Pentti Haddington, Jarmo H. Jantunen and Jari Sivonen

Language and Affect: *Go-Say* and *Come-Say* Constructions in Finnish

Abstract

This paper studies two linguistic constructions in Finnish, the *go-say* construction and the *come-say* construction. Both constructions contain a motion verb and a speech act verb in the 3rd infinitive illative case. The article focuses specifically on how the constructions express a speaker's or writer's affective stance. The analysis in this paper is inter-linguistic and it relies on the theories and methods used in corpus linguistics, interactional linguistics and cognitive semantics. This paper analyses, describes and explains the collocational, social and cognitive motivations behind the affective meanings of these constructions. Finally, it discusses the benefits and challenges of combining three different linguistic theories and methodologies in the analysis of a linguistic construction.

1. Introduction[1]

In this article, affect is understood as an element of the broader phenomenon of stance and stance taking in interaction and discourse. By affect we mean the ways in which speakers or writers express their own or describe someone else's emotional attitude through language, in talk or writing. Affect has interested linguists broadly and studies have shown how language can be used to express a speaker's or writer's affect in different ways. For example, studies have shown how such linguistic markers as some adverbs, verbs and adjectives, inherently express affect (see e.g. Biber & Finegan 1989; Martin 2000; Precht 2003). Others have shown how certain markers, grammatical forms or linguistic practices are functionally used to express a speaker's affective stance in discourse (e.g. Du Bois

---

2007; Englebretson 2007; Keisanen 2007).[2] This article analyses two linguistic constructions in Finnish whose individual formal structures do not inherently have an affective meaning, but which based on our empirical analyses belongs to the structures' meaning potential. Thus the structures are used for expressing affect. In general this paper uses several linguistic methodologies to explain why and how the two structures possess affective meaning.

We call these two constructions the *go-say* construction and the *come-say* construction. They are composed of a motion verb, either *mennä* 'go' or *tulla* 'come', which is accompanied by a speech act verb (such as *kertoa* 'tell' or *sanoa* 'say') in the 3rd infinitive (or so-called MA-infinitive) illative case, as in *mennä kertomaan* 'to go and tell' and *tulla sanomaan* 'to come and say'. Their formal structure is described in (1) and (2).[3]

(1)   *mennä* 'go' + speech act verb in the 3rd infinitive illative case
        e.g.   *mennä   kerto-ma-an*
               go   tell-INF-ILL
               'go and tell'

(2)   *tulla* 'come' + speech act verb in the 3rd infinitive illative case
        e.g.   *tulla   sano-ma-an*
               come   say-INF-ILL
               'come and say'

This study focuses exclusively on these two deictic motion verbs for the following three reasons. First, according to Saukkonen et al. (1979) and the list of the most frequent words in Finnish newspapers,[4] they are the most frequently used deictic verbs of motion in Finnish. Second, according to our corpus data only these verbs among motion verbs (compared to others such as *lähteä* 'to leave', *rientää* 'to hasten', and *rynnätä* 'to burst') are repeatedly used with speech act verbs in affective constructions. In other words, if other motion verbs occur together with speech act verbs they tend to maintain the concrete meaning of motion. Third, by concentrating on these two structures we can analyse them from a detailed, inter-linguistic and multi-methodological vantage point.

---

[2] For overviews see Englebretson (2007) and Haddington (2005).
[3] See Appendix 2 for gloss conventions.
[4] See http://www.csc.fi/tutkimus/alat/kielitiede/taajuussanasto-B9996/view (accessed August 29, 2011).

These types of structures have been studied in different languages and labelled under the terms of hendiadys (Hopper 2001), pseudo-coordinative structures and simple juxtapositions (Stefanowitsch 1999; Payne 1997: 337–338; Airola 2007). However, as Stefanowitsch (1999: 123) argues, these studies tend to focus on the structures' formal properties. In this paper, we study how these structures can be seen to be combinations of form and meaning, and for referring to this combination we use the notion "construction". According to Goldberg's (1995: 4) definition, an essential criterion for a construction is that its semantic properties are not strictly predictable from the construction's individual elements. Consider example (3) below.

(3) *Kaveri-ni Roope   laske-e   juo-nee-nsa   maailma-lla ainakin*
     friend-1PX Roope   count-3SG drink-PTCP-3PX world-ADE   at.least
     viittäsata-a   eri   kahviplaatu-a. Vain Suome-ssa   häne-lle
     five.hundred-PTV   different coffee.brand-PTV only Finland-INE he-ALL
     on   tul-tu   päin   naama-a   selittä-mä-än, että meikäläinen
     be.3SG **come-PTCP** against face-PTV **explain-INF-ILL** that our
     hölli   on   maailma-n   paras-ta.
     coffee be.3SG   world-GEN   best-PTV
     'My friend Roope estimates that he has drunk at least five hundred different coffee brands around the world. Only in Finland people have come and claimed to him that Finnish coffee is the best in the world.'

The example exhibits the following syntactic form: a motion verb *tulla* 'come' followed by a speech act verb in the 3rd infinitive illative case. However, although the structure contains the motion verb, it seems that here the verb has lost its meaning of concrete movement. One explanation is that in the described situation the Actor[5] (not specified in (3) due to passive voice),[6] who has produced the speech act (*selittää* 'explain') that

---

[5] We use the notion "Speaker" to indicate a person who has produced the analysed utterance and who through this utterance evaluates another person's speech act. For example, the person who has uttered example (3) is the Speaker. "The Actor", on the other hand, refers to the person whose speech act is retrospectively referred to by the Speaker. The Actor's speech act is thus evaluated by the Speaker via the *go-say* and *come-say* constructions. In example (3), the Actor is the implicit person who has told Roope that Finnish coffee is the best. "The Addressee", for its part, is the person the Actor is talking to in the examples. In example (3), the Addressee is Roope.

[6] Passive voice in Finnish allows the (human-agent) subject to remain unspecified yet existing (for Finnish passive, see Shore (1988)). This explains the presence of an implicit Actor in the example.

the Speaker reports, is positioned next to Roope and talking to him about Finnish coffee brands and therefore has not moved before producing his utterance. Consequently, rather than expressing motion, the verb *tulla* in this construction has another semantic function: the Speaker's affective evaluation of the Actor's conversational manner as belligerent. Of course, this aggressive tone gets supplementary emphasis in (3) from the adverbial modifier *päin naamaa* 'at his face'.

Such semantic change in motion verbs is not a new finding. Givón (1973) notes that in the world's languages motion verbs frequently undergo semantic developments: they lose the meaning of motion and start to express other semantic properties. It seems that the *go-say* and *come-say* constructions stand as good examples of such changes. It should be borne in mind, however, that the *go-say* construction and the *come-say* construction do not have affective meanings as such, because they may also refer to concrete motion which is followed by a speech act, and these are quite neutral per se. Thus, the affective readings studied in this paper are due to different (textual or social) contexts in which these constructions are used. In the following, the aim is to describe how these constructions' affective meanings are evident in the data and to explain possible reasons behind such semantic change.

Although the verbs *mennä* 'go' ja *tulla* 'come' are basic deictic verbs in Finnish and form an intrinsic semantic pair, they are by no means semantically symmetric. They differ in meaning both in their concrete and figurative usages. For example, in the concrete sense, the verb *mennä* is said to express more extensive motion along the path than the verb *tulla* (Huumo & Sivonen 2010: 113). Also in dictionaries these two verbs are listed to have clearly different sets of meaning types. For instance, a recent and comprehensive dictionary of Finnish gives more figurative meaning types to the verb *tulla* compared to the verb *mennä* (KS s.v. *mennä*, *tulla*).

The analysis in this paper is inter-linguistic. It relies on theories and methods used in three different linguistic paradigms: corpus linguistics, interactional linguistics and cognitive semantics. It uses corpus linguistic methods to study the frequencies and phraseological uses of the constructions and in that way sheds light on the constructions' affective meanings. The interactional linguistic method is used to investigate the social and interactional contexts in which the constructions are used and to see whether these contexts of use, for their part, can explain the affective meanings of the constructions. Finally, by using cognitive semantics, this article tries to provide an explanation of the constructions' affective

meanings. The analysis will also show that although both of these constructions express affect, they differ in how frequently they do that, in what contexts they appear and what the cognitive motivations behind the affective meanings are.

This paper is divided into six sections. After the introduction, Section 2 describes the used databases and provides some further background to our approach. Section 3 gives a corpus-based analysis of the *go-say* and *come-say* constructions. In Section 4, we analyse how the constructions are used in everyday conversation. Then, in Section 5, our focus turns to the semantic motivation of these constructions within the framework of cognitive semantics. In the last section we briefly sum up our conclusions and then discuss the benefits and challenges involved in using three methodologies for studying the same linguistic constructions.

2.   Data and methodologies: three approaches to form and meaning

The analysis in this paper is empirical and relies on several digital language databases. In Sections 3 and 5, the examples come from written language data collected from The Finnish Language Bank.[7] This material consists of volumes of four Finnish newspapers and the size of this database is approx. 60 million words. The newspapers are published in different dialect areas in Finland. The normed frequency of the constructions (i.e. the structures with affective meaning) in written data was 4.8 per million words (1/205479), the absolute frequencies being 196 for the *go-say* construction and 93 for the *come-say* construction.

The spoken language data come from several audio corpora. The first database is the corpus of conversational Finnish located at the Department of Finnish Language and Literature at the University of Helsinki.[8] It consists of face-to-face and telephone conversations from various dialect areas in Finland. These data are supplemented by a collection of mobile phone recordings and two short audio recordings located at the University of Oulu. The overall duration of the everyday conversational data is 10 hours and 3 minutes, which amounts to approximately 120 000 words (approx. 200 words per minute). We have also made a search for the

---

[7]   See   http://www.csc.fi/english/research/sciences/linguistics/index_html   (accessed August 29, 2011).

[8] In all, the corpus contains approximately 340 hours of conversational Finnish. See http://www.helsinki.fi/hum/skl/tutkimus/kesk_arkisto.htm (accessed August 29, 2011).

constructions in the Finnish Broadcast Corpus,[9] which contains approx. 17 hours of broadcast talk and unfinished recordings of various radio and TV monologues and dialogues. The normed frequency of the constructions in spoken data was 141.7 per million words (1/7060). All the constructions were collected from the databases and transcribed.

The analysis in the article relies on the methods used in corpus linguistics, interactional linguistics and cognitive semantics. The basic starting points of these approaches are different. Corpus linguistics uses large corpora to unravel how the meanings of linguistic forms emerge from their frequent use in discourse. Interactional linguistics studies how social actions and activities are accomplished through different linguistic practices and thus how different linguistic items receive their meaning through frequent use in everyday interaction. Finally, cognitive semantics shows how language use and meaning reflects the ways in which individuals conceptualise their perceptual experience in the world. Despite the differences, these approaches are all usage-based and empirical, and aim to investigate the relationship between form and meaning.

