regard to an object. It is
found also with pay 'go', for instance:

(17) p'ǒm c'ɔ̂ɔp pay dəən   nay pàa
     'I' 'like' 'go' 'walk' 'in' 'forest'
     'I like going for a walk in the forest'

(18) rótfay pay kruŋt'êep ʔɔ̀ɔk   weelaa hòk
     'train' 'go' 'Bangkok' 'move out' 'time' 'six'

     mooŋ   c'áaw
     'hour' 'morning'

     'The train for Bangkok will leave at six o'clock in
     the morning'

and with yet other verbs, e.g. pen 'be' (in the sense of
expressing being a member of a class):

(19) sŭïə   pen   sàt   dùrâay mâak
    'tiger' 'be'   'animal'   'wild' 'very'
    'The tiger is a very wild animal'

(20) p'ŏm tàt   kràdàat pen   rûup   woŋklom
    'I' 'cut' 'paper' 'be' 'picture' 'circle'
    'I cut a circle out of a piece of paper'

If we had just one or two cases like the ones given one
might settle for a solution which would consider the
different uses homonymous. As there are quite a few -
and many more can be given - we have to account for it
in a systematic fashion. Some Thai verbs allow for quite
a flexible range of uses which, when compared with
English word classes, correspond to main verbs,
particles accompanying verbs in complex expressions and
prepositions.

Marybeth Clark and Amara Prasithrathsint consider them
cases of "synchronic lexical derivation". In their view
the use of the lexemes not as a primary verb of a
proposition should be classified as a "preposition" and
they propose that these prepositions should be described
as zero-derivations from the lexemes used as primary
verbs of propositions. They also point out that there
are related parallel cases of the same lexeme being used
as a primary verb and as a preposition in other East
Asian and South East Asian languages, e.g. Khmer,
Vietnamese, Hmong and Mandarin. There also is according
to Clark and Prasithrathsint a further derivational
process which derives adverbs from verbs
(Clark/Prasithrathsint 1985).

Others have distinguished between primary and secondary
verbs (Haas 1964, XXII) or between verbs and co-verbs
and have considered constructions as given in examples
(2), (4), (6), (8), (10), (12), (14), (16), (18), (20)
as co-verb constructions or as serial verb constructions
(Kuhn 1990 on Vietnamese). We will later see that there
are yet other uses open to some Thai verbs. Most of the
examples discussed so far show verbs expressing a
movement - that is all except for pen - and most of the
motion verbs mentioned so far are verbs of motion
expressing the path a movement takes.

I will not go into a discussion of how the sentences
(2), (4) and (6) and so on should be analysed
syntactically, e.g. whether one should assume
subordination of a second proposition (with a second
verb) or zero-derived prepositions or particles,

respectively.

II

Leonard Talmy has proposed a typology of lexicalization of motion verbs. Talmy gives a model of descriptions of motion events. He distinguishes between something being in <u>motion</u> (vs. its being localized), the <u>figure</u> which is moving, the <u>ground</u> with regard to which it is moving, the <u>path</u> that the figure takes in motion with respect to the ground, the <u>manner</u> of the motion, and, finally, whether the description of the motion event contains an indication of its <u>cause</u> or not. E.g. in sentence (3) the figure is <u>rótfay</u> 'train', the ground is <u>kruŋt'êep</u> 'Bangkok', the fact of movement and the path taken are both contained in <u>t'ǔuŋ</u> 'arrive'. Manner and cause are not expressed in (3). Languages incorporate into the meaning of a motion verb other semantic factors besides motion itself. Talmy's typology maintains that languages show a preference for incorporating either the <u>manner</u> of motion into a monomorphematic motion verb, or the <u>path</u> of the motion with respect to the ground or the <u>figure</u> which is moving.[1]

