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1. Introduction

In the domain of spatial relations, antonyms denote opposite orientations in space. As Lindner (1982) articulated, however, antonymous word pairs, such as ins and outs also have extended

1) This paper is a revision of Kwon (2007), ‘The Ins and Outs as Non-Opposites in Korean.’ The draft has been written for Linguistics 106 (George Lakoff, University of California, Berkeley, Fall 2007) and presented at High Desert Linguistics Society (University of New Mexico, November 4-6, 2010). I would like to thank George Lakoff, Eve Sweetser, and the audience from HDLS-2010 for their invaluable comments. Any error, of course, belongs to me.
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meanings which are not necessarily opposites and may indeed be quite close in meaning—for example, metaphoric origination-related or creation-related meanings. For instance, Lindner shows that defining semantic relation between lexical items such as in and out as opposite is the result of oversimplification:

(1) a. He filled in his registration card.
   b. He filled out his registration card.

This observation also seems to hold in Korean (I.-K. Kim 2009). Similarly, Korean speakers also take it for granted that the antonym of tul-ta (move.in-Decl) ‘in’ is na-ta (move.out-Decl) ‘out’ (2), but, we can see that it is not always the case as Lindner claimed in (3):

(2)a. kunye-nun ku-uy nwun pakk-ey na-ess-ta
    she-Nom his-Gen eye outside-Loc move.out-Ant-Decl
    “Lit. she went out of his eye (she became out of his concerns).”

b. kunye-nun ku-uy nwun-ey tul-ess-ta
    she-Nom his-Gen eye-Loc move.in-Ant-Decl
    “Lit. she came inside of his eye (she became his concern).”

(3)a. chelswu-nun pyeng-i na-ess-ta
    chelswu-Nom disease-Nom move.out-Ant-Decl
    “Lit. Disease went out (to) Chelswu (Chelswu became sick).”

b. chelswu-nun pyeng-i tul-ess-ta
    chelswu-Nom disease-Nom move.in-Ant-Decl
    “Lit. Disease came in (to) Chelswu (Chelswu became sick).”

It is not surprising that stems na- and tul- in (2) convey the opposite meaning: when na- ‘move.out’ is used, an entity is moving from inside to outside of a conceptual container (here, the range of the speaker’s eyesight) as shown in (2a) and when tul- ‘move.in’ is used,
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it indicates the reverse in (2b). (3a) and (3b), however, convey the non-opposite meaning: Both indicate that “Chelswu became sick,” even though the semantically opposite morphemes na- and tul- are used. In this vein, we can see that the stems can be interchangeably used in a context where they are construed as creation-related meanings such as ‘happen,’ ‘occur,’ ‘appear,’ ‘be generated,’ and so forth.

It is not the end of the story. Intriguingly, in Korean, there is subtle meaning difference, even though sentences containing the lexical items indicate that something happens or is generated. There are some cases where only one of the two markers is licensed. The main purpose of this study is to explicate conceptual motivations of the asymmetry, one of which is exemplified in (4):

(4) ku hwanca-ka samsip-pwun-tongan
    the patient-Nom thirty-minute-for
    cengsin-i    tul/?na-ess-e
    spirit-Nom    move.in/?move.out-Ant-Indic
    Lit. The patient’s spirit came in / out for 30 minutes.
    “The patient was conscious for 30 minutes.”

In (4), na- is not licensed under the same context where tul- is licensed. This is because predicate tul- is compatible with a durative adverbial, whereas the other predicate is not. In this respect, we can see that tul- and na- which are used as non-opposite senses have subtle semantic differences.

Following Lindner’s claim that central senses of lexical items determine their extended meanings, this paper argues that the two predicates tul- and na- in Korean encode subtle semantic differences due to their original semantic contrast, even when they are construed as their extended, non-opposite senses. This paper also looks into the distribution of these two predicates, exploring previously unrecognized aspects of their semantics, such as conceptualizations of causal structure, aspect, and factivity. Based on the discussion, this paper provides unified accounts of the distribution of the two predicates, investigating their central spatial image schema (Johnson 1987, Lakoff
The Author’s Copy

1987) and their (extended) meanings.