Our aim is to put these three linguistic approaches together on the same ground with the hope that through the analysis of the two constructions we can take a small step towards improving our understanding of the relationship between linguistic constructions, cognition and language in use. This is not the first paper to undertake such a task. For example Biber & Jones (2005) and Fillmore (1992) have discussed how different linguistic approaches could be used or merged for the benefit of getting a better understanding of language.[10] More in line with the current paper, Etelämäki et al. (2009) provide an important theoretical discussion of the possible ways to integrate the cognitive linguistic and conversation analytic terminological toolbox (e.g. "conceptualisation" and "social action") for getting a more elaborated understanding of the relationship between form and meaning. One of the major advantages of such inter-linguistic studies is that the analyses are based on different types of corpora (large corpora and more detailed interactional data). This means that the findings are potentially more generalisable than findings based only on introspection and provide a detailed understanding of their use in discourse. Conversely, empirically informed introspection as the main methodology of cognitive semantics can

---

[9] See http://www.csc.fi/kielipankki/aineistot/puhe.phtml (accessed August 29, 2011).
[10] See also Arppe & Järvikivi (2006), Gilquin & Gries (2009) and references therein, and Couper-Kuhlen & Kortmann (2000).

provide an understanding of the cognitive motivation behind the meanings of the constructions, i.e. how the individuals' experiences as beings in the world contribute to the meanings of these constructions.

3. *Come-say* and *go-say* constructions in corpus data

In this section, the *come-say* and *go-say* constructions are analysed as cotextual units, and both the variation in the constructions themselves and in their cotext are taken into account. It is argued in line with Sinclair (1991, 1998), Tognini-Bonelli (2002) and Stubbs (1995a, 2001) that form and meaning are systematically interconnected and that words and expressions "do not live in isolation but in strict semantic and functional relationship with other words" (Tognini-Bonelli 2002: 91) or structures. The analysis of so-called extended units of meaning, i.e. words or structures with their contextual and functional information, challenges the traditional view that words are memorised as single units. Rather, corpus linguistics assumes that they are memorised as prefabricated phraseological units with lexical, grammatical, semantic and functional information encoded in them (see e.g. Erman 2007: 26). The latter view to words and structures follows Sinclair's (1991) hypothesis of the idiom principle, which stresses the fixedness in language and strong co-selection of items. During the last 20 years, corpus linguistic research has shown that the use of large databases reveals different kinds of "hidden" lexico-grammatical and lexico-semantic choices in a language. These idiomatic patterns do not seem to be as marginal phenomena in language as has been assumed. On the contrary, prefabricated structures and fixed expressions, i.e. structures following the idiom principle, are core elements in native speakers' language production and stored as wholes in native speakers' memory (Sinclair 1991; cf. also Erman 2007).

The co-selectional approach to investigating words and expressions involves at least five levels of analysis: the core itself, its collocational and colligational choices, and the semantic preference and semantic prosody of the item. The collocational choice is a rather concrete co-occurrence of words in the syntagmatic dimension, and it is usually analysed using statistical methods (cf. Stubbs 1995a, 1995b; Barnbrook 1996). The other syntagmatic relations are more abstract: Colligation is not a relation between two words, but a relation between a word and grammatical classes in its cotext. Semantic preference, in turn, refers to a word's regular co-occurrence with items that share a certain semantic feature, and semantic

prosody is usually defined as a co-selection of an item and a negative or positive (or neutral) meaning (or cotext) that surrounds that item. (Sinclair 1998; Stubbs 2001).[11]

The following sections focus on collocations and the semantic syntagmatic patterning (i.e. semantic preference and prosody) of the *come-say* and *go-say* constructions. It is claimed that corpus analysis is able to reveal repeated syntagmatic cotextual patterns that are typical to these constructions and that these patterns can be used to explain the affective meanings of the constructions. Before doing the cotextual analysis, it is worth investigating the lexical meaning of the speech act verbs used in both constructions.

3.1   The lexical meanings of speech act verbs in the *come-say* and *go-say* constructions

In the following, the 93 speech act verbs that are used in the *come-say* constructions are arranged into different semantic sets (see Table 1). The most common speech act verb used in this construction is SANOA[12] 'to say, tell'. When SANOA is related to other semantically close verbs (like PUHUA 'to speak', SELITTÄÄ 'to explain', KERTOA 'to tell' and ESITTÄÄ 'to suggest'), we get a semantic preference[13] 'telling' which is the most common semantic preference of the verbs used in the *come-say* construction: 44% of all the speech act verbs share this meaning. The concordance lines also provide evidence of other, but less frequent, semantic sets. The verbs that belong to the semantic preference of 'telling' have a relatively neutral lexical meaning in terms of how they indicate speaker attitude. Another set of neutral verbs constructs a semantic preference of 'asking'. The other verb sets, however, include verbs which clearly express speaker attitude. The semantic preferences 'asking for trouble', 'complaining', 'criticising', 'demanding' and partly 'dictating' are all verb sets that consist of lexemes containing unpleasant or negatively

---

[11] For more precise definitions of the cotextual restrictions, see, for example, Stubbs (1995a), Sinclair (1996, 1998), and Tognini-Bonelli (2001). For semantic prosody, see also Whitsitt (2005) and Hunston (2007).

[12] Capitalised forms denote a lemma, i.e. the abstraction of all word forms.

[13] Semantic preference is originally a relation between the node and a set of collocations. Here the verb *tulla* is perceived as the node and speech act verbs as its collocates; later in Section 3.3, the whole structure (*tulla/mennä* + speech act verb) is seen as node.

evaluative meanings. Thus, it seems that verbs used in the *come-say* construction are mostly either neutral or negative in their meaning: the proportion of verbs counted in the sets listed in Table 1 is as high as 99% (n=92) of all the verbs in the construction. Verbs expressing positive attitude (only KIITELLÄ 'to thank' and HEHKUTTAA 'to boost or cheer in a positive manner' in the data) are, then, very rarely used in the *come-say* construction.

Table 1. Semantic preferences of the verb TULLA 'come' in the *come-say* construction (frequency and per cents)

Semantic preference	Speech act verbs in *come-say* construction
'telling' 41 (44%)	SANOA 'to say' 25, PUHUA 'to speak' 6, SELITTÄÄ 'to explain' 5, KERTOA 'to tell' 4, ESITTÄÄ 'to express' 1
'asking for trouble' 15 (16%)	HAUKKUA 'to tell off' 2, VÄITTÄÄ 'to insist' 2, HAASTAA RIITAA 'ask for trouble' 1, RYPPYILLÄ 'to argue against, gripe' 1, RÄHISTÄ 'to brawl' 1, SOITTAA SUUTA 'to blather' 1, HUUTAA 'to yell' 1, RÄKYTTÄÄ 'to blather' 1, INTTÄÄ 'to argue' 1, INISTÄ 'to whine' 1, SÖNKÄTÄ 'to stutter' 1, NIMITELLÄ 'to call sb names' 1, SYYTTÄÄ 'to blame' 1
'complaining' 11 (12%)	VALITTAA 'to complain' 9, KITISTÄ 'to whine' 1, RUIKUTTAA 'to whine' 1
'asking' 9 (10%)	KYSYÄ 'to ask' 6, KYSELLÄ 'to ask around' 2, TIEDUSTELLA 'to ask' 1
'dictating' 7 (8%)	SANELLA 'to dictate' 2, KOMENTAA 'to command' 2, JAKAA OHJEITA 'to brief' 1, MÄÄRÄTÄ 'to command' 1, NEUVOA 'to advice' 1
'criticising' 5 (5%)	ARVOSTELLA 'to evaluate' 2, KRITISOIDA 'to criticise' 1, HUOMAUTTAA 'to remark' 1, HUOMAUTELLA 'to make remarks' 1
'demanding' 4 (4%)	MANKUA 'to implore' 1, VAATIA 'to demand' 1, PYYTÄÄ 'to request' 1

The verb MENNÄ in the *go-say* construction also has a clear preference for a more or less neutral semantic preference of 'telling': 46% (n=90) of all the verbs in that construction share a meaning of 'telling' something. Similarly with the *come-say* construction, the verb SANOA is overwhelmingly most

frequent. Table 2 displays the speech act verbs that belong to this semantic set and the other semantic preferences of MENNÄ. However, none of the other preferences is as frequent as the semantic preference of 'telling'. Semantic preferences listed in Table 2 cover as much as 83% (n=163) of all the meanings of the verbs used in this construction.

Table 2. Semantic preferences of the verb MENNÄ 'go' in the *go-say* construction (frequency and per cents)

Semantic preference	Speech act verbs in *go-say* construction
'telling' 90 (46%)	SANOA 'to say' 72, KERTOA 'to tell' 10, PUHUA 'to speak' 5, LAUSUA 'to pronounce' 1, MAINITA 'to mention' 1, SELITTÄÄ 'to explain' 1
'promising' 16 (8%)	LUVATA 'to promise' 13, LUPAILLA 'to promise' 3
'suggesting' 14 (7%)	ESITTÄÄ 'to present' 5, NEUVOA 'to advise' 4, EHDOTTAA 'to suggest' 2, SUOSITELLA 'to recommend' 1, KEHOTTAA 'to urge' 1
'criticising' 12 (6%)	ARVOSTELLA 'to evaluate' 4, MOITTIA 'to blame' 3, TUOMITA 'to denounce' 2, KOMMENTOIDA 'to comment' 1, VÄHEKSYÄ 'to belittle' 1, KRITISOIDA 'to criticize' 1
'predicting' 11 (6 %)	ARVIOIDA 'to estimate' 4, ARVAILLA 'to guess' 3, ENNUSTELLA 'to predict' 2, ENNAKOIDA 'to foresee' 1, SPEKULOIDA 'to speculate' 1
'swearing' 6 (3%)	VANNOA 'to swear' 6
'confessing' 5 (3%)	TUNNUSTAA 'to confess' 5
'praising' 5 (3%)	KEHUA 'to praise' 2, KEHAISTA 'to praise' 1, KIITELLÄ 'to thank' 1, LEUHKIA 'to boast' 1
'denying' 4 (2%)	KIISTÄÄ 'to deny' 3, KIELTÄÄ 'to deny' 1

Tables 1 and 2 clearly show that the semantic sets of verbs in the *go-say* construction differ from the ones of the *come-say* construction. First of all, in the *go-say* construction there are only two sets of verbs that have a clear negative lexical meaning: verbs denoting the meanings 'to criticise' and 'to deny'. Other semantic preferences of this construction are more or less neutral or positive in lexical meaning; in fact, the semantic preference 'praising' is a surprisingly positive, yet a relatively small group of verbs compared to the semantic preferences of the *come-say* construction. Consequently, it seems that the *come-say* construction tends to contain more negatively evaluative speech act verbs than the *go-say* construction.

3.2   Collocations of *come-say* and *go-say* constructions

The initial collocation sets for both constructions were retrieved within the span of four words from both sides of the constructions. In order to avoid idiosyncrasies and rare word combinations, only words occurring at least five times in the span are counted. This filtering generates 25 collocation candidates for the *come-say* construction and 17 for the *go-say* construction. To find the statistically significant collocates, i.e. to avoid taking into consideration collocations which might exist in the span due to chance, also statistical tests are computed. This analysis follows Stubbs's (1995a: 40–41) suggestion that the results of two significance tests, e.g. MI-test (Mutual Information test) and t-test, are probably needed to identify linguistically interesting collocations. Using more than one significance test can balance the picture of collocates (Barnbrook 1996: 101).[14] Table 3 displays the collocates that have passed both of the two significance tests.

