

Experience report starters and their evoked speech event conceptions: Conceptual overlap of interpersonal and ideational metafunctions

Katsunobu Izutsu / Takeshi Koguma

Hokkaido University of Education / University of Shiga Prefecture

1. Introduction*

This study addresses the diversity found in the ideational and interpersonal features of “pre-patterned” or “prefabricated” (Barlow 2000) expressions used to start report talks about recent experiences in English, Japanese, Korean, and an occasional reference to Spanish. We argue that an analysis of the speech event conception associated with the relevant expression in each language can help to account for how and why those ideationally and interpersonally diverse expressions can carry out the same pragmatic function.

Japanese and Korean speakers who are about to start a report of what they recently experienced will use specific constructions literally meaning ‘I did and came’ and ‘I did and saw,’ respectively: e.g., *sensyuu mekisikoni it-te-ki-ta-yo* (Japanese) and *jinanju megsiko-e ga bo-asseo* (Korean), both translatable as ‘Guess where I went last week? (!) Mexico!’ Upon hearing these expressions, the addressee(s) will prepare themselves for an experience report to be recounted in the subsequent conversation. As can be seen from the fact that their English translation manifests as an interrogative or imperative, those constructions primarily serve “interpersonal metafunction” (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004); thus, they can be termed “experience report starters.”

In both the Japanese and the Korean constructions, the “predicator” (*ibid.*) presents itself as a verbal sequence of indicative (declarative) mood. Though apparently similar in lexicogrammatical configurations, they exhibit significant differences in ideational (experiential) terms. Japanese *-te-ki-ta-yo* is centered on a verb of “material process” (‘come’), accompanied by a “negotiator” (Teruya 2007: 48-49), *-yo*, while Korean *-a bo-asseo* is centered on a verb of “mental process”

(‘see’), without a negotiator.

The functional counterpart in English does not share such lexicogrammatical configurations, let alone the mood evoked, with the relevant constructions in Japanese and Korean. The typical predicator is another verb of mental process *guess* and the preferred mood is another indicative (interrogative) or imperative rather than declarative.

Systemic functional approaches can provide a plausible account of how each construction can function as experience report starter. However, they would somehow leave unexplained how and why such a comparable function is carried out by those constructions of great discrepancies in lexicogrammatical configurations and mood categories. We propose a solution to those questions based on the “speech event conception” (Izutsu and Izutsu 2017: 3.2) associated with each of the constructions, which will hopefully amount to a further cultivation of “interpersonal metaphor” (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 10.4).

2. Recent experience report starters

It is very common in many languages of the world that one speech event participant brings his or her recent experience into conversation as a topic that is intended to be developed in the ensuing stretch of verbal interaction. In Spanish, for instance, we can find such a recent experience report in the following interview news, where an actor named Gad Elmaleh talks about the last few days he spent with his beloved son Raphaël in Monaco.

- (1) *En la misma entrevista, Gad confesaba: “Justo acabo de estar en Mónaco unos días y ha sido genial. Raphaël y yo hemos estado todo el tiempo juntos. Pero, claro, en algún momento tuve que decirle que me*

tenía que marchar a trabajar y que volvería pronto”.
(*Vanitatis: El Confidencial*; emphasis added)¹

‘In the same interview, Gad confessed: “I’ve just been in Monaco for a few days and it was great. Raphaël and I were together all the time. But, of course, there was some time when I had to tell him that I had to go to work and that I would be back soon.”’²

Here the recent experience report is started with a “prefabricated or semi-prefabricated chunk” (Barlow 2000: 319), *justo acabar de V*, where *acabar de V* is usually described as an expression of a recent past. This kind of expression can be characterized as recent experience report starter.