Section 2 will explore previous research on predicates *tul-* and *na-* in Korean and show that it needs to be revised. As a stepping stone, Section 3 provides descriptions of original meaning conveyed by the two predicates, i.e. when they are used as the opposite to each other, with examples to enhance understanding of their idiosyncratic properties. In Section 4, I will show that as Lindner observed, the two predicates can actually convey non-opposite meanings, especially when they construe as origination-related meanings. Based on the explications of the predicates as opposites and non-opposites, Section 5 discusses that there are subtle semantic differences that stem from the semantic difference between the original predicates’ meanings: when they convey origination-related meanings, only one of the two stems is licensed in some cases because of aspectual clash. I will employ a few diagnostic test frames to distinguish aspects of the two in the section.

2. Previous Approaches

Despite that image schematic analyses such as Lindner’s work are frequently discussed in more than a few works in Korean linguistics, there are very few motivated accounts for *na-* and *tul-* of non-opposites (I.-K. Kim 2009, K.-D. Lee 1996, inter alia). This section explores the most recent work of relevance by I.-K. Kim (2009) and discusses its shortcomings.2)

First of all, I.-K. Kim’s (2009) argues that we need to distinguish basic senses,3) which are spatial, from their extended senses, which are

2) One of reviewers suggested another recent work on the similar topic by Baek (2010). Baek’s work mostly focuses on the non-opposite meanings of the two stems in an abstract domain and how viewpoints affect their construal. Their subtle semantic difference as non-opposites, however, still has not been discussed in the literature.

3) A reviewer pointed out that the terms ‘basic sense’ and ‘original sense’ could be regarded as different. In this study, however, both ‘basic’ and ‘original’ senses refer to meanings that rely on basic schematic knowledge,
non-spatial. However, it does not seem clear that the basic senses by he meant by really refer to spatial notions. In his examples of basic senses, the following example is not spatial:

\[(5) \quad \text{nay pay-eyse kkolok-kkolok soli-ka} \]
\[\text{my belly-Loconomatopoeia sound-Nom} \]
\[\text{na-ess-ta move.out-Ant-Decl} \]
\[\text{Lit. Sound of hunger kkolok came out of my belly.} \]
\[\text{“I heard sound of hunger kkolok from the inside.”} \]

Strictly speaking, sound is not a spatial notion. Rather, (5) involves a conceptual metaphor SOUNDS ARE OBJECTS. In addition, (6a), one of his examples for the extended senses, does not seem to differ from one of his examples for the basic senses (6b):

\[(6)a. \quad \text{ku-nun ilccik camcali-ey tul-ess-ta} \]
\[\text{he-Nom early sleeping.place-Loc move.in-Ant-Decl} \]
\[\text{Lit. He went into his sleeping place.} \]
\[\text{“He went to bed.”} \]

\[b. \quad \text{nay catongcha-ka kocang-i na-ess-ta} \]
\[\text{my car-Nom mal.function-Nom move.out-Ant-Decl} \]
\[\text{Lit. A trouble came out to my car.} \]
\[\text{“I had my car broken.”} \]

If we conceptualize camcali ‘sleeping.place (bed)’ to be a container where a person gets into, I believe that (6a) is based on the spatial sense of tul-, not on its extended sense. In addition, (6b), an example of his basic senses does not seem to be spatial. In this vein, I.-K. Kim’s analyses of examples according to his own classification of the senses are neither consistent nor convincing. Following the basic idea as implied in Lindner’s work, this paper argues that basic senses are

which often is equivalent to core meanings of constructs in question.
based on spatial notions and their extended senses are, in fact, meanings related to origination and creation.

The second issue regarding I.-K. Kim’s analysis is the way that he models the two predicates’ semantic structures in terms of schemas as shown in Figure 1. He makes use of a notion of ‘gradation bar’ and tries to show the contrast between the lexical items of opposites and those of non-opposites.