Table 3. The significant collocates of *come-say* and *go-say* constructions

Collocates of *come-say*	F	MI	t	Collocates of *go-say*	F	MI	t
KUKAAN 'no-one'[*]	19	6.77	4.32	PAHA 'bad, difficult'	23	5.77	4.71
JOKU 'someone'	14	5.97	3.68	MIKÄÄN 'nothing'[**]	18	3.89	3.96
MINÄ 'I'	11	4.39	3.16	VAIKEA 'difficult'	17	4.69	3.98
ME 'we'	10	3.67	2.91	PITÄÄ 'must'	16	3.60	3.03
SITTEN 'then'	7	3.16	2.35	JULKISUUS 'publicity'	7	5.06	2.57
MITEN 'how'	5	3.94	2.09	TURHA 'futile'	7	5.19	2.38
TURHA 'futile'	5	5.88	2.20	KUKAAN 'no-one'[*]	7	4.32	2.51
				TIETYSTI 'of course'	6	4.81	2.36
				JULKISESTI 'in public'	5	7.00	2.22

[*]Also 'anyone'. [**]Also 'anything'.

The analysis shows that the *come-say* and the *go-say* constructions share

---

[14] To measure the significance and strength of collocations, there are several tests available, of which t-test and Mutual Information test are suggested e.g. by Stubbs (1995a) and Barnbrook (1996). The MI-test underlines the significance of co-occurrence of low frequency items, and the t-score measure picks up collocations that are relatively frequent in the data. Since there are differences between the tests themselves and the information they provide, it is important to use more than one test to get a proper assessment of the collocational diversity. The threshold for MI-test is set at 3.00 and for t-test at 2.00.

only two statistically significant collocates: KUKAAN 'no-one, anyone' and TURHA 'futile'. Thus, these two constructions differ collocationally. The *come-say* construction's collocates are mainly pronouns (JOKU 'someone', MINÄ 'I', ME 'we', KUKAAN 'no-one, anyone'), whereas the *go-say* construction's collocates seem often to be adjectives (PAHA 'bad, difficult', VAIKEA 'difficult', TURHA 'futile'). The collocational profiles indicate that the latter construction is used more often in a cotext that includes an affective adjective meaning 'difficulty' or 'futility'. Some instances selected from the data are reported in Concordance 1.

Concordance 1. Adjectives PAHA 'bad, difficult', VAIKEA 'difficult' and TURHA 'futile' in the cotext (4L–4R) of *go-say* construction

Kun tsekinkielestä on ***paha***	mennä	*arvailemaan* mitään, vinkit puoltavat
Tässä pimeydessä on ***paha***	mennä	*arvioimaan*, miten nokista jälkeä
ja häviäjistä on ***paha***	mennä	*sanomaan* etukäteen mitään varmaa
Leikas korostaa, on ***vaikea***	mennä	*vannomaan*, että terveillä elämäntavoilla
kuuluu musiikissa, onkin ***vaikeampi***	mennä	*määrittelemään*, sillä sukupuolta enemmän
yhdenkään kansanedustajan on ***vaikea***	mennä	*sanomaan*, että minä tein
on auktoriteettien aivan ***turha***	mennä	*kommentoimaan*, tämänhän tiedämme jo
riehuessa baijerilaisille lienee ***turha***	mennä	*sanomaan*, että paavilta viedään
vireessä. Sitäpä on ***turha***	mennä	*ennustelemaan* ennen kuin pääsen

The *come-say* construction's pronoun collocates, in turn, illustrate that the Addressee is often mentioned in the cotext. This is shown in Concordance 2, which includes examples of pronouns MINÄ 'I' and ME 'we' in allative (*minulle* 'to me', *meille,* 'to us'), ablative (*minulta* 'from me'), genitive (*meidän* 'our') and partitive (*meitä* 'us') cases.

Concordance 2. Pronouns MINÄ 'I' and ME 'we' in the cotext (4L–4R) of the *come-say* construction

Tuukkaa. Aikaisemmin kukaan ei	tullut	*sanomaan* **minulle** minkälaisia **meidän**
mutta **minulta** ei tarvitse	tulla	*kysymään.* Tykkään olla taiteilija
puolella. Reilun tuntuinen kaveri.	Tuli	punttisalillakin **minulta** *kysymään*, saanko
kiinnosti ihmisiä, kun **minulle**	tultiin	siitä *puhumaan* kaupan jonossakin
palloilla? Mutta ajanhukkaa olisi	tulla	**minulle** *inttämään*, että maailmassa
paljon. Olemme vahvistuksia. **Meille**	tullaan	heti *sanomaan*, jos pelit
esimerkiksi **meille** nuorille kukaan	tule	*sanomaan*, mitä ja miten
se rohkaisevaa, kun **meille**	tultiin	*sanomaan*, että miksi tällainen
ajatuksia, että ei pidä	tulla	**meitä** *arvostelemaan* ja johtamaan
oli suopea. Kukaan ei	tullut	**meille** *räkyttämään*, vaikka jotkut

Stubbs (1995a: 42) claims that statistical tests can help identify not only individual collocations, but also semantic sets in cotext. This can be proven also here, since the statistically significant collocates seem to group, at least partly, semantically. However, to get a wider picture of the semantic sets occurring in the cotext we also need to analyse the semantic preferences of the whole constructions.

3.3   Semantic preferences of *come-say* and *go-say* constructions

Sinclair (1996, 1998) shows that words belonging to a certain semantic preference can be found in different positions in the cotext of a node and they may even belong to different word classes. Thus, rather than studying only the constructions themselves and their collocations, it is also worth studying their semantic cotext. By consulting the concordances, we are able to find the following semantic preferences.

Of the 93 cases of the *come-say* constructions retrieved from the corpus, in 38 (40%) the cotext includes a word that expresses 'quantity'. Quite often the word is either an indefinite pronoun KUKAAN 'no-one, anyone' or JOKU 'someone'. Also the *go-say* construction has this semantic preference but it is clearly less common (16%), the most common collocate being MITÄÄN 'nothing, anything'.[15] Another semantic preference that dominates in the cotext of the *come-say* construction is 'time': 36% of the concordance lines has a word expressing 'time'. As regards the *go-say* construction the proportion is again smaller, 18%. The constructions also

---

[15] See also Table 3 for the collocates.

share a semantic preference 'futility': the proportions are 9% for the *come-say* and 6% for the *go-say* construction. The *go-say* construction also has semantic preferences of its own: the most common is 'difficulty' (as many as 24% of all the occurrences in the data), while others are 'being able to' (10%), 'stupidity' (8%), 'publicity' (7%), 'must not' (7%), and 'daring' (3%).

The analysis of semantic preference reveals that although the speech act verbs in these constructions can be more or less neutral in lexical meaning (e.g. belonging to the semantic set of 'telling'), the cotext often includes semantic preferences that render a very negative overall meaning of the said thing. For example, even when a neutral speech act verb (e.g. SANOA 'say') is used in the *go-say* construction, we may find words indicating negative semantic preferences in the context – such as 'difficulty' (VAIKEA, PAHA 'difficult'; lines 1–5), 'stupidity' (TYPERÄ, HÖLMÖ 'stupid'; lines 6–7) or 'futility' (TURHA 'futile'; lines 8–9) (see Concordance 3). Consequently, it seems that even if the speech act verbs themselves carry a neutral meaning, the cotextual patterning of the constructions may convey a negative attitude. This can clearly be seen in the case of the *go-say* construction which, in the first place, seems to be a neutral or positively used construction, but which, however, is often used in negative contexts as well. However, the analysis of the semantic preferences does not give a thorough picture of the cotextual patterning of these constructions. The following analysis completes the description by investigating the semantic prosodies of the constructions.

Concordance 3. Examples of semantic preferences 'difficulty, stupidity, futility' with neutral speech act verbs in the *go-say* construction

1	suomalaiseen systeemiin. On ***vaikea***	Mennä	*sanomaan*, että se on
2	kunnosta on hyvin ***vaikea***	Mennä	*sanomaan* mitään. Jos tietäisi
3	jäsenten kanssa. ***Vaikea*** kuitenkin	Mennä	*sanomaan* mitään varmaa kollegoiden
4	laumasta otuksia on ***paha***	Mennä	*sanomaan* mitään yleistävää, edes
5	on tässä yhteydessä ***paha***	Mennä	*puhumaan*. Todella hienoa ja
6	tai sukupuolesta riippumatta. ***Typerää***	Mennä	edes *esittämään* tuollaista. Ehdotus
7	mukaan vaikea, jopa ***hölmöäkin***,	Mennä	*sanomaan*. Tarkkaa tavoitetta hänestä
8	ainakin sille porukalle ***turha***	Mennä	kenenkään *selittämään*. Yhden tai
9	riehuessa baijerilaisille lienee ***turha***	Mennä	*sanomaan*, että paavilta viedään

3.4 Semantic prosody of *come-say* and *go-say* constructions

Semantic prosody (or discourse prosody (Stubbs (2001)) is a consistent positive or negative (or sometimes neutral) "aura of meaning with which a form is imbued by its collocates" (Louw 1993: 157). The *come-say* and *go-say* constructions themselves seem to be evaluative, since the speech act verbs, especially in the *come-say* construction, carry mostly a negative meaning. Furthermore, we have noted that also the collocates and semantic features often show a negative meaning. The last analysis, i.e. the analysis of the semantic prosodies of these constructions reveals, undoubtedly, that both constructions have a clear unfavourable or negative semantic prosody: in the case of the *come-say* construction 89% (n=83) of the occurrences in the data show a clear negative prosody, and in the case of *go-say* construction the proportion is as high as 93% (n=183).

The items indicating the negative prosody may be the speech act verb itself (*syöttää puppua* 'to feed rubbish', example (4)), collocates that show a certain negative semantic preference (*turha* 'futile', *ei kannata* 'to be not worth of', examples (4)–(6)) or other items with a negative meaning (*ero* 'divorce', example (5); *katua* 'to regret', example (7); *vetää turpaan* 'to beat up', example (8)).

(4) *Sii-nä   miele-ssä   on   ihan   **turha**   kene-n=kään*
     it-INE   sense-INE   be.3SG   completely unnecessary   anyone-GEN=PART
     *yrittä-ä tul-la   **syöttä-mä-än** mitään **puppu-a**.*
     try-INF   come-INF   feed-INF-ILL   any   rubbish-PTV
     'In this sense, it is completely **unnecessary** for anyone to come and **feed** [us] any **rubbish**.'

(5) *Häne-n   luo-kse-en   **ei**   sitten   **kannata**   tul-la*
     s/he-GEN to-TRA-3PX   NEG.3SG   then   be.worth.CNG   come-INF
     ***valitta-ma-an**   kun   **ero**   tule-e.*
     complain-INF-ILL   when   divorce come-3SG
     'It's **no use** to go and **complain** to him when they [will] **split up**.'

(6) ***Ei=kä**   mu-lle   **kannata**   tul-la   puhu-ma-an   Jumala-sta*
     neg.3SG=PART   I-ALL   be.worth.CNG come-INF   talk-INF-ILL   God-ELA
     ja   taivaa-sta.
     and   heaven-ELA
     '**Nor** is it of any **use** to come and talk to me about God and heaven.'