Talmy describes Atsugewi, an Amerindian language in California as a typical language which incorporates the figure which is moving. That is, a monomorphematic verb in a description of a motion event will contain an indication of a quality of the figure in motion, e.g. its shape or its solidness or the like. In recent work on the typology of motion verbs mainly <u>path</u> and <u>manner</u> have been considered. Christoph Schwarze was able to show that Italian has about an equal amount of monomorphematic motion verbs which incorporate manner (Schwarze 1985). I was able to show that Japanese and Korean also belong to the path incorporating type of language (Wienold 1987). All of the languages which have a large amount of verbs lexicalizing the path of the motion, now, seem to have at least some amount of verbs which incorporate the manner of motion. That is, they have verbs for 'fly', 'swim', 'crawl', 'dance', 'walk' and the like. German, on the other hand, a language typically incorporating the manner of motion, practically has no motion verb incorporating the path at all. English does have quite a few, but most of them - expect for <u>rise</u> and <u>leave</u> - are of Romance origin. The

Italian and the German case, then, may indicate that
manner and path may play different roles in the typology
of lexicalization of motion verbs. Manner may be the
exclusive element which is incorporated into a
monomorphemic motion verb - as in the German case -, and
may be incorporated into a restricted group of motion
verbs as in the case of Japanese and Korean which are
typical path-incorporating languages, and it may be
lexicalized to such an amount that the typology may seem
to get blurred - as in Italian. On the other hand, in
studies done up to now no path-incorporating language
has been sighted which does not have at least a modest
amount of manner-incorporating verbs. As the number of
languages examined is quite small yet, however,
languages like this might easily come to light soon. Be
this as it may, the point I wish to argue is: Manner and
path in Talmy's typology are of different status. It is
not simply the case that a language will either
preferably incorporate manner into a motion verb or path
- or figure which I will not consider any further in
this study -, I would rather expect that the reasons for
a language to have manner incorporating verbs or path
incorporating verbs are independent of each other (cf.
also Wienold in print).

This discussion has taken us away from the Thai verbs
referred to in the beginning. But it was necessary to
prepare the ground for further discussion of them. Let
us first establish where Thai stands with regard to
Talmy's typology. As indicated in the beginning Thai is
rich in verbs of motion expressing a path.

(22)
k'âw	'to move into s.th.'
ʔɔɔk	'to move out of s.th.'
k'ǔɯn	'to move upwards'
loŋ	'to move downwards'
p'àan	'to move through s.th.'or 'to move past s.th.'
lôot	'to move through (under) s.th.'
lɘɘy	'to move past s.th.'
t'álú	'to move through s.th.'(possibly breaking it)
k'âam	'to move across/over s.th.'
t'ǔŋ	'to move towards, up to s.th.'
càak	'to move away from s.th.'
bùk	'to move forward' (restricted to certain uses like soldiers or tanks advancity, cf. also *bùkrúk* 'to invade, to trespass). In other situations one has to

use expressions like *pay/maa k'âaŋnâa* 'to go/come forward'

t'ɔ́ɔy   'to move backwards'
(*t'ɔ́ɔy* can freely alternate with *pay/maa k'âaŋlǎŋ* 'go/come backwards, i.e., one may say *p'ǒm t'ɔ́ɔy tǔŋ pràtuu* 'I move backwards the door' whereas *p'om bùk tǔŋ pràtuu* is not acceptable.)

klàp   'to move back to an earlier position', 'to return (home)'
hân   'to turn backwards'
taam   'to move along s.th.'
yaay   'to move from one place to another'
yɔ́ɔn   'to move against the current'

Monomorphematicity is also a true criterion for a basically still monosyllabic language like Thai. Monosyllabicity does not imply at all that there will be mostly monomorphematic lexicalizations in Thai: On the contrary, there are numerous instances of complex expressions made up of more than one monosyllabic morphemes having monomorphematic expressions corresponding to them in English, e.g. Thai <u>hua rɔ́</u> - engl. <u>laugh</u>, Thai <u>yókthoot</u> - engl. <u>forgive</u>. The finding, that we have monomorphematic lexicalizations of path in Thai movement verbs, then, cannot simply be explained by the monosyllabic structure of Thai.

Thai resembles very closely Korean and Japanese with regard to concepts lexicalized in motion verbs. There is however one difference. Many Thai path verbs can be used as intransitive verbs only. The subject of the verb refers to the figure in motion. There is only a limited list of path verbs (e.g. <u>lɔ́ɔk</u>, <u>klàp</u>, <u>k'ǔn</u>, <u>t'ɔ́ɔy hân</u>, <u>yaay</u>) (cf. also Clark/Prasithrathsint 1985, 45f.). Korean and Japanese, in general, have corresponding transitive verbs with the figure as object. The following is a sample list:[2]

(23)   Jap.   Kor.
              Non-Caus. Caus.   Non-Caus. Caus.