According to his accounts, (a) denotes the two predicates’ meanings of opposites, whereas (b) denotes the two predicates’ neutralized synonymous meanings. It seems that his accounts are good enough to capture the contrast between the different readings. It is noted, however, that the two interpretations, i.e., opposites and non-opposites belong to the predicates’ polysemous semantic network.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
tulta \\
a. \\
b. \\
TULTA \\
n \\
NATA \\
\end{array}
\]

Figure 1. Gradation bar (I.-K. Kim 2009)

In other words, they are conceptually related meanings rather than synonymy, even though their apparent meanings are the opposite. Thus, his schematic accounts might not be the best way to represent the conceptual relatedness between the two interpretations. Considering the opposite directionalities of the arrows in (a) and (b) in the figure, it seems that there is no way to relate one reading to the other conceptually. This paper argues that we need to have a better way to represent their conceptual relatedness as well as the semantic relation between their original senses in terms of image schemas. This study provides motivated accounts of their schematic similarities by means of ‘frame of attention’ with which we can cognitively select portions that we would like to focus on (Section 4).
The last issue that the previous research does not seem to capture, which this paper mostly concentrates on, is the subtle differences of the extended meanings that is shown in (4) above. So to speak, na- and tul- encode different aspectual properties: tul- is compatible with resultative and durative aspects, whereas na- is not. This paper explores relevant semantic parameters such as aspectual properties of the predicates, presuppositional properties, etc. in order to provide more motivated accounts of the two predicates. Now, let us take a look at the basic properties of predicates tul- and na-.

3. Tul- ‘move.in’ and Na- ‘move.out’ as Opposites

Both the stems tul- ‘move.in’ and na- ‘move.out’ make conceptual reference to a CONTAINER schema in general, because concepts of INSIDE and OUTSIDE cannot exist without a concept of a container which has its boundary. Now, let us first take a look at semantic properties of tul-.

3.1 Meaning of Tul-

The stem tul- prototypically denotes that something that is originally not located inside of a certain container comes into the inside of the container and thus, comes into existence at the inside of the container or even changes the state of the container. This prototypical profiling can be metaphorically extended to various scenarios: the trajector (TR) can be a physical entity such as a person etc., or a metaphorically abstracted notion such as a disease, a spirit, etc., whereas the landmark (LM) can be a physical container such as a room, a human body etc., or an abstracted container such as a human eyesight etc. However, it is not hard to grasp the idea that all the extended scenarios rely on the basic image schematic scenario that tul- evokes: as something enters a container, the internal state of the container changes. This can be schematized as follows:
Let us say the little circle is a trajector (TR). As TR which was outside of the container comes into the container, the internal state of the container changes. In other words, the state of the inside changes from the state where the container does not have the TR to the state where it does include the TR. Note that the internal state of the container is focused (the dotted box in Figure 2; frame of attention (FOA)), not the outside state of the container. The seemingly various semantic properties of the stem *tul-* are based on the schema. Now, let us exemplify the schematic picture with linguistic expressions which contain the stem *tul-*. 

3.1.1 Chasing the TR’s trace

As mentioned above, expressions that include the stem *tul-* function either as depicting the way the TR moves (from outside to inside ) or as describing change of state which is caused by the TR’s existence. First of all, most of the expressions that contain the stem track the TR’s trace: the TR’s coming into a certain container as shown in Figure 2 is profiled in these expressions. They are exemplified as follows:

(7)   *ec*ey  *cip-an-ey*  *totwuk-i*  *tul-ess-ta*
     yesterday house-inside-Loc thief-Nom move.in-Ant-Decl

4) The notion of FOA is similar to Langacker’s notion of active zone (2002:190): “… [i]t is more accurate to think of it [the active zone] as the focal area of the relational interaction, the participation of a region becoming more tenuous the farther it lies from this focus.”
“Lit. A thief came inside the house yesterday (I got my house robbed by a thief).”