(7)   *Sibelius itse   myöhemmin **katu-i**,   että ol-i   men-nyt*
       Sibelius himself later   regret-PST.3SG   that be-PST.3SG go-PTCP
       mainitse-ma-an teokse-sta mitään.
       mention-INF-ILL work-ELA   anything.
       'Sibelius himself later **regretted** that he had gone and mentioned anything about the work.'

(8)   *Westerlund   ja   Summanen   **vetä-isi-vät**   minu-a   varmasti*
       Westerlund   and Summanen   beat-COND-3PL   I-PTV   probably
       ***turpa-an**, jos   men-isi-n   ehdotta-ma-an   jotain.*
       gob-ILL   if   go-COND-1SG suggest-INF-ILL   something
       'Westerlund and Summanen would probably **beat me**, if I went and suggested something.'

To sum up, the data-based analysis of the *go-say* and *come-say* constructions illustrates that both constructions carry a clear negative meaning on both paradigmatic (the choice of speech act verbs) and syntagmatic (collocations, semantic preferences and prosodies) dimensions. According to Stubbs (2001: 65–66), semantic (discourse) prosodies express speakers' attitudes and reasons for making the utterances. It seems that one way for the Speaker to say that the Actor has said something in vain, wrongly or in an otherwise bad or inconvenient manner is to use the *come-say* or *go-say* constructions. Nevertheless, these constructions differ in terms of how the affective stance is expressed: in the *come-say* construction the speech act verbs themselves are more negatively evaluative than in the *go-say* constructions, whereas the latter construction is used in a more negative cotext, which became evident in the semantically negative collocations and in the higher proportion of negative semantic prosody.

4.   Grammatical structures in interaction

Interactional linguistics analyses how linguistic structures are used in naturally-occurring talk in their actual interactional contexts (Ochs et al. 1996; Couper-Kuhlen & Selting 2001: 1–3; Ford et al. 2002; Keevallik 2003). For interactional linguists "language system" and "everyday language use" are inextricably intertwined (Thompson 2001: vii). Its main starting point is to investigate "how certain syntactic and other structures can be attributed to, and motivated by, the accomplishment of interactional tasks in situated use of language" (Keevallik 2003: 23). Interactional linguistics investigates the relationship between linguistic detail and

interaction from two starting points. On the one hand, it studies "what linguistic resources are used to articulate particular conversational structures and fulfil interactional functions" and, on the other hand, what interactional function or conversational structure is furthered by particular linguistic forms and ways of using them (Couper-Kuhlen & Selting 2001: 3). In this section, we take the latter approach. We start from the two structures and study the social activity contexts in which they are used in everyday interaction.

4.1 The *go-say* and *come-say* constructions in spoken discourse

As the corpus linguistic analysis in Section 3 shows, the studied constructions tend to carry negative affective meanings. This became evident either in the meaning of the speech act verbs (especially *come-say* construction) or in the cotextual patterning of the construction (especially *go-say* construction). The interactional linguistic analysis below provides further evidence for this by showing how the constructions' negative affect is closely tied to the social activity context in which they are used: in everyday conversations they are used for trouble-telling and gossiping. Although the normed frequency of the *go-say* and *come-say* constructions is higher in spoken discourse than in written discourse, they are not very frequent in spoken discourse. All in all, we found 11 examples of the linguistic forms in the 10-hour database of everyday discourse and 6 examples in the institutional discourse corpus. Generally speaking, the examples from everyday discourse were used for expressing negative affect, whereas in institutional discourse three of the six occurrences were non-affective and expressed either concrete movement or future tense.

In general, these findings align with the corpus linguistic analysis in which the cotextual patterning, semantic preferences and semantic prosody were seen contribute to the constructions' negative affective meaning, although the construction and the elements in it may not be affective. It should be borne in mind, though, that although the majority of the *go-say* and *come-say* constructions expressed affect, we found that in naturally-occurring talk they rarely had an affective meaning alone with no indication of movement. In general, it was, across the examples, challenging to tease out those structures that were affective from those that profiled movement. In fact the only example that does not profile movement comes from political discourse. This example was recorded from the Finnish Broadcasting Company's main TV news broadcast in

autumn 2003. The news item deals with whether and with what schedule Finland should participate in the European Union's (EU) new common defence policy. The example is the Finnish Foreign Secretary's response to the opposition's Parliamentary question. The *go-say* construction is used twice (see lines 11 and 14 with arrows).[16]

(9)   1DB-225613.TextGrid: [Finland's defense policy in 2003], 1 min 52 s
       ET: Erkki Tuomioja, Foreign Secretary

```
1  ET:  (H)Jos  nämä   ehdotukse-t,
            if   these suggestion-PL
            'If these suggestions
2  ?   ((INDECIPHERABLE TALK))
3  ET:  niinkun  toista-n    vielä,
            as      repeat-1SG  still
            as I repeat once more
4       <HI> men-isi-vät  ^sellaisenaan  lävitse</HI>,
              go-COND-3PL  as.such        through
            would be accepted/ratified as such
5       kun ne     konventist    on     kirjoite-ttu,
            as  they  conventionally be.3SG  write-PTCP
            as they have conventionally been written
6       (H)niin  ne    'tule-vat  ^voima-an,
            so     they  come-3PL   force-ILL
            they will come into operation
7       sillon kun tule-e   'tämä perustuslaillinen  ^sopimus.
            then   when come-3SG this constitutional    agreement
            at the same time with the EU constitution
8       ...(0.5) Se on     kakstuhat-ta      kuus.
                  it be.3SG  two.thousand-PTV  six
                  which is in two thousand and six
9       ... Jos noudate-taan    si-tä   aivan  ^oikee-ta,
            if  comply.with-PASS it-PTV  exactly right-PTV
            If one complies with the exactly right
10      .. teidä-n  'logiikka-a-nne  sii-tä  että,
            you-GEN   logic-PTV-2PL.PX  it-ELA   that
            your logic that
11 →    <A> nyt  ei     pidä     men-nä  sano-ma-an  et   em-me
            now  NEG.3SG must.CNG go-INF   say-INF-ILL  that NEG-1PL
            one must not go and say that we
```

---

[16] The data in this section have been transcribed by using the intonation unit-based transcription system (Du Bois et al. 1993) in which each line represents one intonation unit. The transcription conventions can be found in the Appendix 1.

```
12        ^ole    mukana ehdottomasti</A>,
          be.CNG  with    absolutely
          now are definitely not in on this
13        (H)niin  yhtä     selvä-ä    logiikka-a  on
             so     equally  clear-PTV  logic-PTV   be.3SG
             so equally obvious is the logic
14 →      (0)et   ei      meidä-n pidä     'myös=kää   men-nä sano-ma-an
             that NEG.3SG  we-GEN must.CNG either=PART go-INF say-INF-ILL
             that we must not go and say
15        et   me ^ol-isi-mme jossain   mukana,
          that we be-COND-1PL  somewhere with
          that we would take part in something
16        (H)sellaise-ssa jo-ta     me em-me   pidä          unioni-lle=kaan,
             such-INE      which-PTV we NEG-1PL consider.CNG  union-ALL=PART
             that we do not consider
17        (H)öö toivottava-na  kehitykse-nä.
             desirable-ESS     development-ESS
             desirable development for union either.'
```

In his response, the Foreign Secretary uses the *go-say* construction twice. However, it does not seem to communicate strong negative affect, but rather what problematic consequences two hypothetical, alternative and future political stances could have, if they were made carelessly. The fact that the constructions do not profile movement could in fact be a feature of and specific to institutional talk which resembles planned or written discourse. However, it is hard to make a definite claim about this and further analyses are required.

In the following, we focus on the use of the constructions in everyday conversation. As regards the occurrences of the *go-say* construction in these data, it was sometimes difficult to tell apart the affective, the motional and future tense meanings. The *come-say* constructions in turn frequently expressed both motional and affective meanings. In the following sections we focus more specifically on the interactive context in which these constructions are used, and the meanings they convey. As we will show, the structures are used primarily as resources for expressing a speakers' affective action, such as trouble-telling (4 examples out of 11) and gossiping (7 examples out of 11). These actions are also usually part of longer sequences of action, such as stories, narratives or accounts.

4.2   The *go-say* construction in everyday conversation: negative affect in trouble-telling and gossiping

In everyday conversation, the *go-say* construction is used in storytelling sequences, and mostly as part of gossips and trouble-telling. In 8 out of the 9 examples, the speaker used a zero (3 cases) or first person (5 cases) pronoun or affix in the construction, which shows that this construction is used either for expressing the Speaker's own action or an unidentified Actor's action. Furthermore, in these sequences the construction usually refers to a hypothetical or likely future action, e.g. whether to file a complaint or snitch on somebody in the future and not something that has happened (cf. the uses of the *come-say* construction). In these interactional contexts, the *go-say* construction is indeed an element of affect display, either displaying positive (a recount of a happy incident, in one example) or negative affect (8 examples). However, rather than expressing affect only, the construction tends to communicate motion, i.e. the Speaker moving towards the Addressee in order to say something, which is also evident in the distribution of person in this construction. Moreover, although none of the examples are used merely for marking future tense, some of this meaning is retained as part of the more prominent affect display.

All this is evident in the next example, in which three young women, Emma, Ira and Vera, are gossiping about their mutual male acquaintance, Pekka. After telling the others that Pekka has moved into his own apartment, Emma tells that he has a German girlfriend. The girl is currently in Germany, and Pekka is planning to move to Germany to play ice hockey. After this Ira says 'Well he did act like a bachelor, there at least when I saw him in the restaurant' (lines 1–2) and thereby questions Pekka's credibility as a faithful boyfriend. Then Emma responds and uses the *go-say* construction twice (see lines 13–14).

