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Introduction to Jan Anward, Doing Language

Jan Anward (1947-2016) completed Doing Language during the last year of his life, when he was fatally ill, although still completely intellectually vital. He wrote the booklet in a succinct and compact, literary and partly aphoristic style that was characteristic of most of his oeuvre. Such a parlance, however, might not necessarily be immediately and altogether accessible, not even for those who do share his points-of-view in advance, and I therefore suggested to him that he might need to write an introduction to his treatise. However, under the given circumstances he did not seem to have the strength to do so, although apparently he would not have anything against me or someone else trying to do it.1 Accordingly, in this short introduction I have brought up a few assumptions behind his work which I would like to make somewhat more explicit, in a subjective manner of my own of course, yet I think one that was largely shared by Jan.

Jan Anward’s basic interest is as simple as it is ambitious. He wants to account for the connections between the language system and the situated and socially contexted practices of people’s languaging in, for example, mundane conversations. (Jan prefers the term ”doing language” to ”languaging” (but cf. p. 121), and of course to ”language usage”.) What do people do when they spontaneously bring communicative content into language in the divergent situations of human life, and how do they do it? In other words, what does ”doing language” involve?

The fundamental perspective of doing language means that units and rules of some abstract language systems are not simply deployed, ”used” or applied by people as they speak or listen, write or read. Participants’ primary activities do not consist in applying ready-made units and rules. Such a perspective, not seldom naively propounded, or at least tacitly assumed, by linguists in their conventional accounts, would not do justice

1 Indeed, he conceded to a group of people including Leelo Keevallik, Angelika Linke and myself to write a short introduction and to make some – mainly technical – editorial changes in the text. I thank Leelo and Angelika for their useful comments on this introduction.
to the dynamic and contextually apposite nature of the doings, and it does not assign any significant agency to participants (cf. Linell, 2015).

In *Doing Language* Jan takes his point of departure in *dialogue*, i.e., in interactions in which participants communicate in and through language by taking turns at talk. (In this context, he takes the term dialogue in a fairly concrete sense, rather than referring to some very general ability to make sense together.) The basic function of a conversation is, he (p. 123) tells us, that of updating a current social scene, whether real or imaginary. When infants use sounds, gazes, gestures, etc. to take part in dialogue, and in their own and carers’ vocalisations, they learn to recognise recurrent patterns, in terms of utterances, grammatical structures, intonational phrases and contextual meanings. Infants’ utterances are holophrastic, semantically unarticulated and intonationally continuous from the start (p. 98); with time they become more analytic.

In dialogue parties take turns at speaking and listening. Participants build upon prior utterances and modify and renew these in a cooperative manner. Such “recycling with différance” – Jan’s central concept and favourite term (e.g., p. 21, 85) – means that grammatical structures and relations unfold and become varied when people use partly the same words, but do this in slightly changed ways because they need coherence backwards to prior talk and progression forwards (carrying on and developing dialogue), rather than just repeating things in their communicative exchanges. Conversations evolve on the basis of turn-taking, sequence organisation, and repair, the three classical interactional resources highlighted in Conversation Analysis (Schegloff, 2007). But Jan adds a fourth resource, that is, ”recycling with différance” (or in Du Bois’s, 2014, terminology: resonance with adjacent utterances).

When participants use ”recycling with différance” their interactions will provide and stabilise interactional routines. But that is only one side of it. They will also accomplish systems of language with internal paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations. ”Speakers continuously negotiate the analyzability of linguistic resources, as well as expand both paradigms
and syntagms” (p. 99). Thus, language systems too emerge from situated interactions. On this point Jan Anward goes much further than mainstream conversation and interaction analyses, which normally have little to say about the emergence of language systems. In actual languaging, we “update” both traditions and local contexts, both interaction routines and language.

Constructions are reused in particular conversations, but above all, the utterance patterns are supported by constructions that have emerged in previous conversations. We learn to recognise (partly abstract) relations between utterance types, as we “transform” utterances to related forms of utterances. For example, we develop an understandings of regular relations between verbs and nominalisations, assertions and questions, straight and cleft sentences, main and subjunctive clauses, etc. “Recycling with différance” works when people inflect the same words as appeared just before, when they derive new words from old words (p. 68), when they extend the meanings of a word already used, when they build assonances in their joint discourse. Such – still concrete – knowledge of language arguably develops not only by everyday doing of language but also from metalinguistic activities, talk about language (we educate our offspring by various instructions; Taylor, 2013), and the development of literacy skills. As Jan points out, we continue to modify and learn our language throughout our lifetime.

Naturally, as situations develop, there will be a need for partly new linguistic expressions. At the same time, as people move between situations, they create routines of using same or similar resources for partly new purposes. Their linguistic and other semiotic practices give rise to structures at two levels, in specific situations in which participants elaborate their current communicative projects, and in traditions that transcend situations. Traditions comprise the voices of a largely anonymous community of predecessors (cf. p. 18). Progression at these two planes take place simultaneously, in and through the same interactions. (This is what Linell, 2009, has termed the “double dialogicality” of interactions.) Prac-
tices get stabilised as routines, pathways that get increasingly established by repeated use (routine from French route ”pathway”). Jan illustrates this way of ”doing tradition” (p. 8f) by using examples from particular, situated conversations, but it is important that the creation of routines will simultaneously lead to – precisely – traditions. Yet, his reference to emergent structures in examples of situated discourse might perhaps obscure the fact that these structures are arguably re-emergent (rather than emergent ab novo), as they have already become available to participants from their experience of situations and traditions prior to the examples (p. 118). Jan cites a large number of linguist predecessors, but seems particularly determined to bring out the ideas of Karcevski (1929), Saussure’s successor in Geneva, and his dynamic system of language based on languaging (parole) (p. 35).