In Japanese and Korean, speakers can start a recent experience report using sequential verb (“converb” in Shibatani’s (2003) terms) constructions illustrated in (2a-b) that literally mean ‘I did and came’ and ‘I did and saw,’ respectively.³ The Japanese construction takes a prefabricated form accompanied by the final particle *-yo*.⁴

(2) JAPANESE

- a. *sensyuu mekisiko-ni it-te-ki-ta-yo.*
last:week Mexico-to go-and-come-PST-FP⁵
‘Guess where I went last week? Mexico!’

KOREAN

- b. *jinanju megsiko-e ga bo-asseo.*
last:week Mexico-to go:and see-PST
‘Guess where I went last week? Mexico!’

ENGLISH

- c. *You’ll never guess where I went last week!*
(*I went to*) Mexico!⁶

In contrast, English does not use such a sequential verb construction but a “clause nexus” (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 8) or clausal sequence that expresses a “projection” (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 206), as illustrated in (2c). This structure can be seen as deriving from conversational sequences such as (3) and (4). Conceivably, speaker A’s utterances that shape two turns in (3) and (4) are somehow contracted into one utterance, giving rise to the structure instantiated in (2c).

(3) A: *Guess where I went last week?*

B: *Where?*

A: (*I went to*) Mexico!

(4) A: *You’ll never guess where I went last week!*

B: *No. Where?*

A: (*I went to*) Mexico!

The contrast between the sequential verb construction and the clausal sequence structure can be identified with what Halliday and Matthiessen (2004: 613-614) argue for as two different modes of mood and modality expression under the notion of “interpersonal metaphor.”

3. Interpersonal metaphor

According to Halliday and Matthiessen (2004: 613-614), (5a) is an “example of metaphor in modality,” in which mental clauses like *I think* or *I don’t believe* can serve as a “metaphorical realization of probability” because “the probability is realized by a mental clause *as if* it was a figure of sensing.” They argue (2004: 614) that being metaphorical, such a mental clause not only serves “as the projecting part of a clause nexus of projection” but also “as a mood Adjunct, just as *probably* does” in (5b). Pointing out that the appropriate form of tag for (5a) is, in the same way as (5b), *isn’t it?* rather than *don’t I?*, Halliday and Matthiessen (*ibid.*) further argue that the relevant expression is regarded as a metaphorical variant of modality because the proposition conveyed is not ‘I think’ but ‘it is going to rain.’

- (5) a. *I think it’s going to rain.*
b. *It’s probably going to rain.*

Likewise, Halliday and Matthiessen (2004: 617) explain expressions like (6) as metaphorical variants of similar modality. (6c-e) are analyzed in systemic-functional terms as in Table 1 and accounted for with respect to the interpersonal metaphor of modality.

- (6) a. *Probably, Mary doesn’t know.*
b. *It seems likely that Mary doesn’t know.*
c. *Mary won’t know.*
d. *In my opinion, Mary doesn’t know.*
e. *I don’t think Mary knows.*

	‘Mary	won’t	know’
	Subject	Finite/ Modality/ Polarity	Predicator
	Mood		Residue
‘in my opinion’	‘Mary	doesn’t	know’
Modality	Subject	Finite/ Polarity	Predicator
Mood			Residue
I	don’t	think	Mary
	α		knows
			‘ β
Subject	Finite/ Polarity	Predicator	Subject
			Finite ‘present’
Mood		Residue	Predicator know
			Residue

Table 1: Analysis of probability expressions (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 617)

As illustrated in (6), semantic domains such as mood and modality can extend across more than one grammatical environment (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 613). The modality of probability can manifest itself in either an adjunct, as in (6a) and (6d), a verbal group (including an auxiliary), as in (6c), or a clause nexus (including a superordinate clause), as in (6b) and (6e).

The previous section saw that the recent experience report starters exhibit contrasting manifestations in Japanese, Korean, and English. Following Halliday and Matthiessen (2004: 613-614), we can now recapture this contrast in terms of interpersonal metaphor. The Japanese and Korean sequential verb constructions and the English clausal sequence structure can be viewed as corresponding to two variations of modal expression: verbal group and clause nexus. Now we can see that they amount to two different modes of starting a recent experience report.