(10) SG 151: [The New Year conversation], 25 min 50 s

```
1   IRA_1:Kyl  se  niin ^poikamiehel-t näytt-i,
            yes it  so   bachelor-ABL    look-PST.3SG
            'Well he did act like a bachelor
2           siel ainaki  mi-tä    mie ^Kantikse-s si-tä   nä-i-n.
            there at.least what-PTV I   Kantis-INE     it-PTV  see-PST-1SG
            there at least when I saw him in the restaurant
3           ...(0.4)
```

```
4   EMMA: No=.
            PART
            Well
5         No.
            PART
            Well
6         <HI> Mikä=s   sii-nä</HI>,
               what=PART it-INE
               So what
7         .. tyttöystävä asu-u    Saksa-s,
            girlfriend  live-3SG Germany-INE
            The girlfriend lives in Germany
8         ei      se saa     ikinä mitää tietä-ä,
            NEG.3SG it get.CNG never any   know-INF
            She will never get to know anything
9         [ku]kaan Suome-s       ei       osaa    puhu-u –
            nobody   Finland-INE NEG.3SG can.CNG speak-INF
            Nobody in Finland can speak
10  IRA_1:[Mm]?
11  EMMA: (H)Yks viiesosa  osaa    Savonlinna-s  varmaa   puhu-u
             one fifth.part can.3SG Savonlinna-INE probably speak-INF
             One-fifth of the population in Savonlinna probably speaks
12        kansalais-i-st @niinku saksa-a,
            citizen-PL-ELA  like   German-PTV
            like German
13  →     Et    tuskin si-lle kukaa  mene-e   sano-ma-a,
            that  hardly it-ALL anyone go-3SG    say-INF-ILL
            So it is unlikely that anyone will go and say
14  →     et    niinku [et] selittä-mä-ä,
            that  like    that explain-INF-ILL
            that or like explain [to her]
15  IRA_2:      [ nii?]
                  PART
                  Yeah
16  EMMA: jos se tänne joulu-ks       tule-e,
            if  it here Christmas-TRA  come-3SG
            if she comes to Finland for Christmas
17        et tiiä-t-kö=s       mi-tä  Pekka täällä on    puuhail-lu (H).
            that know-2SG-INT=PART what-PTVPekka here  be.3SG get.up.to-PTCP
            that do you know what Pekka has been doing here.'
```

In lines 1–2, Ira says that she has recently seen Pekka acting like a single person in a local restaurant. Her gossipy turn implicates that for a person going steady with somebody, Pekka's behaviour is questionable. In the next turn, Emma disaffiliates with Ira and provides an ironic explanation: it

is unlikely that he will be caught for being unfaithful, because the girlfriend is in Germany, and even if she came to town it would be unlikely that anyone (an unidentified Actor) would tell (i.e. snitch) her (the Addressee) about Pekka's behaviour, because few people in town speak German. It is in this interactional context in which Emma uses the *go-say* construction. She says in lines 1–17 'So it is unlikely that anyone will go and say that or like explain to her, if she comes to Finland for Christmas, that do you know what Pekka has been doing here'. Emma uses the *go-say* construction (instead of *sanoo* 'says') as part of gossipy discourse and in a disaffiliative response to a previous speaker's turn for describing the mere conjectural likelihood that anyone engages in such a highly affective action as telling the girlfriend about his boyfriend's behaviour (i.e. reveals information, see Section 5). It is worth noting that the design of Emma's utterance conforms to the construction's collocational patterns in written language. The particle *että* 'that' and the pronouns *se* 'it' and *kukaan* 'no-one, anyone' collocate frequently with this construction, and the latter is also statistically significant (see Table 3). *Kukaan* also belongs to the semantic set indicating 'quantity', which is frequent in this context. In sum, the *go-say* construction is used as part of gossiping and for evoking not only an unlikely future action but also an affective situation in which the speech act (snitching) in itself is questionable. This also supports the findings made in Section 5 (see below), in which the Speaker considers a speech act as a questionable action.

In example (11), the *go-say* construction occurs in a similar interactional context. The example comes from a phone conversation. Mika has called his friend Jami, who is a lawyer, to seek advice. Mika has recently bought a new computer monitor which has broken down for the second time. Mika produces a long complaint and trouble-telling sequence in which he criticises the warranty service and then finally asks whether it would be useful to file a complaint to the consumer ombudsman: 'Is it worth the effort to go and complain to the fucking ombudsman' (lines 5–7).

(11) SG 122_A2: [The monitor], 0 min 40 s

```
1   MIKA: (H) ni   ^voi-ks      tollase-s      niinku,
               PART can.3SG-INT  like.that-INE  like
               'So can one like in that kind of a
2              mi- --
3              o- --
4              e- --
```

```
5  →        on-s       ^mitää hyöty-y     niinku,
            be.3SG-INT any    benefit-PTV like
            Is it worth the effort to
6  →        (H) men-nä marise-ma-a   mi-lle=kää  vitu-n
            go-INF  grumble-INF-ILL any-ALL=PART fuck-GEN
            go and complain to the fucking
7          kuluttaja-asiamiehe-lle,
            ombudsman-ALL
            ombudsman
8          tai ^mi-llä vo-is     niinku ^uhkail-la   siel
            or  what-ADE can-COND.3SG like   threaten-INF  there
            or with what could I threaten [the people]
9          ^huollo-s,
            service-INE
            at the service
10         et   mä  sa-isi-n   nyt ^varamonitor[i-n,
            that I   get-COND-1SG now spare.monitor-ACC
            so that I would now get a spare monitor
10 JAMI:                                [kyllä si-tä
                                         yes   it-PTV
            kannatta-is   u-
            worth-COND.3SG
11         uhkail-la,
            threaten-INF
            Yes it would be a good idea to threaten them somehow.'
```

After the trouble-telling, Mika in line 1 starts a turn that seeks advice or confirmation in form of a yes-no interrogative. Our target utterance, the question in lines 5–7, contains linguistic evidence for Mika's (the Actor and the Speaker) strong affective stance. He uses the verb *marista* 'to grumble' to describe a possible complaint to the ombudsman (the Addressee). He also uses the expletive *vitun* 'fucking' for displaying his frustration with the situation. In other words, the *go-say* construction co-occurs with linguistic elements that display the speaker's affective stance. So similarly with example (10) (see also example (8)), the *go-say* construction is used in a context which describes a hypothetical and negative situation in the future, in this case the filing of a complaint. Mika's utterance in lines 5–6 is also structurally similar with the *go-say* constructions in written language, since the *olla* verb 'be' is a frequent collocate and the pronoun *mitään* 'anything, nothing' is a statistically significant collocate (Table 3). The structure *mitää[n] hyötyy* also belongs to the semantic set of 'futility', which occurs frequently in this context and contributes to the general negative cotext of the construction.

In sum, in spoken language the *go-say* construction is used in various kinds of telling sequences as a resource for displaying the speakers' understanding that if they (the Speaker and the Actor) do the action or take the described stance, they can in the future be held accountable for that action or stance. It is therefore used in irrealis mode for describing a speech act which is presented as occurring in a contingent world (Payne 1997). Furthermore, by using the *go-say* construction, speakers also display their negative affect involved in producing a speech act that has not yet been produced. In other words, they communicate a meaning that the still hypothetical affective action is possibly problematic or inappropriate. "To go and grumble" to the ombudsman basically does the action of filing a complaint and "to go and say" something about a boyfriend's questionable behaviour in the local pub to his girlfriend equals snitching. All in all, by using the *go-say* construction in social interaction, the speakers display their negative affect towards the hypothetical speech act and orient to potential trouble in the future.

4.3 The *come-say* construction in everyday conversation: reporting a dubious action

Similarly with the *go-say* construction, the *come-say* construction in everyday conversation is used in stories and tellings. However, in contrast to the *go-say* construction, the *come-say* construction is used for describing the realis actions of a third person (the Actor) in the past. In these cases, the Addressee is the Speaker (see Section 3.2 for similar findings). This coincides with the fact that all 8 occurrences of the *go-say* construction are produced with a 3rd person pronoun, indicating an action done by somebody to the Speaker. In example (12) below, Teppo is telling a story of how he and his friends were robbed twice during the same evening in Amsterdam. After he has told about the first attempted robbery, he tells about the second one.

(12) SG 020 A_03: [He came and explained], 4 min 4 s

```
1    TEPPO:  Se   ol-i       se kundi  tul-i        t- t- --
             it   be-PST.3SG it guy    come-PST.3SG
             'It was the guy who came
2     →      Tul-i        siihen selittää,
             come-PST.3SG there  explain.INF.ILL
             came there to explain
```

```
3        Jotain    vittu-a  et,
         something fuck-PTV  that
         fucking something like
4        Joo  ei,
         yes  no
         yeah no
5        Tai sit käv-i            vähä    silleen että,
         or  then happen-PST.3SG little like    that
         Or then what happened was slightly like.'
```

As part of the story of how he and his friends got robbed, Teppo describes the actions of one of the robbers (lines 1–3): 'It was the guy who came there to explain fucking something like'. The *come-say* construction is used to describe the attacker's movement toward the Speaker, as well as the fact that the attacker's actions were aggressive and hostile. Thus, the incident is clearly troubling for the Speaker, which explains the use of the *come-say* construction and the expletive *vittu* 'fuck' in line 3 that are indicative of the Speaker's affective stance. The construction is also used in a reporting clause, which is followed by indirect speech. All in all, Teppo uses the *come-say* construction for describing the actions of a third person (the Actor) in the past in a situation in which he was the target (the Addressee) and which was frightening, and which still raises strong emotions in him.

Example (13) is similar to the previous example in that it describes the past actions of a third person (the Actor) in a somewhat dubious light. The example comes from a phone conversation between two young women who are both dog enthusiasts. Mari (the Speaker) is currently telling a story of how her mother (the Addressee), also an active dog person, had recently attended a dog show and seen a slim dog, unlike any dog she had seen before. This particular dog did not thrive in the show, after which the owner of that dog (the Actor) had gone to talk to Mari's mother.

(13) SG122 B_01: [Dog conversation], 16 min 8 s

```
1 → MARI:   Sit  se  ol-i        vaan meiä-n mutsi-lle tul-lu
            then it  be-PST.3SG  only we-GEN mother-ALL come-PTCP
            'Then she had just come to my mother and said
2           sanoo       se omistaja että,
            say.INF.ILL it owner    that
            the owner that
3           (H)(TSK) Nii et  no   tää  tule-e,
                     so  that well this come-3SG
                     like that well this will come
```

```
4          tonne Kokkola-n    pentunäyttely-yn,
           there Kokkola-GEN  puppy.show-ILL
           to the puppy show in Kokkola
5          (H) Ööh,
6          ens .. sunnuntai-na,
           next    Sunday-ESS
           next Sunday
7          ja  et,
           and that
           and that
8          <VOX> Ja  Maria sitten esittä-ä    se-n  siellä? </VOX>
                 and Maria then   perform-3SG it-ACC there
                 And then Maria performs with it there.'
```

Mari's utterance in line 1 is a reporting clause that precedes direct reported speech in lines 3–5. It precedes the description of the dog owner's actions, i.e. proudly coming and talking to Mari's mother after her dog has not done well in the show. In this storytelling and gossipy context, the utterance (including the otherwise neutral speech act verb *sanoa* 'to say') therefore expresses both movement and displays the Speaker's (Mari, telling the story) affective stance towards the Actor (the dog owner) and her actions.

As in the examples above, the cotextual features between written and spoken language are again very similar (cf. *sit* 'then', *se* 'it' and *oli* 'was'). All in all, Mari's telling indeed conveys the dog owner's reported talk and actions as dubious and questionable. These contextual features act as further evidence for the fact that the investigated constructions in reporting clauses tend to occur in gossipy contexts, and to be part of talk in which a Speaker expresses negative affective stance towards an Actor's talk and actions.