The above-mentioned argument implies that repeated occasions of interaction creates both traditions of interaction and language systems (p. 20ff). If we see things this way, it may seem somewhat paradoxical that ”speaking” is described as ”independent of language” (p. 121) that ”is appropriated in languaging”; ”speaking is the iteration of syllables, grouped into intonation units”, and ”speaking precedes language” (p. 55). But as routines and structures of speaking get sedimented, they ”structure interaction towards a language” (p. 33, 55, 98). Having been confronted with ample evidence of speaking, infants no longer hear speech as unstructured vocalisations or nonsensical gibberish but as recognisable and meaningful utterances; in fact, they cannot help hearing them as meaningful, when they have acquired such a ”language stance” (Cowley, 2011). While the independence of language from speaking may be true of an evolutionary perspective (how language once evolved out of pre-linguistic and pre-semiotic practices deployed by hominids before homo sapiens), when modern infants encounter conspecifics ”doing language” they are, with Heidegger´s term, ”thrown into” activities imbued with language (and often treated by adults as if they understood more of this than they actually do). So it seems disputable that the original evolution of language can be
the same thing as negotiating language when you already have one.

Jan creates a sophisticated account of language and doing language, and of situations and traditions, by working his way from dialogue and turn-taking to recycling and adopting routines from others. This may seem self-evident to many readers of his text, but we must not forget that linguists have often simply posited quite abstract units and rules that participants putatively apply and ”use” despite being completely unaware of them. Jan remarks that ”[l]anguage is […] not made once and for all and then used; rather it keeps on being done. And, of course, what is being done on one occasion may well reproduce what has been done on previous occasions” (2014: 54). Knowing a language is not primarily about having knowledge of an abstract system; it is about the practical mastery of interaction formats that offer potentialities of meaning (on avoiding ”meaning-blindness”, see p. 77).

Jan Anward seems ambivalent to structures and structuralism. Or one could say that he was a moderate structuralist. Sometimes, he was inclined to use formalisations, something which may have to do with the fact that he studied mathematics at college (the Swedish gymnasium) and started his academic life in theoretical philosophy. Yet, formalisation of (some) regularities was for him not paramount to claiming that language is a formal object. At times, however, he proposed unnecessarily structurally complex explanations (as in his suggestion for VP pronominalisation, pp. 111-115). But at the same time, he was relatively sympathetic to exemplar theory, the assumption that new utterances were being modelled on prior concrete examples, rather than more abstract grammatical accounts.² Competence, he says, cannot be regarded as something ”extracted” from linguistic practices; he thinks that competence is the ”sum of practices” (p. 24). Yet, such a formulation may be compatible with a notion of practice that involves some extraction (or abstraction). This seems inherent in his account of how participants build interaction formats, con-

² Here, we held slightly different views, it seems. I look upon myself as a moderate structuralist too, but for marginally different reasons.
tributions to topics, episodes and activities (pp. 45ff), stances and rhemes (p. 64). Another example is the emergence of grammatical persons (i.e. 1., 2., 3.) and predicate-argument structures which are ”grounded in the very structure of interaction” (p. 93).

Jan closes his text by stating that he has ”tried to inflict as little harm as possible to systems of linguistic resources actually done in conversations” (p. 124). This, I believe, is a way of saying that he sees the task of linguistics to describe and explain language and languages as they are ”actually done” in real life. Yet, linguists have often applied quite abstract points-of-view, with ”[des] regards éloignés” (p. 73) on linguistic phenomena. And indeed, ”structures” are, almost by definition, abstract, as Jan himself demonstrates. But we want to understand structures as contained in actual utterances (or texts), not as representations far removed from ”surface language” (seeing manifest structures as related to distant underlying representations by long ”derivations”). Structuralism and hyperstructuralism (i.e., Chomskyanism) adopted particularly abstract pictures of language, while Doing Language calls for an account of language that is more substantialist, although with a recognition of some patterns or structures (Anward & Linell, 2016).

Jan Anward sometimes mentions that language should be seen as ”an open secret” (Anward, 2014; Doing Language: p. v, 124). ”Secret” seems to mean that there is something obvious that we cannot easily see. The ways in which language has been portrayed by linguists may have obscured our minds. Yet, Jan never explains in so many words what he thinks the secret is. One answer might be the following. Language is not a mystery for us, when we learn to ”do” it in everyday life. If we start from observations of how we ”do language” in dialogue, in particular in conversations, it should become open to us. Language is at least not an abstract hidden structure.

April 2016
Per Linell
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Preface

In this book, I will be concerned with two things.

First, I will demonstrate how people in conversation (and other forms of communicative practices) on-line construct working, and re-usable, systems of linguistic resources, through turn-taking and a method of turn construction (recycling with différance), which together structure material at hand - syllables and intonation units - towards a language (to combine formulations by Cassirer 1994 and Lacan 1977).