In (7), the TR is a person and the container is a house. The sentence denotes that the TR is inside of the container. Not only can this pairing of a person and place or group be used, but other pairings can also be in use. In (8), the TR is a city and weather’s influence range is the LM, i.e. the container:

(8) nayil sewul-un kokiap-uy
    tomorrow Seoul-Top high.pressure-Gen
    yenghyangkwen-ey tul-keyss-supnita
    range.of.effect.-Loc move.in-Fut-Decl [honorific]
    “Lit. Tomorrow, Seoul will go in the range of high pressure (Seoul will be affected by high pressure tomorrow).”

In this vein, we learn that expressions that use the stem tul- track the conceptual trace of the TR, which is coming into the container.

3.1.2. Change of the container’s internal state by the TR

On the other hand, the TR can result in a change of the container. In this kind of usage, the stem is mostly used in a metaphorical sense. The expressions can be shown as follows:

(9) i yak-i cal tul-e
    this medicine-Nom well move.in-Indic
    Lit. this medicine came in well
    “This medicine works well.”

(9) does not only describe that the TR is in the container, but also denote that there is a change of state to the container because of the TR’s existence in the container. In (9), the TR, namely medicine, comes into the container, supposedly my body, which yields the interpretation of ‘this medicine works well.’ In this vein, this type of
3.2 Meaning of Na-

The stem *na-* also conveys various polysemous meanings: it can denote a situation when something that underlies the surface protrudes and when the protrusion changes the shape of the surface; metaphorically, it denotes a situation when some event breaks out and when the event results in some significant change, especially when something is created from zero. The ‘something’ can vary from physical objects to abstract ideas which can be generated in a metaphorical sense, such as a path, a hole, sound, smell, taste, sweat, style, and so forth. Even though they seem to vary much, they are all extended from a basic schematic meaning: something is generated out of a certain source.

Let us say the little circle in Figure 3 is a trajector (TR). In stage (a), there is nothing outside of the container, at least in our attention. In stage (b), as the TR moves out of the container, state of the outside changes: from the state of zero to the state where the TR comes into existence at the outside of the container. Notice that the FOA is on the outside of the container where the TR comes out as shown in Figure 3 (the dotted box).

![Figure 3. Schematic Picture of na-](image)

Semantic properties of *tul-* are based on this schematic picture. Now, let us exemplify the schematization of the stem *na-*.
3.2.1. Chasing the TR’s trace

As shown above, the stem na- also tracks the TR’s trace. At this time, TR moves from the inside of the container to the outside. In this case, the external state of the container is focused (represented by the frame of attention (FOA) in Figure 2 and 3), which is different from the stem tul-.

\(\text{10) } \text{khong sim-un-ter} \text{ khong na-ko phath} \text{ bean plant-Conn-place} \text{ bean move.out-Conn red.bean} \text{ sim-un-ter phath na-n-ta} \text{ plant-Conn-place red.bean move.out-Imprf-Decl} \)

“Lit. Beans come out (of ground) where we plant beans and red beans come out (of ground) where we plant red beans (Beans are reaped where they are planted, so are red beans [Korean proverb: Every result has its cause]).”

In (10), it is described that the TR is not inside of the container (the ground) any more. Instead, it gets out of where it was, namely a container in the schema, and changes of the external state of the container by moving TR outside of the container.

3.2.2. Change of the container’s external state by TR

In the case of na-, the change of the container’s external state is focused. Otherwise, the stem na- would not convey the meaning of production or creation as shown below:

\(\text{11) } \text{nappu-n somwun-un kumpang na-n-ta} \text{ be.bad-Conn rumor-Top rapidly move.out-Pres-Decl} \)

“Lit. Bad rumors goes out rapidly (Bad rumors spread rapidly).”

\(\text{12) } \text{ku kikyey-nun khun soli-ka} \text{ the machine-Top loud sound-Nom} \)
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**na-n-ta**

**be.out**-Imperf-Decl

Lit. As for the machine, loud sound comes out of it

“The machine is noisy.”

Basically, sentences (11) and (12) mean that the TR comes into existence, which signals that the TR (metaphorically) appears outside the conceptual container. In this respect, we can account for how being out of the container can also imply change of the state.