4.4 Summary of the *go-say* and *come-say* constructions in everyday conversation

The above analysis suggests that in everyday conversation the *go-say* and *come-say* constructions are used in tellings (storytelling, trouble-telling, etc.), either in the actual story or in the reporting clauses that precede direct reported speech. Telling stories of past incidents to a co-participant, and talking about one's troubles are both very frequent and central features of human social interaction (e.g. Jefferson 1978, 1988 inter alia). Stories, tellings and reported speech are also ways in which tellers communicate their stances toward the reported event (see e.g. Besnier 1993; Niemelä

2005; Stivers 2008). The *go-say* and *come-say* constructions are linguistic resources for doing that. These constructions are also used, although less frequently, as affective comments to something that someone has either said or done in the immediately preceding interactional context. Indeed, 14 of the 17 examples that we found of this construction in spoken data were used for displaying affect or stance. In addition, with only one exception (not presented), all the reported speech acts were presented in a dubious, questionable or otherwise negative context. It suggests that as part of narratives and tellings the construction is used metaphorically to describe the actual difficulty of doing the speech act, or the dubiousness that is related to producing it. However, it is also possible to provide an explanation from a social perspective, and as it relates to the status of participants in social situations. In fact, Goffman (1963: 135) would perhaps argue that the construction describes a social situation that involves an undesired form of social gathering or regrouping, i.e. a "non-with", in which someone, who is not part of a "with", enters and trespasses a border. In the case of the *go-say* construction, it is the Speaker or the Actor trespassing a boundary and in the *come-say* construction, someone trespassing the boundary that includes the Speaker or the Actor. Further evidence for this was provided by the use the pronominal forms in these constructions: zero and 1st person forms co-occurred with the *go-say* construction and 3rd person forms with the *come-say* construction. Furthermore, none of the examples expressed affective meaning alone, but the affective meaning often coincided with the meaning of motion, thus communicating an idea of entering or trespassing a border. In sum, the construction grammatically marks unwanted social participation and involvement, i.e. "coming too close". Also, the personal affective stance expressed through this construction is both based on a social situation and made socially salient in a narrative.

In addition to the similarities between the *go-say* and the *come-say* construction, they do possess some distinct differences. The *go-say* construction is primarily used for describing a hypothetical and questionable action in the future, whereas the *come-say* construction is mostly used in contexts which report a dubious action that has taken place in the past. In other words, the *go-say* construction tends to be used for describing a speech act in an irrealis world, whereas the *come-say* construction profiles a past action in realis world.

5. Cognitive semantics of the *go-say* and *come-say* constructions

Both the corpus linguistic and the interactional linguistic analyses of the *go-say* and *come-say* constructions show that the *mennä* 'go' verb and the *tulla* 'come' verb have partly lost their meaning of motion and began to express negative affect. As Sections 3 and 4 above show, this becomes evident through the meaning of the verbs in the constructions, their cotextual patterning and also through the social activities in which they appear (trouble-telling, gossiping, complaining) or which they report and describe (revealing information, snitching, complaining, quarrelling, threatening).

As the corpus linguistic analysis shows, sometimes the negative meaning of either construction can be explained by the speech act verb which itself conveys the meaning of an affective or even inappropriate saying (for example, *mennä möläyttämään* 'blurt out' [*go* + *blurt* in the 3rd infinitive illative case]). However, this does not explain the affective use of the construction *mennä kertomaan* [*go* + *tell* in the 3rd infinitive illative case] in which the speech act verb *kertoa* 'tell' itself is not affective. *Kertoa* is, according to Finnish dictionaries (e.g. KS s.v. *kertoa*), a polysemous verb that profiles a set of different meanings, but it is a rather basic speech act verb and highlights the message itself, not the manner of communication (Pajunen 2001: 345–346).

Consider example (14) which is taken from The Finnish Language Bank. A larger context of the example shows that a cleaning lady (the Actor) has told an implicit Addressee how a politician with a reputation of a lady´s man (the referent of *it*) had tried to have sexual intercourse with her but failed due to impotence.

(14) *Ja   yks   siivvooja   **men-i**   **kerto-ma-an**, jotta kyllä se*
  and   one   cleaning.lady go-PST.3SG   tell-INF-ILL   that yes   it
  hän-tä=kin   kerran elustussaunna-n   laattija-lla yritt-i.
  she-PTV=PART once   representation.sauna-GEN floor-ADE   try-PST.3SG
  'And one cleaning lady **revealed** that he also tried to make an attempt at her once on the floor of a representation sauna.'

In example (14) the Actor's motion is downplayed and instead the sentence conveys the meaning of 'revealing' or 'snitching' and thereby the Speaker's affective and disapproving position about the reported speech act (see analyses in Sections 3 and 4). If the *mennä* 'go' verb was removed from the above example, the construction would lose its affective meaning.

One could therefore argue that the negative affect that the construction expresses is related to the lexical semantics of the verb *mennä* 'go'. Onikki-Rantajääskö (2001: 207) and Airola (2007: 56) indeed argue that the *mennä* verb is often associated with expressions of non-canonical or negative states. For example, 'to break down' in Finnish is *mennä rikki* (lit. 'go broken'). However, this feature of the *mennä* verb does not alone explain the negative meaning of the construction, because examples can be postulated in which *mennä* 'go' is associated with neutral tone as in *Miten menee?* 'How are things [going]?' and even with a positive change, as in *Kaikki meni hyvin* 'Everything went well'.

As regards the *sanoa* 'say' verb, on the other hand, Routarinne (2005: 84–85) has noted that it is generally used as a rather basic and unmarked speech act verb. However, according to a dictionary (KS s.v. *sanoa*), when it is used in infinitival form, such as in *olla sanomassa* [be say-INF-INE], it can also express 'remarking, criticising' and 'carping'. Therefore, it is no surprise that when *sanoa* is used in the *come-say* construction, it frequently gets the meaning of aggressive speaking. Consider example (15) which is again taken from The Finnish Language Bank.

(15) *Suome-n   maa-ssa   ja   tä-ssä   maailma-ssa ei   löydy*
      Finland-GEN   land-INE   and   this-INE world-INE   NEG.3SG find-CNG
      *ihmis-tä,   joka   vo-isi   **tul-la   sano-ma-an**, että minä*
      person-PTV   who   can-COND.3SG   come-INF   say-INF-ILL   that   I
      ole-n   ol-lut   nä-i-den   kyseis-ten   aine-i-den   tai   mi-n=kään
      be-1SG be-PTCP this-PL-GEN that-GEN.PL   stuff-PL-GEN or   any-GEN=PART
      mu-i-den=kaan   kielletty-j-en   aine-i-den   kanssa tekemis-i-ssä.
      other-PL-GEN=PART forbidden-PL-GEN stuff-PL-GEN   with   making-PL-INE
      'In Finland and in this whole world, there is not a single person to be found who could **argue against** me that I have had anything to do with these or any other illegal substances.'

The above example reports a situation in which a famous Finnish cross-country skier was asked in a press conference if he had used illegal doping substances. In the press conference, he denied such accusations strongly and insisted that no-one could accuse him of using doping. By using the construction *tulla sanomaan*, the skier (the Speaker) is most likely not anticipating any concrete motion towards him but rather expressing that he would consider any accusations, delivered for example through mass media, as aggressive and hostile actions against him. Again, if the *tulla* verb was removed, the meaning of blaming, accusing or criticising (see

semantic preferences in Section 3) would be downplayed and the sentence would emphasise the process of saying.

Consequently, what we see here is that there is something in the constructions themselves that contribute to their negative affective meaning. This semantic phenomenon has been acknowledged before but there is little research that tries to explain how the construction gets its affective reading. For example, the recent reference grammar of Finnish (VISK § 470) only briefly states that when the verb *mennä* is followed by another verb in the 3rd infinitive illative form the structure expresses that the activity is not hoped for (see also Kiuru 1977: 263). In addition, one may ask if there is a reason for the presence of these motion verbs in this context, or is it just an unexplainable coincidence? From the point of view of cognitive semantics these are not trivial questions. A basic tenet in cognitive semantics is that linguistic forms are to a great extent semantically motivated. Even idioms, which in other paradigms are often considered to be difficult to analyse, are from the cognitive viewpoint seen to be motivated, not arbitrary (Lakoff 1987: 450). Based on this assumption, we can expect that also the deictic motion verbs *mennä* and *tulla*, when used in the *go-say* and *come-say* constructions, are not devoid of semantic motivation even though they do not express overt motion. The core of our claim is that in these cases motion is understood metaphorically through the dynamic conceptualisation of a change in a semantic dominion of control.

As Givón (1973) has shown, in the world's languages, deictic motion verbs easily get semantic extension, for example, in the form of temporal and modal meanings. Consequently, it is no surprise that what first catches one's eye in the constructions is precisely the deictic directionality of the motion verbs. In Finnish, the motion verb *tulla* 'come' profiles motion towards a stationary deictic centre, and the verb *mennä* 'go' motion away from it. Here we assume that the deictic centre is set to the location of the speaker, and thus that the Finnish *mennä* 'go' is associated with a motion away from the speaker, whereas the verb *tulla* 'come' profiles motion towards the speaker.

However, the speaker is capable of imagining herself into different positions of the referred situation and then to describe the event from these viewpoints. This process which utilises our mental capacity to conceive of a situation from different perspectives (compare *John is going to the hall* vs. *John is coming to the hall* when the sentences refer to the same situation but from opposite vantage points) can be seen as one manifestation of a

phenomenon called "conceptualisation". The "new" observation point can be called a Shifted Deictic Centre (Langacker 1991: 266–267).[17] We believe that the Speaker's ability to choose different vantage points for describing a situation explains why precisely the deictic motion verbs so easily get semantic extensions: especially in figurative expressions containing motion verbs the Speaker often sets the deictic centre away from its own observation position into the location of the Trajector (represented by syntactic subject) or the Landmark (object or adverbial complement). Deixis is important for yet another reason. As pointed out by Hopper (2001: 169), the constructions that contain deictic motion verbs typically express the speaker's attitude, and, we would like to add, not only attitude but also affective evaluation of the referred situation. For these reasons, it is not enough to base the explanation of the meanings of these constructions merely on the concept of motion, but also the deixis of these verbs needs to be taken into account.

Humans characteristically aspire to control the situations and actions around them. Lakoff & Johnson (1980: 117–118) even propose that control is one of the basic human experiences, a natural kind of experience. Following Lakoff & Johnson (1980: 117–118), we assume control to be one fundamental dominion in human interaction and in how it is coded linguistically. Langacker (1993: 6, 1999: 173–174) defines "dominion" as the conceptual region to which a particular reference point affords direct access. A prototypical situation that involves dominion is possession. For instance, the sentence *He deeded the ranch for his daughter* can be seen as an example of abstract motion[18] where the ranch metaphorically leaves the agent's (referent of *he*) dominion and enters the recipient's dominion (Langacker 2008: 394). In other words, possession is a dominion which encloses all those entities that are directly owned by the possessor. In addition to possession, other types of dominions may be postulated. For example, Huumo (2006: 41, 43) characterises a cognitive dominion which consists of what the sentient reference point perceives, thinks or knows at a particular point of time. Correspondingly, a control dominion includes things which are directly controlled by the reference point (or agent), which lie in its spherical domination, such as decision making between moving vs. non-moving and speaking vs. non-speaking etc.

---

[17] For similar discussion on Finnish, see Larjavaara (1990: 259–260).

[18] In abstract motion, a motion verb (or some other expression normally referring to concrete movement) is metaphorically used for describing a change in some entity's state as in the sentence *The milk is about to go sour* (Langacker 1990: 155–156).

The control dominion links the directional lexical semantics of the deictic verbs *mennä* and *tulla* to the affective meanings of the *go-say* and *come-say* constructions. When the verb *mennä* is used in this construction, the meaning of the following infinitive speech act verb is interpreted as a place or, more generally speaking, as a 'container'. According to Lakoff & Johnson (1980: 30–32), it is common that activities (here the speech acts) are metaphorically conceived as substances and therefore as 'containers' which have the capacity to "take in" other entities. Thus, the action of telling something represented by the *go-say* construction is metaphorically conceived as motion where the entity occupying the Shifted Deictic Centre (the subject of the *mennä* verb) is abstractly moving towards the 'container' (the speech act). The infinitive's illative case supports the assumption of abstract motion towards a 'container' since the basic meaning of illative can be characterised as 'movement into' (cf. Huumo & Ojutkangas 2006: 13–14).