Secondly, I will explore a number of properties of such systems, in particular their character of embedded and dynamic systems, solidly entrenched in space, time, and social relations.


This book has been on its way for a while. On this way, I have benefitted from the supporting environment of the Graduate School in Language and Culture in Europe at Linköping University, collaboration with Universität Potsdam and Universität Zürich, participation in the two conferences on Interactional Linguistics in Spa 2000 and Kallvik 2002, and useful comments from audiences in Helsinki, Linköping, Münster, and Neuchâtel. A special thanks to Björn Lindblom, who taught me about deriving language from non-language, and to Auli Hakulinen, Lars Fant, Jack Du Bois, Paul Hopper, Chuck Goodwin, Lorenza Mondada, Susanne Günthner, and Angelika Linke. My greatest debt is to Per Linell, friend and discussion partner for almost fifty years. Where would we have been without each other?
And warm thanks to Carin Franzén for including this book in the series Studies in Language and Culture, to Anna-Lena Nilsson for fixing the references, and to Chibi Anward for formatting and layout.

This book is dedicated to my wife, Agneta Rolf.
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In 1981, Charles Goodwin (1981: 170-173) pointed out that in self-repairs such as (1),

(1) \text{i ask him if he— (0.4) could— if you could call him}

linguistic units and relations are not merely 'used' to achieve interactional goals, but are actually produced, 'done\textsuperscript{2}', in the process of achieving such goals.

In the repair in (1), the speaker thus articulates \text{i ask him if he— (0.4) could—} into two successive units: \text{i ask him} and \text{if he— (0.4) could—}, then produces an alternative to the second unit: \text{if you could}, and finally continues with a further unit: \text{call him}.

Here, I will generalize Goodwin’s observation, and argue that an embedded and dynamic system of linguistic resources is continuously emerging in a tradition of conversations, and that the very methods which participants use to structure conversation - turn-taking, sequence organization, and repair (Schegloff 2006) - also structure conversation towards a language (to borrow a formulation from Lacan 1977).

The inherent organization of conversation is the open secret of linguistic structure.

---

1 See also Goodwin 2006: 100-103.
2 In the sense of Sacks (1992).
Conversation is grounded in a natural attitude of humans, a dialogical attitude (Linell 2009), which compels humans to hear a sound as an address and an aboutness, to answer an address with a returned address and a continued aboutness, and to assume that other humans work in the same way as you do.

Participants informed by a dialogical attitude will accomplish conversations where they take turns at dialogical actions, which are relevant to preceding dialogical actions, make further dialogical actions relevant, and serve to affect participants and relations within the ongoing social activity.
Turn-taking

The first kind of structuring of a conversation done by its participants is then an obvious one. A conversation is structured as a sequence of turns at talk (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson 1974).

Let us listen to the first four turns of a land-line phone call\(^1\). Eva calls a neighbour in a practical matter. Bodil, a young girl who is visiting the neighbours’ house to play with their daughter Veronika, answers the phone.

(1) *Pippiperuk 1*

1. ((four signals))
2. Bodil: >sex sju två fyra<
   six seven two four
3. Eva: >hej de e Eva.
   hi it is Eva
   hi this is Eva
4. har du mamma hemma<
   have thou mammy home
   is your mother at home
5. Bodil: näe:
   noo:

The first two turns of (3) are a classical example of an adjacency pair (Schegloff & Sacks 1973, Schegloff 2007), where, in the analysis of Schegloff (1968), a first action, a summons (line 1), makes a second action, an answer (line 2), relevant, and where the pair as a whole makes further talk relevant. The answer to the summons is not just any answer, though, but an identification, which is accomplished through recital of a telephone number\(^2\), and this identification, in its turn, makes a second identification relevant. The second identification, by first name this time, follows in the third turn (line 3), and it is preceded by a greeting, which makes a second greeting relevant. However, Eva does not wait for a second greeting. Instead,

---

\(^1\) For a discussion of this type of identication, in a comparative perspective, see Lindström (1994).

\(^2\)
she asks Bodil to pass on the phone call to an adult, thereby deferring the second greeting by means of an inserted question.

In accomplishing this small stretch of interaction, Eva and Bodil also jointly produce a one-dimensional linguistic system, shown below with no further articulation than intonation units. Their unfolding responsonry of dialogical actions simultaneously unfolds a system of syntagmatically related intonation units and turns, where each intonation unit is demarcated by a contour, and each turn is demarcated by a change in voice.

1. ((four signals))
2. Bodil: >sexsjutvåfyra<
4. hardumammahemma<
5. Bodil: näe:. 

**An embedded system**

Producing differences is in the nature of dialogue. For the dialogical attitude to recognize its own workings, responses and participants must be discernible. A response to an action A needs to be both relevant to A and different from A, and thus project a further response which is still relevant to A but could not have been a direct response to A. Moreover, contributions by one particular participant need to be both relevant to and different from contributions by other participants, indexing that participant’s unique position and perspective relative to the other participants (Bakhtin 1986, Clark & Holquist 1984, ch. 3).

A conversation, then, produces a network of differentially voiced and authored actions, within an evolving tension and collaboration between at least two ‘contextures’ (Mukařovský 1977: 87), distinct perspectives on the topics talked about.