4. Ideational (dis)similarities in interpersonal metaphors

As seen above, English employs a clause nexus for the formation of a recent experience report starter, whereas Japanese and Korean adopt a verbal group for the same purpose. The Japanese and Korean constructions are comparably comprised of a tensed verb preceded by another verb in an adverbial form. However, they differ in further ideational terms: the tensed verb must be one of “material process” (‘came’) in Japanese but can be one of “mental process” (‘saw’) in Korean, as in (2a-b) repeated below. Moreover, Japanese *-te-ki-ta-yo* is accompanied by a “negotiator” (Teruya 2007: 48-49), *-yo*, while Korean *-a bo-asseo* is not. These lexicogrammatical differences among the relevant expressions of the three languages can be accounted

for in terms of different facets of the same speech event conception in which the speaker reports his or her recent experience to the addressee.

(2) JAPANESE

- a. *sensyuu mekisiko-ni it-te-ki-ta-yo.*
last:week Mexico-to go-and-come-PST-FP
‘Guess where I went last week? Mexico!’

KOREAN

- b. *jinanju megsiko-e ga bo-asseo.*
last:week Mexico-to go:and see-PST
‘Guess where I went last week? Mexico!’

ENGLISH

- c. *You’ll never guess where I went last week!*
(I went to) Mexico!

The discourse of recent experience report consists of some ideational and interpersonal facets: (i) the speaker now conceives of what he experienced a short time ago, (ii) gives the addressee the gist of the experience, and (iii) makes the addressee want to hear more about the experience. Facets (ii) and (iii) largely amount to “assertive” and “directive” illocutionary acts (Searle 1979: 12-13), respectively. This implies that expressions like recent experience report starters serve for complex illocutionary acts, which are supposedly encoded separately by declarative and imperative sentences.

The recency facet (i) can be envisaged as the speaker having just brought the experience to the site of speech event (‘come here with the experience’), as in Japanese example (2a). Alternatively, it can be envisioned as the speaker’s keeping a visual perception or vivid cognition of the experience (‘saw and now keep the experience’), as in Korean example (2b). Unlike the Japanese verb of seeing *mi-ru*, the Korean verb *bo-da*

	Japanese	Korean	English
RECENCY	material process ‘come here with the experience’	mental process ‘saw and now keep the experience’	-
GIST-GIVING	interpersonal particle for ‘I tell you’	-	mental process ‘guess <i>wh</i> ’
INTRIGUING	interpersonal particle for ‘I tell you’	-	interrogative/imperative ‘guess?’ or negative ‘you’ll never guess’

Table 2: Ideational and interpersonal facets and their lexicogrammatical manifestations

covers a category of meaning that ranges over ‘seeing,’ ‘meeting,’ and ‘experiencing,’ which is seemingly responsible for the semantic import of Korean *-a bo-asseo*: the speaker’s current maintenance of the relevant experience as a vivid image in his memory.

Japanese further encourages the speaker to emphasize the gist-giving facet (ii) and the intriguing facet (iii) with *-yo* (‘I tell you’), one of the “interpersonal particles” that add “various negotiatory values to the clause, expressing the speaker’s attitudinal stance towards the proposition or proposal put forward” (Teruya 2007: 141). In contrast, English allows the speaker to activate the intriguing facet (iii) using a strong emphasis of the addressee’s ignorance (‘you’ll never guess’), as in (2c), or an interrogative/imperative mood (‘guess where?’), as illustrated in example (3) above. The gist-giving facet is prompted as the mental process of ‘guess *wh*.’

As seen so far, the speaker’s conception of a speech event in which the speaker delivers a recent experience report involves both ideational and interpersonal facets in one composite whole. In other words, the “speech event conception” (Izutsu and Izutsu 2017) is by nature a composite entity intermingling interpersonal and ideational metafunctions. It is not that the speech event is represented either ideationally or interpersonally [i.e., as “clause as exchange” and “clause as representation” in Halliday and Matthiessen’s (2004: Chs.4 and 5) terms] but that its interpersonal and ideational facets are essentially inseparable and compose a monolithic representation.