4. *In* and *Out* as Non-Opposites in Korean: Shared Image Schema

As mentioned before, even though *na-* and *tul-* originally convey the opposite meanings, they can also be used in the similar context. Let us take a look at the cases where the two stems can be interchangeably used.

As shown in (1a) and (1b), it seems that *in* and *out* are to be interchangeably used in some contexts in English. In Korean, it seems that the stems *tul-* and *na-* can be replaced with each other in a certain context where they are interpreted as ‘happen,’ ‘appear,’ ‘be generated,’ ‘be yielded,’ and so forth:

(13) kulehkey cam-ul ca-cianh-umyen
    in.such.a.way sleep.n.Acc sleep.v-Neg-if
    pyeng-na/-tul-l-ci mol-la
disease-be.out/-be.in-Relativizer-Conn not.know-Indic

Lit. If you don’t sleep like that, disease will be out / in (my body)

“If you don’t sleep enough, you will get sick.”

(14) cengsin-i com na- / tu-ni?
spirit-Nom a little move.out/move.in-inter

“Lit. Is (your) spirit out / in? (are you up? or are you OK?).”
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As shown above, when we describe the state of human body with regard to various TRs such as disease, spirit, thought, idea and so forth, it seems that the two stems are interchangeable. The interchangeability comes from the shared schematic structure of the FOA in the image schemas of the two stems. This can be shown in Figure 4.

As shown in the figure, image schemas of in and out share the schema in common where the TR moves into the range of the FOA. The difference between the two cases is created due to the different position of the FOA. In the case of the stem tul-, the internal state of the container is focused, which licenses the interpretation of change of the internal state, whereas in the case of the stem na-, the external state of the container is focused.

The presence of the FOA enables us to explicate the phenomena in a more conceptually motivated way. By setting it up, we can account for how the extended senses of the two predicates become similar to each other. In addition, we can capture Lee’s (1996) observation that the starting point or the arriving point denoted by tulta and nata is the closed area.

*na*- ‘be.out’  
*tul*- ‘be.in’

Frame of Attention (FOA)  
Figure 4. The Shared Schema of In and Out
Next section shows, however, that even though the two stems are sometimes used interchangeably, they are different in their aspectual semantics.

5. Aspectual Differences

The two stems *tul-* and *na-* as non-opposites are, in fact, different in aspect. They are different in the followings:

- The conceptualized position of TR with regard to the container,
- Durative aspect,
- Presupposition of TR’s existence, and
- Factivity

In this section, I will show that the distribution of the two stems relies on their subtle aspectual meaning difference, which can be captured with the criteria above.

5.1. The location of TR with regard to the container

Even though the two stems can be interchangeably used due to the shared schema, there are some cases where the location of the TR matters. Let us take an example:

(15) *nay on mom-ey meng-i tul-/?na-ess-ta*
    my whole body-Loc bruise-Nom move.in/?move.out-Ant-Decl
    “Lit. bruise came in my whole body (I got bruises on my whole body).”

(16) *chelswu-nun kamki-ka simha-key tul- / chelswu-Nom cold-Nom be.severe-Adv move.in-/ na-ess-ta.*
    move.out-Ant-Decl
    “Lit. Cold came in severely (to) Chelswu (Chelswu caught a
In (15), the bruise is the TR. Since our common sense tells us that bruises are mostly caused by external (outside of body) impacts, it seems to be natural that the stem *tul*- is used in the sentence. In (16), the cold is a TR. Since when someone caught a cold, it is believed that cold is caused by an external factor such as low temperature and so forth, this way of construal in (16) seems to be natural. Note that the relative position of TR to a conceptual container contributes the construal of the sentences in these cases. So to speak, the distribution of the stems is determined by whether the cause of the events described in the sentences is external or internal with regard to the containers, namely, *my body* in (15) and (16).

However, the distribution due to the TR’s location with regard to the container does not seem to be clear, considering the following example:

(17) chelswu-ka pyeng-i *tul-/na-ess-ta*
    chelswu-Top disease-Nom move.in-/move.out-Ant-Decl
    “Lit. Disease came in / out (to) Chelswu (Chelswu became
sick).”