'upwards'   agaru   ageru   orŭda   ollida
'downwards'   oriru   orosu   naerida   naeryŏttŭrida,
                                                = naerida
'outwards'   deru   dasu   nada   naeda
'inwards'   hairu   ireru   tŭlda   nŏt'a, tŭrida
'around'   mawaru   mawasu   tolda   tollida
'through'   tooru   toosu   chinada   (chinaeda),
                                                chinagage hada
'across'   wataru   watasu   kŏnnŏda   kŏnnejuda
'across'   koeru/kosu koesasu   nŏmta   nŏmgida
(impediment)

Thai does not seem to have a very productive process
which would supplement the intransitive path verbs by
corresponding transitive ones. The way commonly used in
Thai in this respect seems to be independent transitive
lexicalizations. A sample of such transitive path verbs
looks like this

(24)
sày   'to put s.th. into' or 'to put on to s.th.'
luaŋ   'to reach into s.th.'
rɔɔŋ   'to put s.th. under s.th.'
kàp   'to put s.th. over s.th.'
sɔ̌ɔt   'to put s.th. in between'
kèp   'to put s.th. back, to put s.th. where it
             belongs'
wái   'to put away'
sîap   'to stick into'
t'ɛ̀ŋ   'to sting'

I give only examples for one of the verbs listed: luaŋ

(25) p'ǒm luaŋ   linc'àk hâa   k'ɔ̌ɔŋ
      'I' 'reach into'   'drawer' 'seek for' 'thing'
      'I searched for something in the drawer'

(26) p'ǒm t'ǔuk   luaŋ   kràpǎw kaaŋ keeŋ
      'I' 'suffer' 'reach into' 'pocket' 'trousers'
      'I suffered (someone) reached into (my) trousers'
      pocket'
      'Something has been stolen out of my trousers'
      pocket'

As I maintained earlier, that Bahasa Indonesia also has
movement verbs in corporating the path, I add the

following list here:

(27)
masuk	'to move into'
keluar	'to moveout of'
naik	'to moveup'
turun	'to movedown'
kembali/balik	'to move back to an earlier position'
pulang	'to move back home'
mundur	'to move backwards'
maju	'to move forward'
sampai	'to move up to'
tiba	'to move towards, to arrive'
lalu	'to move through'
melintasi	'to move across'
pindah	'to move from ... to'[3]

Let us take it an established fact, then, that Thai with
Japanese and Korean (and Malay/Indonesian) belongs with
the languages with a large number of path verbs. We
should also take note of the fact that Thai just as
Korean and Japanese has manner verbs, but not very many,
although may be a few more than those two languages.
Consider the following list.

(28)
dəən	'to walk'
wîŋ	'to run'
bin	'to fly'
lêɛn	'to drive' (can only be used of vehicles and is intransitive)
kràdòot	'to jump'
luy	'to wade'
k'laan	'to crawl'
tài	'to crawl, climb' (of small animals)
lɯɯy	'to crawl' (without having legs to use, that is of snakes, plants and the like)
wâay	'to swim'(commonly in the connection waay naam)
k'ɔ̂ɔp	'to gallop'
yɔ̂ɔŋ	'to creep, to sneak, to prowl'
kaaw	'to stride, to strut, to stalk'
see	'to sway'
ram	'to dance'
piin	'to climb'
klîŋ	'to roll'

This list is slightly longer than the corresponding
lists would be for Japanese and Korean which do not seem
to have monomorphemic manner motion verbs like luy,
k'ɔ̀ɔp, yɔ̀ɔ̀ŋ, kâaw, see (cf. Wienold in print). On the
other hand Thai does not have the abundance of manner
verbs like English stride, strut, stalk, stroll,
stampede or German sausen, rasen, hasten etc., which
indicates a strongly articulated manner language.