And these actions serve to update the ongoing social activity, by introducing participants and relations among those participants into
the activity and maintaining them there (Gardiner 1951, Ballmer 1972, Karttunen 1976, Anward 1980, and many others). Some of these participants and relations are physically present in the activity (‘real’), while others are only symbolically present, i.e. they enter the activity only through linguistic expressions, and still others are both physically and symbolically present in the activity.

To use a vivid metaphor from the artistic field: in Magritte’s painting ‘The apparition’ (1928), we find quite a precise picture of a social activity peopled by both physically present and symbolically present participants: a wanderer and a number of embodied words: fusil, nuage, fauteuil, horizon, and cheval.

In the second turn of Pippiperuk 1, repeated below,

2. Bodil: >sèx sju två fyra<
   six seven two four

Bodil introduces herself as a participant in the social activity of the phone call, physically present through her voice. She also introduces another participant by directly addressing her. And finally, she introduces herself as a symbolically present participant, as well, through the telephone number she uses to identify herself.³

Symbolically present participants and relations are typically, and reasonably, taken to be in a separate location from where conversationalists are. That location is often assumed to be some kind of mental space (Fauconnier 1994, Fauconnier & Turner 2002). However, that installs too great a divide between real and symbolic participants. Turns at talk are definitely material (if short-lived) components of social activities, and participants they serve to introduce and maintain may very well both speak and gesture (Günthner 1998, Anward 2002). I therefore prefer to locate symbolically present participants and relations in that intermediate space of

---

³ See Haiman (1998) for an extensive discussion of this kind of speaker doubling.
human activity, which Winnicott (1971, chs. 7 and 8) argues is the location of cultural experience and play. In that space, which is “neither … inner psychic reality nor … external reality” (Winnicott 2005 [1971]: 129), turns and turn parts are participants and relations, just as a broom can be a horse, and a button, a diamond, when we are playing.

In this way, the system above, and, à fortiori, all systems produced in conversation, are inextricably embedded in their ongoing social activities.

We can display this crucial embeddedness in an extended transcription\(^4\), where not only turns at talk (and other semiotic resources) are included, but also participants, and relations between participants, both real and symbolic, effected by these turns at talk.

Let us transcribe line 2 in the following way:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
| & 1 & 2 \\
\hline
<2,1> & m & 2 \\
& sexsjutvåfyra (2)
\end{array}
\]

The outer rectangle depicts an entire conversational scene, including its participants (1, 2, …), a space (m; inside the inner rectangle), where symbolic relations are managed, and a sequence of turns (<2,1>, …), through which relations and participants are introduced and manipulated.

What we have here are then two physically present participants (1 and 2), one of which (2) is also symbolically present, in the intermediate space m, where she is identified as sexsjutvåfyra, through a turn by herself, directed at the other participant (<2,1>), where the first number indicates the speaker and the second the addressee.

An extended transcription of the four turns we have been listening to would look like this, reflecting an interpretation where the second turn and

---

\(^4\) Inspired by Discourse Representation Theory (Kamp & Reyle 1993, Geurts & Beaver 2011).
the second intonation unit of the third turn are about 2 (Bodil), while the first intonation unit of the third turn is about 1 (Eva).
A look ahead

In chapters 2 through 8, I will be concerned with demonstrating how turns in conversation are designed to situate their speakers, addressees, and topics within the social activities in which they are embedded. This involves designing turns relative to a dynamic social organization of a complex interactional space (of the kind shown above) and a relevant tradition. And I will argue that it is precisely this design of turns that allows an embedded and dynamic system of linguistic resources to emerge in conversation.

In chapters 2 through to 4, I will demonstrate how conversationalists can orient to a tradition in which they speak, and how, in doing so, they use a method of turn construction, recycling with différance, which, together with turn-taking, structures conversation towards a language.

In chapter 5 to 8, I will, through an analysis of a conversational sequence where participants co-operate to make sense of a strange object in the room where they are gathered, explore in more detail the kind of embedded linguistic systems, what I will call interaction formats, which emerge from turn-taking and recycling with différance, and how such systems can be used.

In chapter 9 and 10, I will return to the phone call between Eva and Bodil, and use this to demonstrate how interaction formats can be launched from scratch, and then stabilized and elaborated when recycled in a tradition.

Chapter 11 will contain a summary.
Participation in any form of languaging requires access to a tradition (Becker 1995), to a common history of negotiated meanings, which offers not just words and constructions as resources for further meaning-making but also, and perhaps even more importantly, a complex system of set phrases, dead and not so dead metaphors, ways of speaking, quotations, proverbs, folk theories, and figured worlds (Gee 2011).

Consider the following example (Walker & Adelman 1976: 138-139). “… quite a lot of the things the class found very funny, we did not ‘get’. We had to ask people afterwards what the joke was. For example, one lesson the teacher was listening to the boys read through short essays that they had written for homework on the subject of ‘Prisons’. After one boy, Wilson, had finished reading out his rather obviously skimped piece of work the teacher sighed and said, rather crossly:

T[eacher]: Wilson, we’ll have to put you away if you don’t change your ways and do your homework. Is that all you’ve done?