In (17), both stems are licensed. According to our observation above, the stem *na-* should not be used, because a disease is generally believed to an external TR. The stem is, however, licensed as shown in (17). Thus, it seems that we might not be able to cover the distribution of the stems only with the TR’s initial location with regard to the container. It is true that this criterion is a vital factor which determines the distribution, but we might need another criterion.

5.2. Durative Aspect

In a fine-grained sense, the sentence in (17) is to be construed differently. The contrast can be clearly shown with the following example:
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(18) camkkan pyeng-i na-(/tul)-ess-nuntey temporarily disease-Nom move.out-Ant-Conn
simha-ci anh-ta be.serious-Conn be.not-Decl
“Lit. Disease came out temporarily (to sb), but it is not serious (Somebody was sick, but it was not that serious).”

Considering (18), when the stem na- is used with pyeng ‘disease,’ it generally means that the degree of suffering is not significant. In contrast, when the stem tul- is used with it, it is likely to mean that the disease is quite serious. This example indicates that the stem tul- is not compatible with temporary or instant state of event, whereas the other stem na- is. If we say pyeng-i tul-ess-ta [disease-Nom move.in-Ant-Decl] ‘disease came in,’ the sentence is likely to mean that somebody is seriously sick of the disease and that the disease has affected somebody for a while.

Now, let us get back to (17), where both stems can be licensed. On the one hand, if the stem na- is licensed in this context, the sentence will be construed as an instantaneous event where Chelswu becomes sick. On the other hand, if the stem tul- is used in the context, the sentence will be interpreted as a resultative state of Chelswu. This can be tested in the following examples:

(19)a.?ku-nun kapcaki pyeng-i tul-ese
he-Top suddenly disease-Nom move.in-Caus
cwuk-ess-ta
die-Ant-Decl
Lit. Since disease came in, he died.

b. ku-nun kapcaki pyeng-i na-ese
he-Top suddenly disease-Nom move.out-Caus
cwuk-ess-ta
die-Ant-Decl
Lit. Since disease suddenly came out, he died
“He died, because he, all of a sudden, got infected with disease.”

As shown in translation above, it is noted that in (19) we are concerned only with the case where adverbial kapcaki ‘suddenly’ modifies tul- or na-, not cwuk ‘die.’ In (19), tul- seems to be more reluctant to be used with an instantaneous event and kapcaki ‘suddenly,’ whereas na- is compatible with them.5) In this vein, we see that although the two stems are licensed in the seemingly same circumstances, they have different aspectual readings: the stem na- seems to convey semantic properties of achievement (punctuality), whereas the stem tul- does not. The punctuality/ instantaneousness can also be diagnosed by tongan ‘for’ test as shown in (20):

(20)  ku hwanca-nun samsip-pwun tongan cengsin-i
the patient-Nom thirty-minute for spirit-Nom
tul-ess-e (/?na-ess-e)
moves.in-Ant-Indic (/?move.out-Ant-Indic)
“Lit. The patient’s spirit came in for thirty minutes (The patient was up for 30 minutes).”

In a normal context, (20) might sound weird. Given that there is a patient who falls into a coma and wakes up sporadically, however, the stem tul- is licensed and can be used with the durative adverbial phrase samsip-pwun tongan ‘for thirty minutes.’ The other stem na- is not licensed. Rhee (2008) noted that na- now is pervasively used as a perfective aspect marker in Korean. The fact that na- conceptually requires an instantaneous result is compatible with the

5) Regarding the unacceptability of (19a), one of reviewers commented that it is fully acceptable. I can see the reviewer’s caveat and it will be clearer when we look into corpus data. My claim is, however, that (19a) is relatively less acceptable than (19b) (with a question mark, not an asterisk). I do not mean that (19a) is ungrammatical, but make attempts to show that (19a) is not absolutely identical to (19b) in its acceptability.
grammaticalization path that the marker takes toward an perfective aspect marker.