The affective meanings of 'revelation', 'snitching', and so on (see Sections 3 and 4), which are expressed by the *go-say* construction, utilise a metaphorical conceptualisation where the act of telling is conceived as abstract motion away from control dominion. If the control of an activity or situation is lost, the result may be something that is not hoped for. This we saw in the interactional analysis of the *go-say* construction in Section 4. Our assumption gains support from observations of various other metaphorical Finnish expressions containing the verb *mennä*, which, as mentioned earlier, have a strong tendency to be associated with negative states or negative results in general. Indeed, it seems that Finnish utilises a conventional metaphor where a change into an inferior situation is conceived as motion (away from the deictic centre) into a negative state. In addition, many of these expressions seem to intuitively involve some sort of loss of control (for instance, *mennä pieleen* 'go wrong'). Also Larjavaara (1990: 261) points out that expression *mennä noloksi* 'go shamefaced' profiles a change 'away-from' something "primary" or "normal". Based on our analysis, we can define these observations by arguing that these metaphors often include abstract motion away from the control dominion. This hypothesis seems to provide a reasonable explanation for why the verb *mennä*, which profiles motion away, is often associated with negative situations.

As regards the *come-say* construction, our suggestion to motivate the affective reading of this construction is based on an assumption that one does not tolerate another active entity close to one's own control dominion.

In the *come-say* construction, the Actor's speech act is metaphorically conceived as abstract motion in which the Actor moves towards the control dominion of the Addressee (again see the interactional analysis in Section 4). This process is understood as a threat against the Addressee, a kind of abstract penetration. In other words, the *come-say* construction can be seen as an infringement of privacy or personal space.[19] Due to this, the speech act of this "intruder" gets an aggressive or arrogant reading even though it is not the lexical meaning of the speech act verb in question.

6. Conclusion and discussion

This paper has analysed two constructions in Finnish: the *go-say* and *come-say* constructions. By using different linguistic theories and methods, we found that across written and spoken corpora, the *come-say* construction is frequently used to display negative affect despite the fact that nothing in the construction itself suggests this. The corpus analysis partly confirmed the negativity of the *come-say* construction in that many speech act verbs (apart from verbs meaning 'to tell') in this construction were semantically negative. The *go-say* construction's meaning was less negative but its cotextual preferences (collocations and especially semantic prosody) were more negative. Consequently, these two constructions partly differed in how negative affective meaning is generated. The interactional linguistic part of the study was able to confirm the above findings. Although the spoken data did not reveal any purely affective uses of the construction, but rather combinations of affective, motional and temporal meanings, both constructions were frequently used for expressing negative affect in different kinds of telling sequences. The cognitive semantic part of the study suggested that the cognitive motivation for the purely negative affective meaning in the *come-say* construction is that it is an example of abstract motion towards a control dominion of the actual or Shifted Deictic Centre of the motion verb. This fictive movement is then considered as a threat against the Addressee and therefore the *come-say* construction has gained an affective meaning. The *go-say* construction was less negative with the meaning of revealing but it nevertheless emphasises that the referred speech act is considered inappropriate or regrettable. This meaning can again be seen as metaphorical conceptualisation in which the control over the speech act is lost. The result is that the Speaker or the Actor utters

---

[19] See also the idea of "non-with" discussed in Section 4.4.

something that should not be uttered. In general, rather than expressing a neutral meaning (e.g. 'X said') or the Speaker's or the Actor's motion towards an Addressee, these constructions tend to convey negative affect towards the reported actions.

In this paper, we have relied on theories and methodologies used in three different linguistic approaches. The aim has been to see what kinds of results their differing starting points provide for the analysis of two constructions. All of these approaches are first and foremost interested in *meaning* and *usage*. They also start from the assumption that form and meaning are systematically interconnected. Moreover, they all suggest that constructions (in general and the ones studied in this paper) are memorised as larger functionally motivated chunks, i.e. phraseological units. Indeed, Sinclair's (1991) "idiom principle", Goldberg's (1995) notion of "construction" and the interactional linguistic idea that linguistic constructions are stored and retrieved from memory as schematic patterns (Thompson 2002) all seem to address similar and quite fundamental aspects about linguistic constructions. They also share the idea that meaning is functionally motivated and emerges from recurrent and repetitive uses. In addition, by using the three methods rather than only a single one we were able to fortify findings that were made with one method. For example, the interactional linguistic analysis was in line with the findings regarding the constructions' lexical and semantic collocations that were based on a written language corpus and studied with corpus linguistic methods. Also, the study of spoken language was able to confirm the cognitive linguistic hypothesis that the construction is used in gossip sequences as well as other negatively saturated interactional contexts. Consequently, in many ways, each approach fed into the others, supplemented and improved our individual understandings of the *go-say* and *come-say* constructions.

What is different – some would say even contradictory – between these three approaches is that they have different understandings of where meaning resides or where it is located. Corpus linguistic research often focuses on a construction's immediate linguistic context (collocations, semantic preferences and semantic prosodies) and explains its meaning with this cotext in mind. Cognitive semantics, on the other hand, explains meaning mainly as a product of a person's cognitive knowledge base and mental, unconscious processes. Finally, for interactional linguists, meaning arises from the repeated uses of a construction in particular functionally motivated contexts and is closely intertwined with the social action that is

produced with the help of a construction. In addition, in interactional linguistics, meaning is understood to be negotiated and constructed between and by conversationalists, for the practical purposes of accomplishing social actions.

Nevertheless, these differences perhaps were the reason why we have been able to identify features of the construction's structure as well as its use that would not have been possible with one method only. We hope to have provided a broad view of the functional, social and cognitive reasons that motivate the constructions' meaning. More specifically, the corpus study, which was based on a large written language corpus, was used for getting an idea of the constructions' frequency and usage as phraseological units. Indeed, it is less likely that a cognitive or an interactional study would have been able to shed light on these questions. The interactional approach, with data coming from naturally-occurring, real-life interactions, was able to show that the constructions are used in particular, recurring interactional contexts in everyday conversations, i.e. in narratives and tellings, which cognitive semantics and corpus linguistics would not have been able to show. The major advantage of the cognitive approach, on the other hand, is that it deals with the semantic motivation of linguistic expressions. Accordingly, the cognitive semantic view makes the Finnish *go-say* and *come-say* constructions sensible by explaining why there is a motion verb, but no actual motion and also by giving a cognitive explanation to the constructions' affective meanings. Answering these questions would be difficult if only corpus linguistic or interactional analytic methods were used. However, despite the different approaches and the dissimilar angles to the analyses of the constructions, the findings were in some respect remarkably similar. This would seem to provide evidence for the multifaceted nature of language; that language inherently contains a functional, social and cognitive dimension.

We do argue that three methods together are better than one method alone, but not in the sense that by using them together we are simply able to obtain a richer account of language. Although we believe that three methods together supplement each other when the aim is to achieve a general view of a linguistic construction, there has also been another lesson to be learned. Linguists are no doubt aware of the strengths of their own approaches. However, we have noticed during this work that the true challenge has been to understand and acknowledge that our approaches do not answer everything, but address and emphasise different aspects of language form and language in use. One debate that the authors had, for

example, concerned whether the *come-say* construction can have a purely affective and non-motional reading. Since no examples were found from the spoken data, the existence of this meaning was questioned, although such examples can of course be postulated. However, during the next week, the sceptic witnessed three uses of the construction with that meaning. With respect to the cognitive semantic explanation, on the other hand, we also noticed that its method is not sufficient for explaining and motivating the constructions' use. In many ways, cognitive explanations and analyses *presuppose* a social situation, and thereby seem to demand social accounts and explanations of the situations in which they are used. Also, since humans do not act or make decisions in isolated vacuums, but in a dialogic relationship with their world, cognitive motivations have to be seen to be *occasioned* and *played out* in social interaction. If there are intentions and cognitive strategies at work with the use of linguistic constructions, as there at least sometimes have to be, they have to be fluid and able to respond the contingencies of social interaction. Further, we have to ask, whether the postulated examples can be found in real life and whether they are frequent, which is rarely done in cognitive semantic research. Consequently, all analyses of linguistic constructions have to critically consider what type of data is being used (e.g. large written corpora, introspection or spoken data) and how they influence or even skew the findings.

In sum, an important lesson to be learned in the writing of this paper has been to see what questions our approaches cannot answer, or to which they can only provide partial answers. The different approaches used in this paper emphasise very different aspects of language and they are not necessarily able to reveal the same things; in fact, it would be a surprise if they did. And if they did, the need to have different theories could be questioned. Along with other similar studies conducted in the recent years, we think that through discussion, debate and critical reflection they can be used in order to get an informed understanding of, for example, a particular linguistic construction.

References

Airola, Anu (2007) *Coordinated Verb Pairs in Texts*, Department of General Linguistics, publications no. 41. Helsinki: Helsinki University Print.
Arppe, Antti & Järvikivi, Juhani (2006) Take empiricism seriously! In support of methodological diversity in linguistics. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory* 3 (1): 99–109.
Barnbrook, Geoff (1996) *Language and Computer: A Practical Introduction to the*

Computer Analysis of Language, Edinburgh Textbooks in Empirical Linguistics. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Besnier, Niko (1993) Reported speech and affect on Nukulaelae atoll. In Jane H. Hill & Judith T. Irvine (eds.), *Responsibility and Evidence in Oral Discourse*, Studies in the Social and Cultural Foundations in Language 15, pp. 161–181. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Biber, Douglas & Finegan, Edward (1989) Styles of stance in English: Lexical and grammatical marking of evidentiality and affect. *Text* 9 (1): 93–124.

Biber, Douglas & Jones, James K. (2005) Merging corpus linguistics and discourse analytic research goals: Discourse units in biology research articles. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory* 1 (2): 151–182.

Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth & Kortmann, Bernd (2000) *Cause, Condition, Concession, Contrast: Cognitive and Discourse Perspectives*, Topics in English Linguistics 33. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth & Selting, Margret (2001) Introducing interactional linguistics. In Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen & Margret Selting (eds.), *Studies in Interactional Linguistics*, Studies in Discourse and Grammar 10, pp. 1–22. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Du Bois, John W. (2007) The stance triangle. In Robert Englebretson (ed.), *Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, Evaluation, Interaction*, Pragmatics & Beyond New Series 164, pp. 139–182. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Du Bois, John W.; Schuetze-Coburn, Stephan; Cumming, Susanna & Paolino, Danae (1993) Outline of discourse transcription. In Jane A. Edwards & Martin D. Lampert (eds.), *Talking Data: Transcription and Coding in Discourse Research*, pp. 45–89. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Englebretson, Robert (2007) Stancetaking in colloquial Indonesian conversation. In Robert Englebretson (ed.), *Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, Evaluation, Interaction*, Pragmatics & Beyond New Series 164, pp. 69–110. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Erman, Britt (2007) Cognitive processes as evidence of the idiom principle. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 12 (1): 25–53.