B[oys]: Strawberries, strawberries. (Laughter)

When we asked why this was funny, we were told that one of the teacher’s favourite expressions was that their work was ‘Like strawberries - good as far as it goes, but it doesn’t last nearly long enough’.

It is this kind of built-in and continuously reproduced and renewed history which make linguistic resources efficient tools for everyday meaning-making, enabling complexity and depth of meaning to be achieved quickly and effortlessly in self-evident ways.
In addition, as Walker and Adelman note, a tradition serves as an efficient means of exclusion, inclusion, and identification. A group which shares a tradition knows how to tell insiders from outsiders. If you, like Walker and Adelman, are not part of the tradition, you can not participate fully in what goes on, and you are therefore identifiable as an outsider, both by the group and by yourself.
In every conversation, then, a tradition is present. Often it is only indexed by the resources which participants choose to use, but sometimes the tradition is focussed and made relevant to the ongoing conversation. I will now turn to such a case. My example is taken from one of the conversations recorded within the project Talsyntax (Syntax of spoken Swedish)¹.

Four physicians, one woman (Clara) and three men (Arne, Björn, and Daniel), who know each other, have volunteered to participate in a formal discussion of euthanasia. An hour before the discussion session will start, they have gathered to plan the discussion. About five minutes into the planning session, following some talk about who in the public debate has said what about euthanasia, Arne, who has the floor, makes a topic shift, and introduces a piece of relevant information about euthanasia, in lines 1 - 3 of (1) below, and, after that, a small discussion ensues.

I have refrained from translating response particles and epistemic stance particles in (1), in order not to short-circuit the analysis to be presented. Their meaning will become clear as we proceed through (1), turn by turn. Suffice it to say, at this point, that mm is a minimal response, that Swedish, like French, has a system of three basic response items (SAG 2: 752):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreeing response</th>
<th>Positive formulation</th>
<th>Negative formulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ja</td>
<td>nā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nā</td>
<td>jo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

that these items can be elaborated in various ways, and that speakers of Swedish also have access to a sizable repertoire of epistemic stance particles, including ju, nog, and väl.
(1) Aktiv å passiv

1. Arne: sen e ja eh: 
   then am I eh
2. sen e där ju hela eutanasiproblemet sönderfaller ju som (p) 
   then is there ju the-whole euthanasia problem falls-apart ju as
3. som ni vet i två begrepp nämligen aktiv å passiv 
   as you know into two notions namely active and passive euthanasia also ju 
5. Clara: mm (p)
6. Björn: medveten å omedveten. (p) 
   intended and unintended
7. Arne: näej aktiv e de där förstår du att du helt enkelt slår ihjäl [folk.] 
   näej active is that you see that you simply kill people
8. Clara: [gör] fel. ((skrattar)) 
   do wrong
9. Arne: på ett eller annat sätt [passiv e bara att du skiter i dom] 
   in one or another way passive is only that you don't care about them
10. Björn: [( ) ja
11. Clara: ja
12. Björn: ja ja jo [men
13. Arne: [så de å de e även där e de ju väldit mycke, 
   so it and it is even there is it ju very much
14. Daniel: de aktiva e att stänga droppe. (p) 
   the active is to shut-off the-drip
15. de passiva att aldrig sätta (.) [in droppe.] 
   the passive is to never set in the-drip
16. Arne: [just precis de.] 
17. Clara: jaha just de ja [mm
18. Arne: [just precis de.

2 The translation of (o)medveten is not straightforward. A literal translation of medveten would be ‘conscious’. However, in this context, medveten strongly implicates intent, as well. Hence, I have translated medveten as ‘intended’.
Invocation

You can speak in a tradition simply by choosing linguistic resources that belong there and use them according to that tradition. But Arne does more than that in his first turn in (1).

At least two strands of the conversation-so-far come together in this turn. First, there has been talk of which medical problems are worthy of discussion, and consensus has been established that there are no bigger problems than euthanasia. Secondly, Daniel, who is going to be the moderator of the following formal discussion, has initiated a co-constructed definition of euthanasia:

(2) Dödshjälp

1. Daniel: nu e de så att eutanasi e väl samma som dödshjälp.  
   now is that so that euthanasia is väl same as death-help
2. e de inte så va,  
   is that no so eh
3. Arne: joo
4. Daniel: dödshjälp e de inte de,  
   death-help is that not that
5. Arne: mm
6. Daniel: hjälp (p)  
   help
7. Clara: m

Through väl in line 1, Daniel solicits agreement from the other participants. He then repeats his request in line 2, through a negative question. In line 3, Arne agrees with Daniel’s proposed definition in line 1, by producing a strengthened positive response to the negative question. Daniel then repeats his definition and request for agreement twice, in lines 4 and 6, and receives minimal responses from Arne and Clara.