In this respect, it seems that there is an aspectual difference between the two stems with regard to instantaneousness, which can be represented by means of image schema. In the figures below, a series of snapshots are put on a timeline \( t \). The snapshots capture image schematic scenes that are evoked by each predicate:

![Figure 5. Inchoative Aspect of \( na-\) ‘move.out’](image)

In Figure 5, it is shown that the predicate profiles the scenes where a trajector comes out, including the scene where only part of the trajector comes out of the container (as shown in the fourth scene). So to speak, although a scene, among the scenes corresponding to potential phases of the denoted event, indicates that the trajector does not completely come out of the container, the predicate still profiles the scene.

In contrast, the other predicate \( tul-\) profiles only from the stage where the trajector completely comes into the container. Namely, only the last two scenes are profiled as shown in Figure 6.

![Figure 6. Resultative Aspect of \( tul-\) ‘move.in’](image)

Notice that the fourth scene where only part of the TR comes into the container is not profiled. It indicates that the predicate \( tul-\)
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requires that the TR get completely inside the container and thus, its resultative aspectual sense arises from the complete containment. I argue that this subtle difference in profiling of the two predicates gives rise to the very subtle semantic difference – inchoative and resultative – in their extended meanings.

5.3. Presupposition of TR’s existence

The distribution of the two stems also depends on whether the TR’s existence is presupposed or not in our image schema. That is, the stem *tul-* ‘move.in’ saliently presumes the TR’s existence, whereas the other stem *na-* does not seem to necessarily presuppose it. The subtle meaning difference in (14) can also be an example of this criterion. Let us assume that there is a serious patient who fell into a coma and that (s)he woke up unexpectedly for the first time. In that case, we would use the stem *na-* and we are not likely to use *tul-*.

In contrast, if there is a patient who is expected to recover soon, we are more likely to use the stem *tul-*. When the speaker presupposes the metaphoric existence of TR, namely, spirit, (s)he is likely to use the stem *tul-*. In other words, if (s)he believes that the patient’s spirit is not gone away, but exists somewhere (of course in a way of metaphorical thinking), and if (s)he thus believes that the patient is recovering soon, she is likely to say the stem *tul-*. In contrast, if the speaker is not sure of the existence of the patient’s spirit, namely, if (s)he does not expect that the patient will be conscious again, (s)he would not use the stem *tul-*. This subtle meaning contrast can be maximized with the following example:

(21) ne-ka malha-n kulen sayngkak-un
you-Nom talk-Conn such idea-Top
cal an tul-e
well be.not move.in-Indic

“Lit. Such an idea that you said does not came in well (I don’t agree to such an idea that you said).”
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(22) ne-ka malha-n kulen sayngkak-un
    you-Nom talk-Conn such idea-Top
    cal an na-e
    well be.not move.out-Indic
    “Lit. Such an idea that you said does not come out well (I don’t agree to such an idea that you said).”

Even though the two stems are licensed in both examples above, (22) would convey the stronger nuance of disagreement. (21) indicates that the addressee could possibly have such an idea that he said, but that the idea is not the speaker’s. In contrast, since (22) does not merely negate the existence of the TR in the speaker’s head, but also negates the existence of the TR itself, (22) conveys stronger negation than (21) does. This contrast also can be shown in the following way:

(23) kulen sayngkak-i an tu-nun-ke-i
    such idea-Nom be.not move.in-pres-thing-Nom
    ani-la aye an na-e
    be.not-Conn ever be.not move.out-Indic
    “Lit. It is not that such an idea does not come in, but such an idea never comes out (It is not that I don’t agree to such an idea, but didn’t even think about agreeing to it).”

(24) ?kulen sayngkak-i an na-nun-ke-i
    such idea-Nom be.not move.out-pres-thing-Nom
    ani-la aye an tul-e
    be.not-Conn ever be.not move.out-Indic
    “Lit. It is not that such an idea does not come out, but such an idea never comes in (It is not that I don’t agree to such an idea, but didn’t even think about agreeing to it).”

Basically, (23) and (24) include metalinguistic negations. These sentences convey scalar negations so that the following clause should convey more information than the preceding clause. In other words, if
the sentence has to have both (23) and (24), (23) should precede (24). In this vein, those two stems convey aspeculal difference in that one presupposes the existence of the TR, whereas the other does not.