Etelämäki, Marja; Herlin, Ilona; Jaakola, Minna & Visapää, Laura (2009) Kielioppi käsitteistyksenä ja toimintana: Kognitiivista kielioppia ja keskustelunanalyysia yhdistämässä [Grammar as conceptualization and as action: Combining cognitive grammar and conversation analysis]. *Virittäjä* 113 (2): 162–187.

Fillmore, Charles J. (1992) "Corpus linguistics" or "computer-aided armchair linguistics". In Jan Svartvik (ed.), *Directions in Corpus Linguistics: Proceedings of Nobel Symposium 82 Stockholm, 4–8 August 1991*, pp. 35–60. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ford, Cecilia A.; Fox, Barbara A. & Thompson, Sandra A. (2002) Social interaction and grammar. In Michael Tomasello (ed.), *The New Psychology of Language: Cognitive and Functional Approaches To Language Structure*, vol. 2, pp. 119–143. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gilquin, Gaëtanelle & Gries, Stefan Th. (2009) Corpora and experimental methods: A state-of-the-art review. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory* 5 (1): 1–26.

Givón, Talmy (1973) The time-axis phenomenon. *Language* 49 (4): 890–925.

Goffman, Erving (1963) *Behavior in Public Places: Notes on the Social Organization of Gatherings*. New York: Free Press.

Goldberg, Adele E. (1995) *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*, Cognitive Theory of Language and Culture. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Haddington, Pentti (2005) *The Intersubjectivity of Stance Taking in Talk-in-interaction*. Oulu: Oulu University Press.

Hopper, Paul (2001) Hendiadys and auxiliation in English. In Joan Bybee & Michael Noonan (eds.), *Complex Sentences in Grammar and Discourse: Essays in Honor of Sandra A. Thomson*, pp. 145–173. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Hunston, Susan (2007) Semantic prosody revisited. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 12 (2): 249–268.

Huumo, Tuomas (2006) 'I woke up from the sofa': Subjective directionality in Finnish expressions of a spatio-cognitive transfer. In Marja-Liisa Helasvuo & Lyle Campbell (eds.), *Grammar from the Human Perspective: Case, Space and Person in Finnish*, Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 277, pp. 41–65. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Huumo, Tuomas & Ojutkangas, Krista (2006) An introduction to Finnish spatial relations: Local cases and adpositions. In Marja-Liisa Helasvuo & Lyle Campbell (eds.), *Grammar from the Human Perspective: Case, Space and Person in Finnish*, Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 277, pp. 11–20. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Huumo, Tuomas & Sivonen, Jari (2010) Conceptualizing change as deictic abstract motion: Metaphorical and grammatical uses of 'come' and 'go' in Finnish. In Fey Parrill, Vera Tobin & Mark Turner (eds.), *Meaning, Form, and Body*, Conceptual Structure, Discourse and Language, pp. 111–128. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Jefferson, Gail (1978) Sequential aspects of storytelling in conversation. In Jim Schenkein (ed.), *Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction*, pp. 219–248. New York: Academic Press.

—— (1988) On the sequential organization of troubles-talk in ordinary conversation. *Social Problems* 35 (4): 418–441.

Keevallik, Leelo (2003) *From Interaction to Grammar: Estonian Finite Verb Forms in Conversation*, Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Studia Uralica Upsaliensia 34. Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet.

Keisanen, Tiina (2007) Stancetaking as an interactional activity: Challenging the prior speaker. In Robert Englebretson (ed.), *Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, Evaluation, Interaction*, Pragmatics & Beyond New Series 164, pp. 253–281. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kiuru, Silva (1977) *Suomen kielen kieltohakuiset verbit* [The Negative Polarity Verbs in Finnish], Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 335. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

KS = *Kielitoimiston sanakirja 2.0* (2008) [The New Dictionary of Modern Finnish], Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskuksen julkaisuja 149. Helsinki: Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus & Kielikone Oy.

Lakoff, George (1987) *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George & Johnson, Mark (1980) *Metaphors We Live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Langacker, Ronald W. (1990) *Concept, Image, and Symbol: The Cognitive Basis of Grammar*, Cognitive Linguistics Research 1. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

—— (1991) *Foundation of Cognitive Grammar*, *vol. 2: Descriptive application*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

—— (1993) Reference-point constructions. *Cognitive Linguistics* 4 (1): 1−38.

—— (1999) *Grammar and Conceptualization*, Cognitive Linguistics Research 14. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

—— (2008) *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Larjavaara, Matti (1990) *Suomen deiksis* [Finnish Deixis], Suomi 156. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Louw, Bill (1993) Irony in the text or insincerity in the writer? The diagnostic potential of semantic prosodies. In Mona Baker, Gill Francis & Elena Tognini-Bonelli (eds.), *Text and Technology: In honour of John Sinclair*, pp. 157–176. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Martin, James R. (2000) Beyond exchange: Appraisal systems in English. In Susan Hunston & Geoff Thompson (eds.), *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*, pp. 142–175. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Niemelä, Maarit (2005) Voiced direct reported speech in conversational storytelling: Sequential patterns of stance taking. *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 18: 197–221.

Ochs, Elinor; Schegloff, Emanuel A. & Thompson, Sandra A. (eds.) (1996) *Interaction and Grammar*, Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 13. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Onikki-Rantajääskö, Tiina (2001) *Sarjoja: Nykysuomen paikallissijaiset olotilanilmaukset kielen analogisuuden ilmentäjinä* [Series: Expressions of State Marked by Locative Cases in Modern Finnish and How They Represent the Analogy of Language], Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 817. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Pajunen, Anneli (2001) *Argumenttirakenne: Asiaintilojen luokitus ja verbien käyttäytyminen suomen kielessä*. [Argument Structure: Classification of States and Verb Behavior in Finnish], Suomi 187. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Payne, Thomas E. (1997) *Describing Morphosyntax: A Guide for Field Linguists.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Precht, Kristen (2003) Stance moods in spoken English: Evidentiality and affect in British and American conversation. *Text* 23 (2): 239–257.

Routarinne, Sara (2005) Keskustelupuheen johtolauseiden kielioppia [The grammar of reporting clauses in conversation]. In Markku Haakana & Jyrki Kalliokoski (eds.), *Referointi ja moniäänisyys* [Referring and Polyphony], Tietolipas 206, pp. 83–113. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Saukkonen, Pauli; Haipus, Marjatta; Niemikorpi, Antero & Sulkala, Helena (1979) *Suomen kielen taajuussanasto* [A Frequency Dictionary of Finnish]. Juva: WSOY.

Shore, Susanna (1988) On the so-called Finnish passive. *Word* 39: 151–176.

Sinclair, John (1991) *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*, Describing English Language Oxford: Oxford University Press.

—— (1996) The search for units in meaning. *Textus* IX: 75–106.

—— (1998) The lexical item. In Edda Weigand (ed.), *Contrastive Lexical Semantics*, Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 171, pp. 1–24. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Stefanowitsch, Anatol (1999) The *go-and-verb* construction in a cross-linguistic perspective: Image-schema blending and the construal of events. In Dawn Nordquist & Catie Berkenfield (eds.), *Proceedings of the Second Annual High Desert Linguistics Society Conference*, pp. 123–134. Albuquerque, NM: High Desert Linguistics Society.

Stivers, Tanya (2008) Stance, alignment, and affiliation during storytelling: When nodding is a token of affiliation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 41 (1): 31–57.

Stubbs, Michael (1995a) Collocations and semantic profiles. On the cause of the trouble with quantitative studies. *Functions of Language* 2: 23–55.

—— (1995b) Corpus evidence for norms of lexical collocation. In Guy Cook & Barbara Seidlhofer (eds.), *Principle & Practice in Applied Linguistics: Studies in honour of H.G. Widdowson*, Oxford Applied Linguistics, pp. 245–256. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

—— (2001) *Words and Phrases: Corpus Studies of Lexical Semantics.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Thompson, Sandra A. (2001) Foreword. In Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen & Margret Selting (eds.), *Studies in Interactional Linguistics*, Studies in Discourse and Grammar 10, pp. vii–viii. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

—— (2002) 'Object complements' and conversation: Towards a realistic account. *Studies in Language* 26 (1): 125–164.

Tognini-Bonelli, Elena (2001) *Corpus Linguistics at Work*, Studies in Corpus Linguistics 6. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

—— (2002) Functionally complete units of meaning across English and Italian: Towards a corpus-driven approach. In Bengt Altenberg & Sylviane Granger (eds.), *Lexis in Contrast: Corpus-based Approaches*, Studies in Corpus Linguistics 7, pp. 73–95. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

VISK = Hakulinen, Auli; Vilkuna, Maria; Korhonen, Riitta; Koivisto, Vesa; Heinonen, Tarja Riitta & Alho, Irja (2004) *Iso suomen kielioppi* [Comprehensive Finnish Grammar], Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 950. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. <http://scripta.kotus.fi/visk URN:ISBN:978-952-5446-35-7> (28 September, 2011).

Whitsitt, Sam (2005) A critique of the concept of semantic prosody. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 10 (3): 283–305.

Appendix 1. Transcription conventions.

Based on Du Bois et al. (1993).

Units

Intonation unit	{line break}
Truncated intonation unit	--
Truncated word	– (en dash)

Transitional continuity

Final	.
Continuing	,
Appeal (seeking a validating response from listener)	?

Speakers

Speech overlap	[ ]
(numbers inside brackets index overlaps)	[2 two words 2]

Accent and lengthening

Primary accent (prominent pitch movement carrying intonational meaning)	^
Secondary accent	'
Unaccented	
Lengthening	=

Pause

Long pause (0.7 s or longer)	...(N)
Medium pause (0.3–0.6 s)	...
Short (brief break in speech rhythm)(0.2 s or less)	..
Latching	(0)

Vocal noises

Inhalation	(H)
Alveolar click	(TSK)
Laughter (one pulse)	@

Quality

Special voice quality	<VOX>two words</VOX>
Higher pitch level	<HI> </HI>

Allegro: rapid speech   <A> </A>

Transcriber's perspective
Researcher's comment   (( ))

Appendix 2. Gloss conventions.

The morpheme-by-morpheme glosses are based on the Leipzig Glossing Rules.

1 = first person
2 = second person
3 = third person
ABL = ablative
ACC = accusative
ADE = adessive
ALL = allative
CNG = connegative (verb)
COND = conditional
ELA = elative
ESS = essive
GEN = genitive
ILL = illative
INE = inessive
INF = infinitive
INT = interrogative
NEG = negation (verb)
PART = particle
PASS = passive
PL = plural
PST = past tense
PTCP = participle
PTV = partitive
PX = possessive
SG = singular
TRA = translative

Contact information:

Pentti Haddington
Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies
P.O. Box 4
FI–00014 University of Helsinki
Finland
e-mail: pentti(dot)haddington(at)helsinki(dot)fi

Jarmo H. Jantunen
Finnish Language / Faculty of Humanities
P.O. Box 1000
90014 University of Oulu
Finland
e-mail: jarmo(dot)jantunen(at)oulu(dot)fi

Jari Sivonen
ELTE BTK Finnugor Tanszék
Múzeum krt. 4/i VIII
Budapest
Hungary
e-mail: jari(dot)sivonen(at)oulu(dot)fi