It is against this background in the conversation-so-far that Arne

---

4 jo is strengthened to joo through lengthening of the vowel.
introduces the distinction in the first turn of (1). Let us look at how he does it. Here is Arnes’s first turn again, broken down into smaller pieces:

(3) Aktiv å passiv, turn 1

2. Arne:    sen e ja eh:  
    *then am I eh*
2a.        sen e där ju  
    *then is there ju*
2b.        hela eutanasiproblemet sänderfaller ju  
    *the-whole euthanasia problem falls-apart ju*
2b.        som (p)  
    *as*
3a.        som ni vet i två begrepp  
    *as you know into two notions*
3b.        nämligen aktiv å passiv eutansii också ju.  
    *namely active and passive euthanasia also ju*

Arne’s first turn beginning (*sen e ja eh:) is aborted, and then partially recycled (Scheglof 1987), as *sen e där ju*, effecting a first step towards a topic shift. The new turn beginning is then developed into an apo koinou (Norén 2007), with *hela eutanasiproblemet* as pivot, through which Arne reintroduces the euthanasia problem as topic, and proceeds to introduce a distinction between active and passive euthanasia, which is established in two steps, lines 3a and 3b.

Note now that every step in this procedure, from line 2a on, is flagged by a marker of common ground. There is an explicit *som ni vet* (as you-PL know) in line 3a, and a *ju*, a particle which marks precisely shared knowledge, common ground (Lindström 2008: 95-99), at the end of lines 2a, 2b, and 3b.

Thus, Arne carefully marks the distinction that he is making available to the ongoing conversation as something which is already at hand in the tradition in which they are speaking, as an established resource within this group of professionals, physicians who routinley speak of life and death. In other words, his turn is overtly designed to invoke that tradition.
In more technical terms (Heritage 2013, Mondada 2013), Arne takes care to display overtly in his turn that the epistemic status of all participants with respect to what he is affirming is that they already share this knowledge, because they are all part of a tradition where that knowledge is at hand.

And there is of course a point in doing that. Although the participants know each other, they have never before met in this constellation for a professional discussion of euthanasia. Hence, there is good reason for the participants to calibrate their common ground. And as we will see, this calibration turns out not to be entirely straightforward.

Censorship

A tradition makes, as I have already said, certain things easily and self-evidently sayable. It also makes other things unsayable. What Althusser (1971) and Bourdieu (1987, 1992) describe as censorship, imminent in every social activity, is the other side of efficient meaning-making. In any tradition, certain ‘choices’ have already been made, and ‘incorrect’ meanings (usages) are unavailable to its bearers. And if such choices nevertheless surface, they must be repressed.

This kind of repression becomes visible in the piece of conversation we are looking at. Arne’s turn in lines 1 - 3 is followed by a news receipt from Björn, in line 4, and a minimal response from Clara, in line 5.

5. Clara: mm (p)

Then Björn, in line 6, sets out to back up Arne’s distinction by wording it

---

5 A response item with a pre-aspirated reduplicated vowel, such as jaha, indicates that what is responded to is already known. Thus, when such a response item is used to signal agreement, as in line 4, its meaning approximates that of a news receipt item (Heritage 1984).
in yet another way.

6. Björn: medveten å omedveten. (p)

In doing this, Björn uses Arne’s preceding turn as a resource, verbalizing only his own reformulation of Arne’s distinction and retaining, implicitly, the overall format of Arne’s turn. In diagraph format (Du Bois 2014), where successive turns are analyzed into recurring equivalent units, placed in the same column, line 6 is, as shown below, straightforwardly analyzable as a combination of (at least) hela eutanasiproblemet sönderfaller ju som (p) som ni vet i två begrepp nämligen and medveten å omedveten, supporting an interpretation of line 6 as effectively proposing ‘the whole euthanasia problem falls apart as you know into two concepts namely intended and unintended euthanasia’.

1. Arne: sen e ja eh:
    sen e där ju
    hela eutanasiproblemet...
    i två begrepp
    aktiv å passiv eutanasi också ju.

... 

6. Björn: medveten å omedveten. (p)

However, this attempted backup is emphatically rejected by Arne as something unsayable in the tradition in which they are speaking:

7. Arne: näej aktiv e de där förstår du att du helt enkelt slår ihjäl [folk.]
    näej⁶ active is that you see that you simply kill people

---

6 näej is a strengthened version of nā (no).
Initiation

Had Arne only said näej in line 7, not only Björn’s turn but also Björn himself would have been excluded from the ongoing conversation.

Remember that a tradition helps making not only meaning but also identity. Speaking outside a tradition means placing oneself outside the group and activity that engage that tradition.

However, Arne chooses not to exclude Björn. Instead, he starts explaining the distinction he is after, thus initiating Björn into the tradition that is being opened up for further use.

7. Arne: näej aktive is that you see that you simply kill people
     ihjäl [folk.]
8. Clara: [gör] fel. ((skrattar))
          do wrong
9. Arne: på ett eller annat sätt [passive is only that you don’t-care about them]
     in one or another way passive
10. Björn: [( ) ja
11. Clara: ja

Arne’s explanation, which is overtly marked as an initiation, through förstår du (you see), is however not unproblematic. In line 12, Björn protests against being treated as ignorant by Arne, and by Clara, who backs up Arne, thereby showing that she, too, knows the tradition in which they are speaking. But Björn’s protest has no effect. Instead, it is followed by more explanation. After an attempted wrapping up by Arne in line 13,

12. Björn: ja ja ja [men
13. Arne: så de å de e även där e de ju väldit mycke,
          so it and it is even there is it ju very much
Daniel takes over, and produces another version of Arne’s explanation, in lines 14 and 15.