5.4. Factivity

There is another criterion, when we extend our hypothesis of temporal instantaneousness and the presupposition of the existence of TR to factivity. That is, when the two stems are used with nouns which are related with regretting such as hwu hoy, ‘regret,’ kiek, ‘memory,’ and so forth., this aspeculal difference in temporal instantaneousness will result in another aspeculal contrast in factivity. Since factive predicates presuppose that relevant events have happened previously, the stem na-, which is not compatible with duratives, is expected not to be compatible with them. Examples can be shown as follows:

(25) kukes-ul ha-ci anh-un kes-eytayhan
   it-Acc do-Conn not-Conn thing-about
   hwu hoy-ka tul-ess-ta (?na-ess-ta)
   regret-Nom move-in-Ant-Decl
   “Lit. Thought that (my) not doing it is regrettable comes in
   (I regret that I did not do it).”

In (25), the stem tul- seems to presuppose that TR has existed quite for a while and thus, it goes well with the factive noun hwu hoy, ‘regret.’ In contrast, the other stem na- is not licensed. These data might support the claim that factivity is another criterion for the distribution of the two stems.

In this section, we have discussed the four criteria which determine the distribution of the two stems tul- and na-, when they mean something like ‘happen.’ We have also shown that there exist some cases where the two stems can be interchangeably used, but that they are subtly different in their aspectual meaning. In order better to grasp it, the discussed criteria are needed, which can be recapped as follows:
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Table 1. Semantic Criteria for Distribution of \textit{na-} and \textit{tul-}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. The conceptualized position of TR with regard to the conceptual container</th>
<th>b. Durative aspects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Outside: \textit{tul-}  
Inside: \textit{na-} | punctuality/ instantaneousness (achievement): \textit{na-}  
non-instantaneousness: \textit{tul-} |
| c. presupposition of the existence of TR | d. factivity |
| non-presupposed: \textit{na-}  
presupposed: \textit{tul-} | non-factivity implied: \textit{na-}  
factivity implied: \textit{tul-} |

Note that the conceptual motivation underlying the four subtle meaning differences of the predicates relies on which portion of the aspectual scenes evoked by the lexical items is profiled, as argued in showing Figures 5 and 6 in this section.

6. Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we have explored that Lindner’s (1982) observation also holds in Korean – prepositions \textit{in} and \textit{out} can be used interchangeably in some contexts, considering the distributions of stems \textit{tul-} ‘move.in’ and \textit{na-} ‘move.out.’ Furthermore, we have seen that they also can be interchangeable when they mean ‘happen.’ This paper argued that the interchangeability can be appropriately accounted for with the location of frame of attention (FOA) in section 3.

This paper argued, however, that in a fine-grained sense, even though the two stems seem to be apparently interchangeable, they have aspectual differences as Lindner hinted in her work that extended meanings of lexical items are motivated by their original construction meanings. They subtly differ in that the stem \textit{na-} is compatible with instantaneousness just like achievement predicate, whereas the other stem \textit{tul-} is not. In addition, this paper also showed that the stem \textit{tul-} presupposed passage of a certain amount time and existence of TR.
Thus, the distribution of the two stems can be related with factivity. This paper discussed another case of numerous pervasive phenomena over languages that shows concepts and image schemas underlie and motivate both original constructions and their extended meanings. Since it is not a rare phenomenon that lexical items in and out are grammaticalized into aspect markers (e.g., Quechua (Weber 1989); -rqU ‘out’ (having happened with remarkable speed); -ykU ‘in’ (perfective)), it will be interesting to look into cross-linguistic patterns of the constructions over languages to see how differently a certain portion of aspectual scenes is profiled.

**Abbreviation**

Acc: Accusative  Adv: Averbializer  Ant: Anterior
Caus: Causative  Conn: Connective  Decl: Declarative
Fut: Future  Gen: genitive  Imprf: Imperfective
Indic: Indicative  inter: interrogative  Loc: locative
Neg: negativizer  Nom: nominative  Top: Topic
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