If our view is correct, the relationships among different variations of the same semantic domain (e.g., mood and modality at a more general level and recent experience report at a more specific level) need not be seen as metaphor. In the first place, metaphor

presupposes two different domains (“source domain and target domain”) and a mapping between them (Lakoff 1987: 288). However, we can hardly see any distinction between the semantic domains that underlie the lexicogrammatical variations of mood, modality, recent experience report, and so on. These variations can be better analyzed as contrasting ways of ethnographic “construal” (Langacker 2008: Ch.3) of a comparable speech event conception.

5. Grammaticalization rather than grammatical metaphor

As far as the Japanese and Korean constructions of recent experience report starter are concerned, we can find one piece of evidence that they are founded on “grammaticalization” (Heine et al. 1991; Hopper and Traugott 1993) rather than interpersonal metaphors, one of the two “grammatical metaphors” that Halliday and Matthiessen (2004: Ch.10) argue for. As demonstrated above, the relevant constructions in Japanese and Korean literally have a lexicogrammatical structure that can be glossed as ‘did and came’ and ‘did and saw,’ respectively. This structure represents sequential verb constructions that are well known to be a typical source of grammaticalization (converb constructions) (cf. Haspelmath and König 1995).

We also saw that the English structure exemplified in (2c) can be seen as deriving from conversational sequences such as (3) and (4), shown above. Likewise, Japanese and Korean sentences (2a-b) can be viewed as stemming from two-clause structures represented in (7a-b). If the parenthesized elements in (7) are left out with the square-bracketed element replacing the preceding one in (7b), we will obtain the structures of (2a-b) with a verbal rather than clausal sequence as their chief element.

(7) JAPANESE

- a. *sensyuu mekisiko-ni it-te (koko-ni)*
last:week Mexico-to go-and (here-to)
ki-ta-yo.
come-PST-FP
'Last week (I) went to Mexico and (I) came (here to this site of conversation).'

KOREAN

- b. *jinanju megsiko-e ga (-seo) (geugeos-eul)*
last:week Mexico-to go (-and) (it-ACC)
bo-asseo.
see[experience]-PST
'Last week (I) went to Mexico and (I) saw [experienced] (it).'

In verb-final languages like Japanese and Korean, sequential verb constructions for various semantic domains (recent experience report as well as mood, modality, tense, aspect, etc.) have developed from clausal sequences in this manner. This kind of development can appropriately be seen as grammaticalization in Hopper and Traugott's (1993: xv) sense. Just as English *be going to* has developed from the purposive expression, as in (8a), into an auxiliary of future, as in (8b), (Hopper and Traugott 1993: 1-4), Japanese *-te-ki-ta-yo* and Korean *bo-asseo* have now been more or less grammaticalized as auxiliary-like verbal sequences of recent experience report starter.

- (8) a. *I am going (to London) to marry Bill.*
b. *I am going to go to London.*

In the systemic-functional framework, *go* is a verb of "material process" (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 184) in (8a), but it serves as auxiliary of future in (8b) (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 338). Likewise, *ki-ta-yo* '(I) came' in (7a) and *bo-asseo* '(I) saw' in (7b) can be best described as verbs of material and mental process, respectively, while in (2a-b), those verbal complexes do not represent such processes but should rather be viewed as a mood element (i.e., element of interpersonal metafunction). Even though one may recognize that grammaticalization such as these is "metaphorical in

nature" (Heine et al. 1991: 46), it is not in the sense of grammatical metaphor but at some conceptual levels.

As is already noted above, the speech event conception in which the speaker delivers a recent experience report shapes a conceptual composite whole whose interpersonal and ideational facets are essentially inseparable and compose a monolithic representation. What can be dealt with as interpersonal metaphors need to be reanalyzed in terms of various types (and further subtypes) of speech event conception (cf. Izutsu and Izutsu 2017).