14. **Daniel:** de aktiva e att stänga droppe. (p)
   \[the active is to shut-off the-drip\]

15. de passiva att aldrig sätta (. \[\text{in droppe.}\]
   \[the passive is to never set in the-drip\]

In producing this new version of Björn’s explanation, Daniel is recycling the format of that explanation, a format which is also used as a resource by Clara in her back-up of Arne in line 8.

(4) *Aktiv à passiv*, recycling of line 7

| Arne: aktiv | e dedär att du helt enkelt slår ihjäl folk |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Clara: | | gör fel |
| Arne: passiv | e bara att du skiter i dom |
| Daniel: de aktiva | e att stänga droppe |
| Daniel: de passiva | att aldrig sätta \[\text{in droppe}\] |

Daniel is then enthusiastically supported by Arne and Clara, in lines 16 - 18.

16. **Arne:** [just precis de.]
17. **Clara:** jaha just de ja [mm
18. **Arne:** [just precis de.]

The phrase *just de* and its elaborated variant *just precis de* mean literally ‘just that’, and ‘just precisely that’, respectively. They are strong means of indicating complete agreement, both with a previous speaker, and with common ground. In Clara’s turn in line 17, the common ground element is further strengthened by an initial *jaha* (see fn. 6) and a final *ja.*
As I have argued in Anward (1997), the repeated *just precis de* in line 18 is not just a closing down of the preceding sequence, but also an instance of text talk, a formulation (Heritage & Watson 1979, 1980) of the sequence, which can be used in the future as a memo of what was achieved in it.

Arne, Clara and Daniel have then accomplished several things. They have defended the tradition invoked by Arne, they have initiated Björn into that tradition, they have shown themselves to be bearers of that tradition, and they have achieved a significant bonding among themselves through the shared use of an explanatory turn format.

**Interpretation**

By using clearly deliberate actions to define both active and passive euthanasia, Arne shows that euthanasia can only be intended and hence, that Björn’s proposed reformulation is not only incorrect but also unsayable in the tradition in which they are speaking: it does not make sense to affirm or deny intended use of euthanasia. Rather, the intended nature of euthanasia belongs to the background in the ongoing tradition, to that on which all meaning-making in the tradition must build.

In order to make this hearable to Björn, Arne phrases his examples in a distinctly non-medical vocabulary: *slår ihjäl folk* (hit to-death people, literally) and *skiter i dom* (don’t give a shit about them, roughly). This is by no means the voice of the life-world as opposed to the voice of medicine (Mishler 1984), but rather a collegial jargon. And this collegial jargon does two things. First, it includes Björn in the group, by treating him as an ignorant colleague and not as an unknowing layperson. Secondly, it provides an interpreting code (Benveniste 1974) for the medical tradition which Björn is being initiated into, a register into which medical terminology can be translated in order to be understood. Thus, the tradition we are listening

---

7 For this notion of unsayable, see Wittgenstein 1922, and also Stenlund 1980.
to is based on heteroglossia (Bakhtin 1981), on a symbiosis between two registers, which provides a context in which problems of exclusion and interpretation which arise in the maintenance of the tradition can be solved.

When Björn nevertheless protests, Daniel makes the same point in an even more explicit way. By using resources from the medical tradition itself (stänga av droppet and aldrig sätta in droppet; shut off and never set in drip, respectively), Daniel emphasizes the non-exclusion of Björn. At the same time, he makes the unsayable in the tradition even more hearable, by providing another pair of clearly deliberate actions, in the format used by Arne.

**Envoi**

Through a repeated use of a certain method of turn construction, Arne, Björn, Clara, and Daniel have managed to construct within the ongoing social activity a complex network of relations between themselves and what is projected as an established distinction within a relevant tradition. Let us now see which linguistic resources emerge from this activity.
And doing language

There’s a piece that was torn from the morning
And it hangs in the gallery of frost

Leonard Cohen: Take this waltz

1. Arne: sen e ja eh:
   then am I eh

2. sen e där ju hela eutanasiproblemet sönderfaller ju som (p)
   then is there ju the-whole euthanasia problem falls-apart ju as

3. som ni vet i två begrepp nämligen aktiv å passiv eutanasia
   også ju.
   as you know into two notions namely active and passive euthanasia also ju


5. Clara: mm (p)

6. Björn: medveten å omedveten. (p)
   intended and unintended

   In doing his turn in line 6, Björn uses, as I have already pointed out,
Arne’s preceding turn as a resource, verbalizing only his own reformulation
of Arne’s distinction and retaining, implicitly, the overall format of Arne’s
turn. In diagraph format (Du Bois 2014), again:
Recycling with différance

This is a method of turn construction which I have called recycling with différance (Anward 2004). Différance is Derrida’s dynamic notion of difference (Derrida 1967, ch. 2, particularly p. 92), which emphasizes that differences are not just there to be used but are always (re)created at each instant of use.

Recycling with différance, which has been identified and described under various names in the literature: poetics of ordinary talk (Sacks 1992, Vol. II, Parts V and VI, Jefferson 1996), format tying (Goodwin & Goodwin 1987), repetition (Tannen 1989, Fant 2000, Blanche-Benveniste 2000), resonance (Du Bois 2014), and quotation (Gasparov 1998), is, as Sacks and Tannen emphasize, a poetic method. It fits nicely Riffaterre’s description of the method by which poetry is made: repeated transformation of a core expression (Riffaterre 1978, based on Jakobson 1960).