III

In earlier discussions of path verbs in Japanese and
Korean I suggested that the presence of a rich amount of
path verbs in these two languages is related to the
presence of relator nouns. These are not a separate
class of words but are nouns which may take the same
array of case particles like any other noun. Most of
them however are somewhat restricted in use as they will
occur either as second noun in a structure of the type
N-Relator-N or will from the context be easily
understood as representing the second position of such a
structure with the first one not actually filled in but
readily to be supplied from either linguistic or
situational context. What I have called 'Relator' is
Japanese no, Korean ǔi(e) which among its functions
includes the expression of possession. These nouns, if
related to a verb syntactically, express this
relationship by a case particle. That is they fill one
of the arguments of the frame of arguments open to a
specific verb. Prepositions like English and German
prepositions, on the other hand may open an additional
argument position for a verb next to the ones
expressible without prepositions. Relational nouns,
then, only semantically resemble prepositions, and only
partially, so, as they cannot express paths as
prepositions/postpositons can.

Now there are further restrictions in Japanese and
Korean. Quite a few spatial relations between the motion
of a figure and the ground which in German or English
can be expressed by prepositions do not have any
relational noun available, thus, there are no relational
nouns for 'through' 'across' 'over' (in the case of
movement), 'along' 'against' 'up to' 'at'. In such cases
we always find verbs which specify the motion's
relatonship to some ground, that is: the path.

Thai does have a few words which may best be classified
as prepositions. These items occur only immediately in
front of a noun phrase, they cannot be used as main
verbs or words conjoined to other verbs without a noun
phrase following. Neither can they be used as a noun.
That is I will analyse as Prep NP only expressions which
cannot be analysed as NP NP or V NP (contrary to, e.g.
Noss 1964, 146ff.). This group includes:

(29) bon   'on'
      nay   'in'
      rɔ̂ɔp   'around'
      kàp   '(jointly) with', 'together' (also one way
               of saying 'and')
      kɛ̀ɛ   'to' (for the recipient of an act, only with
               certain verbs, very restricted)

Besides these prepositions there are nouns which specify
spatial relationships with regard to a ground and which
may be considered relational nouns (cfl. also Kuhn
1989). They include:

(30) t'îi   'place' = 'at'
      k'âaŋ   'side' = 'beside, next to'
      tâi   'space below, south' = 'under'
      nɯ̌a   'space above, north' = 'above'
      t'aaŋ   'way, area' = 'in the area of'
      nâa   'face' = 'in front of'
      lǎŋ   'back' = 'behind'

k'âaŋ can also be combined with nâa, lǎŋ, bon, nay and
itself to specify places independent of a noun phrase.

(31) yɔɔn   bɔɔn   pay   k'âaŋ nâa
      'throw' 'ball' 'go'   'place in front'
      'Throw the ball forwards'

(32) yɔɔn   bɔɔn   pay   k'âaŋ lǎŋ
      'Throw the ball backwards'

For Thai, as for Japanese and Korean, I suggest that
there is a structural relationship between a rich
specification of motion verbs lexicalizing the path of a
motion and the limitations of prepositions and
relational nouns. Also for Bahasa Indonesia a list of
relator nouns-considered secondary prepositions by some
grammarians - can be supplied. Thai does share quite a
few other structural features with Korean and Japanese
but the typological differences are equally noteworthy:
SVO word order vs. SOV word order, isolating (or

polysynthetic) type vs. agglutinative type, strong
tendency to monosyllabicity in Thai (except for
compounds, obliterated compounds, loan words ...) vs.
polysyllabicity, no inflectional or derivational
morphology vs. rich inflectional and derivational
morphology, tone language vs. non-tone language, to
mention just a few. That is the strong similarity of
lexicalization pattern and structural corollaries in
Korean and Japanese and in Thai give strong support to
the hypothesis that this is a typological fact for which
a structural explanation may be expected. Further
support for this contention comes from quite a different
area of the world, that is from Central America, a
language called Tzotzil. In Tzotzil, again, we find no
prepositions and postpositions and a dearth of
relational nouns much bigger than in Thai or Korean or
Japanese and, again, path meanings lexicalized in
monomorphemic motion verbs (Aissen 1987).

Thai verb verb combinations as illustrated in section 1
can be paralleled to some extent by verb verb
combinations in Japanese and Korean. Unfortunately
limitations of space do not permit me to go into this
structural parallel.