6. Another strategy to start a recent experience report and its typological implication

As has been demonstrated so far, a recent experience report can be started with two major types of expressions: a verbal group including an auxiliary, as illustrated in Japanese and Korean examples (9a-b), and a clause nexus including a superordinate clause, as exemplified in English example (9c-d).

(9) JAPANESE

- a. *sensyuu mekisiko-ni it-te-ki-ta-yo.* (=2a)
last:week Mexico-to go-and-come-PST-FP
'Guess where I went last week? Mexico!'

KOREAN

- b. *jinanju megsiko-e ga bo-asseo.* (=2b)
last:week Mexico-to go:and see-PST
'Guess where I went last week? Mexico!'

ENGLISH

- c. *You'll never guess where I went last week! (I went to) Mexico!* (=2c)
d. *Guess where I went last week, Mexico!*

We can now remember that we already saw another strategy or expression employable for introducing a recent experience report into conversation. Section 2 observed that Spanish uses the structure *justo acabar de V* as a recent experience report starter, as in (1), partially repeated as (10) here. It should be noticed, however, that the structure is accompanied by another clausal element that can be translated as 'and it was great': *y ha sido genial*. The foregoing clause mainly conveys the gist-

giving and recency facets, while this additional clause profiles the intriguing facet. Thus, the additional clause preceded by a connective *y* (or the whole structure including the foregoing clause) can be viewed as a type of expression for recent experience report.

- (10) *Justo acabo de estar en Mónaco unos días y ha sido genial.* (*Vanitatis: El Confidencial*; emphasis added)
 ‘I’ve just been in Monaco for a few days **and it was great.**’

In fact, the English translation can serve to start a recent experience report; we can find many more examples with the same structure used in the discourse of recent experience report, some of which are illustrated in (11).

- (11) a. *I went to Mexico last week and it was great.*
 b. *We had my son’s birthday party there last night and it was great!*⁷
 c. *We ate at the restaurant and it was great.*⁸

It is further interesting that Japanese and Korean as well have similar clausal elements that follow a gist-giving expression of recent experience report, as instantiated in (12). An internet search can find a lot more examples of the same formulations as in (13). In these expressions, the use of the verbal-group construction (*V-te-mi-ru* and *V-a bo-asseo*) is optional, as represented by the parenthesis.

(12) JAPANESE

- a. *sensyuu mekisiko-ni it (-te-ki)-ta-*
 last:week Mexico-to go (-and-come) -PST-
nda-kedo, yokat-ta-yo.
 EVD-though be.good-PST-FP
 ‘I went to Mexico last week and it was great.’

KOREAN

- b. *jinanju megsiko-e ga (bo)-ass-*
 last:week Mexico-to go (see) -PST-
neunde joh-asseo.
 though be.good-PST-FP
 ‘I went to Mexico last week and it was great.’

(13) JAPANESE

- a. *sensyuu ginzan-ni it-te-ki-ta-*
 last.week Ginzan-to go-and-come-PST-
*nda-kedo, yokat-ta-yo.*⁹
 EVD-though be.good-PST-FP
 ‘I went to Ginzan (hot spring) last week and it was great.’

KOREAN

- b. *yobeon-e jangmi chugje cheoem*
 this.time-in rose festival first
*ga bo-ass-neunde joh-asseo-yo!*¹⁰
 go see-PST-though be.good-PST-FP
 ‘I went to the rose festival for the first time this time and it was great.’

The examples in (9) through (13) instantiate the cases where the speaker has some good news. Of course, speakers can intend to report some bad news to the addressee; in such cases, they seem to choose some other expressions for the additional clause connected to the gist-giving clause (e.g., *and it was terrible in English*; *-ta-nda-kedo hidokat-ta-yo* ‘and it was terrible’ and *-ta-nda-kedo gakkari* ‘and it was disappointing’ in Japanese; *-ass-neunde simhae-sseo* ‘and it was terrible’ and *-ass-neunde silmanghae-sseo* ‘and I was disappointed’ in Korean).

The *and-it-was-great* type of expression may look like a looser structure than the verbal-group and clause-nexus types (‘I did and came/saw’ and *you (will never) guess wh*). It will not be surprising, however, if the former has achieved a status of sentential expression with a specific discourse-pragmatic function. In fact, there is another instance in which similar two conjuncts connected with *and* have achieved such a construction-like status: coordination with ‘left-subordinating’ *and*, illustrated by sentences like *You drink another can of beer and I’m leaving* (Culicover and Jackendoff 1997: 197).

Our discussion shows that there are at least three types of expressions that are adopted as recent experience report starters; each language can employ one type or another, otherwise a combination thereof, and exhibits a certain degree of favor for one of these. To put it differently, different languages can be classified from a typological perspective based on which type

of expression they prefer as a recent experience report starter. Japanese, Korean, and Spanish prefer a verbal-group type, while English favors a clause-nexus type. All the languages exhibit diverse degrees of inclination to the *and-it-was-great* type.

The existence of these expressions implicates that the four languages have in common a comparable discourse pattern in which the speaker intends to report his or her recent experience and share it with the addressee in the following conversation. The speech event conceptions that underlie the meanings of the expressions will accordingly be similar across the languages but can, at the same time, differ in details of the conceptions. Although similarly adopting a verbal-group type, Japanese envisages a spatial movement (*V-te-ki-ta* ‘did and CAME’), Korean focuses on a perceptual experience (*V-a bo-asseo* ‘did and SAW’), and Spanish emphasizes the completion of an event (*justo acabo de V* ‘finish (of) doing’). These differences can comprise some language/culture-specific facets of the relevant speech event conception in each language. Such differences will also deserve another typological description and analysis, which is sure to be another intriguing, though beyond the scope of this paper, topic of research.

7. Conclusion

The type of expression analyzed in this case study is systemic-functionally, conceptually, and speech-act theoretically complex or multiplex. The speech event conception associated with the relevant expressions, by nature, consists of different ideational and interpersonal facets, each of which is identified as: recency, gist-giving, and intriguing facets. In Japanese, all the facets are lexicographically profiled, as with *V-te-ki-ta-yo*. They also are in Spanish, as manifested in *justo acabar de V y ha sido genial*. In contrast, the gist-giving and intriguing facets are, but the recency facet is not, activated in English, as with *guess wh I did*, while only the recency facet is verbalized in Korean, as with *V-a bo-asseo*.

Accordingly, it is probable that the recent experience report is not so enthusiastically started with the Korean *V-a bo-asseo* as with Japanese *V-te-ki-ta-yo* and English *You’ll never guess wh*.¹¹ Nevertheless, the intriguing

facet can be focused on with the *and-it-was-great* type of expression in Korean as well as in the other three languages. The four languages can thus be best understood as sharing a very comparable discourse type in which the speaker wants to report his or her recent experience and share it with the addressee in the following conversation. They have their own (respectively preferred) type(s) of expressions for this same pragmatic purpose: linguistic devices for a typical starter of such a discourse type. At the same time, the lexicogrammatical diversities of the devices can be seen as an ethnographical reflection of the discourse type.

Notes

* The chief discussion and main claim launched in this paper is a revised version of our presentation at XIV Congreso de la Asociación de Lingüística Sistemico-Funcional de América Latina (ALSFAL), La Facultad de Lenguas de la Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, October 11, 2018. Part of this research is supported by JSPS KAKENHI (Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) 18K00563).

1 https://www.vanitatis.elconfidencial.com/casas-reales/2018-09-19/gal-elmaleh-carlota-casiraghi-raphael-ver-hijo_1617603/

2 This is our English translation. As will be discussed in Section 6, ‘and it was great’ as well as ‘I’ve just been in Monaco for a few days’ can serve to start a recent experience report; therefore, here we employ this literal translation instead of ‘guess where I went and spent a few days, Monaco.’