1 There may be languages which do not incorporate other
  semantic information besides motion in movement verbs,
  languages, which would just have verbs meaning 'to
  move' and deictic movement verbs like <u>go</u> and <u>come</u>.
  Yupik may be such a language.

2 A rather complete list can be found in
  Wienold/Dehnhardt/Kim/Yoshida 1991.

3 This list is preliminary. It also needs discussion of
  the prefix <u>me</u> and the suffix <u>i</u> occuring in some cases.
  On these affixes cf. Dardjowidjojo 1978.

Aissen, Judith L. (1987) <u>Tzotzil</u> <u>Clause</u> <u>Structure</u>.
  Dordrecht: Reidel

Clark, Marybeth and Amara Prasithrathsint (1985)
  "Synchrone Lexical Derivation in Southeast Asian
  Languages", in: Suriya Ratanakul, David Thomas, and
  Suwilai Premsrirat (eds.), <u>Southeast</u> <u>Asian</u> <u>Linguistic</u>
  <u>Studies</u> <u>presented</u> <u>to</u> <u>André-G.</u> <u>Haudricourt,</u> Bangkok:
  Mahidol University, 34-81

Dardjowidjojo, Soenjono (1978) "Semantic Analysis of
  <u>datang</u> in Indonesian", in: Nguyen Dang Liem (ed.),
  <u>South-East Asian Linguistic Studies</u>, Pacific
  Linguistics C31. Canberra: The Australian National
  University, 1-23

Haas, Mary (1964) <u>Thai-English Student's Dictionary</u>.
  Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press

Kuhn, Wilfried (1989)"The so-called 'Relator Nouns' in
  Vietnamese", in: F.J. Heyvaert and F. Steurs (eds.),
  <u>Worlds</u> <u>behind</u> <u>Words:</u> <u>Essays in Honor of Prof.Dr. F.G.</u>
  <u>Droste</u> Leuven: Leuven University Press, 217-228

Kuhn, Wilfried (1990) <u>Untersuchungen</u> <u>zum</u> <u>Problem</u> <u>der</u>
  <u>seriellen</u> <u>Verben:</u> <u>Vorüberlegungen</u> <u>zu</u> <u>ihrer</u> <u>Grammatik</u>
  <u>und</u> <u>exemplarische</u> <u>Analyse</u> <u>des</u> <u>Vietnamesischen</u>.
  Tübingen: Niemeyer

Noss, Richard B. (1964) <u>Thai</u> <u>Reference</u> <u>Grammar</u>.
  Washington D.C.: Foreign Service Institute

Schwarze, Christoph (1985) "Uscire e andare fuori:
struttura sintattica e semantica lessicale", in:
Annalisa Franchi de Bellis and Leonardo M. Savoia
(eds.), Sintassi e morfologia della lingua italiana
d'uso: Teorie e applicazioni descrittive. Roma:
Bulzoni, 371

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

Wienold, Götz (1987) "Strukturelle Zusammenhänge
zwischen Lexikon, Syntax und Morphologie in
typologischer Sicht: Englisch und Deutsch im Vergleich
mit Japanisch und Koreanisch", in: Rudolf Böhm and
Hennig Wode (eds.), Anglistentag Kiel 1986, Gießen:
Hoffmann, 327-349

Wienold, Götz (1989) "Parallele semantische Strukturen
im Japanischen und Koreanischen", in: Irmela Hijiya-
Kirschnereit and Jürgen Stalph (eds.), Bruno Lewin zu
Ehren: Festschrift aus Anlaß seines 65. Geburtstages
Bochum: Brockmeyer, 1989, 425-453

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

Wienold, Götz, Annette Dehnhardt, Chin-Do Kim and
Mitsunobu Yoshida (1991) Lexikalische und syntaktische
Struktur japanischer und koreanischer
Bewegungsverben, Fachgruppe Sprachwissenschaft der
Universität Konstanz, Arbeitspapier No. 29

Wienold, Götz (in print) "Lexical and Conceptual
Structures in Expressions for Movement and Space (with
reference to Japanese, Korean and Thai)", in: Peter
Pause, Christoph Schwarze and Götz Wienold (eds.),
Lexical Meaning and Conceptual Structure Amsterdam:
Benjamins