3 A similar characterization of Japanese *V-te-kuru* is found in Mizutani (1985: 32-34).

4 We can find a similar discourse in a Twitter posting such as:

- (i) *soo ie-ba konaida kyooto-e*
so say-if the.other.day Kyoto-to
it-te-ki-ta-yo.
go-and-come-PST-FP
‘Guess where I went the other day? Kyoto.’

5 We adopt the following abbreviations in glossing example sentences: COP for copula, FP for final particle, PST for past, and QUOT for quotative.

6 In Japanese and Korean, too, comparable formulations

such as the following are possible. However, their use is more limited to conversations among close friends or family members.

(i) JAPANESE

- a. *sensyuu doko-ni it-te-ki-ta-to*
 last:week where-to go-and-come-PST-QUOT
omou? *Mekisiko-da-yo.*
 think Mexico-COP-FP
 ‘Guess where I went last week? Mexico!’

KOREAN

- b. *jinanju eodi-ro ga bo-ass-neun-ji*
 last:week where-to go-and see-PST-QUOT
ara? *meksiko-ya.*
 know Mexico-COP-FP
 ‘Guess where I went last week? Mexico!’

7 <https://wonderlandspokane.com/faq-items/we-had-my-sons-birthday-party-there-and-it-was-great/>

8 https://www.tripadvisor.co.uk/ShowUserReviews-g551607-d1371222-r534719428-Four_Seasons_Restaurant_at_Knock_House_Hotel-Knock_County_Mayo_Western_Ireland.html

9 http://fhrp.seesaa.net/article/34163794.html?seesaa_related=category

10 <https://www.inst4gram.com/tag/남편이랑데이뜨>

11 Yong-Taek Kim informed us that in Korean as well, another converb construction meaning ‘did and came’ (V-go *wasseo*) seems to exhibit an increasing tendency to assume some shades of gist-giving, intriguing, and recency.

Acknowledgement

We would like to express our gratitude to Walter Klinger for his helpful and valuable comments on earlier versions of the present discussion, especially on the relevant English expressions, and also for his stylistic suggestions for the final version of this article. Needless to say, all remaining mistakes are our own responsibility.

References

Barlow, Michael. 2000. Usage, blends and grammar. Michael. Barlow and Susanne Kemmer (eds.), *Usage Based Models of Language*, pp. 315-345.

Stanford: CSLI.

Culicover, Peter W. and Ray Jackendoff. 1997. Semantic subordination despite syntactic coordination. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28: 195-217

Halliday, M.A.K. and Christian M.I.M. Matthiessen. 2004. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (3rd ed.). London: Hodder Arnold.

Haspelmath, Martin and Ekkehard König. 1995. *Converbs in Cross-Linguistics Perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi, and Friederike Hünemeyer. 1991. *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hopper, Paul J. and Eliazbet Closs Traugott. 1993. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Izutsu, Katsunobu and Mitsuko Narita Izutsu. 2017. Mental gaze monitoring and form manipulation: distinct conceptions of language production and its management. *Lege Artis: Language Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow*, 2, 47-96.

Lakoff, George. 1987. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What categories reveal about the mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Langacker, Ronald W. 2008. *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mizutani, Nobuko. 1985. *Nichi Ei Hikaku: Hanashi Kotoba no Bunpo* [A grammar of spoken language: a Japanese-English comparison]. Tokyo: Kurosio.

Searle, John R. 1979. *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shibatani, Masayoshi. 2003. Directional verbs in Japanese. In Erin Shay and Uwe Seibert (eds.), *Motion, Direction, and Location in Languages: In Honor of Zygmunt Frajzyngier*, 259-286. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Teruya, Kazuhiro. 2007. *A Systemic Functional Grammar of Japanese*, volume one & two. London: Continuum.