Basically, in recycling with différance, speakers model new turns on old turns, in such a way that one part of the old turn is kept (implicitly or explicitly), and a new expression substitutes for the other part of the old turn. Thus, each new recycling of an old turn also introduces a difference, or sets into play différance, in the sense of Derrida.
A construction

In offering a reformulation in support of Arne’s distinction by the method of recycling with différance, Björn is at the same time creating a construction.

First of all, by modelling his turn on Arne’s previous turn, Björn is creating a resemblance between the two turns, of a kind which Bloomfield took as absolutely fundamental in his set of postulates for linguistics as a science: “Within certain communities successive utterances are alike or partly alike.” (Bloomfield (1966 [1926]: 26). Moreover, the resemblance created in this way is a working resemblance, put to a social use, in this case a potential alignment. As Douglas (1996) eloquently argues, following Goodman (1970), similarity comes cheap to any observer and needs, to have any descriptive value, to be secured in a demonstration of its practical relevance to participants. In this case, however, the resemblance is unproblematically part of a local communicative project. Thus, the similarity between Björn’s turn and Arne’s turn is an achieved similarity, in Sacks’ sense (Sacks 1992, Vol. II, p. 4). Björn produces his turn in such a way that its similarity to Arne’s turn “will be seeable” (ibid.), and we are entitled to say that Björn, in doing his turn, effectively subsumes that turn and Arne’s turn under a common turn type, a recurring turn format with a recurring function – a linguistic sign, in other words, in an extended Saussurean sense (Chafe 1967, Langacker 1998).

Secondly, by making his turn parallel to a key part of Arne’s turn, and implicitly retaining the remainder of Arne’s turn, Björn, as we have already seen, effectively makes a proper analysis of Arne’s turn into two parts, (hela eutanasiproblemet sönderfaller ju som ni vet i två begrepp nämligen and aktiv å passiv eutanasi), and proposes a paradigmatic alternative to one of these parts. Thus, the turn type created through Björn’s turn is also, both formally and functionally, a combination of a constant part and a variable

---

1 For this notion, see Linell 2009, section 9.7.
part, as shown below. In other words, it is what Tomasello (2003: 117) calls an item-based construction. The semantic composition is straightforward: the constant part is predicated of the variable part.

1. Arne:    …

    hela eutanasiproblemet
    sönderfaller ju som (p)
    som ni vet i två begrepp
    nämligen

    \{
    \begin{array}{c}
    \text{aktiv å passiv eutanasi} \\
    \text{medveten å omedveten.}
    \end{array}
    \}

6. Björn:    …

A problem

However, when Arne rather emphatically rejects Björn’s proposed reformulation of Arne’s distinction

6. Björn:    medveten å omedveten. (p)
intended and unintended

7. Arne:    näej aktiv e de där förstår du att du helt enkelt slår
ihjäl [folk.]
    näej active is that you see that you simply kill people

8. Clara:    [gör] fel. ((skrattar))
do wrong

9. Arne:    på ett eller annat sätt [passiv e bara att du skiter i dom]
in one or another way passive is only that you don’t-care about them

we get into trouble. The repartee by Arne makes what would otherwise seem to be a straightforward move at this point, namely the subsumption of the two turns under a context-free construction, such as

\begin{align*}
    \text{hela eutanasiproblemet} & \quad \text{aktiv å passiv eutanasi} \\
    \text{sönderfaller ju som (p)} & \quad \text{medveten å omedveten} \\
    \text{som ni vet i två begrepp} & \quad \text{nämligen}
\end{align*}
quite problematic.

What the context-free representation of the turns says is that the alternatives of the middle paradigm are of equal status. However, this is far from true, as we have already seen. Remember that the very point of the sequence we have been looking at is to establish the distinction between active and passive euthanasia and relegate the distinction between intended and unintended euthanasia to the realm of the unsayable, in the sense of Wittgenstein (1922), that which it makes no sense to affirm or deny of euthanasia. Of course, we could try to annotate the construction on this point, but that would really amount to somehow incorporate the full sequential contexts of the paradigmatic alternatives into the construction. A notational variant, at best.

**An exemplar model**

Many linguists find it natural to assume that concrete turns are dissolved in memory, leaving only a residue of general patterns, from which new turns can be formed; thus projecting the grammarian’s decontextualising practices of collecting and sorting (Harris 1980) onto everyday languaging.

However, as we have just seen, in such a process of dissolution, information would be lost which is absolutely vital to the way recurrent patterns can be further used. To be able to use experienced turns as models for new turns, participants can not let them dissolve into abstract patterns, but must have access to them as fully detailed exemplar turns, in their sequential and social contexts.

This means that linguistic competence can not be regarded as something extracted from our linguistic practices. Rather, it is precisely the sum of these practices, of situated conversations and texts, which constitutes our linguistic competence (Hopper 1987, 1998, Becker 1995, Gasparov 1997, Jusczyk 1997, Bod 1998, Anward & Lindblom 1999, Barlow and Kemmer 2000, Anward 2004).
Thus, when I wrote a while ago that Björn, in offering a reformulation in support of Arne’s distinction, is also at the same time creating a construction, we should not take this to mean that the construction so created is somehow absorbing the exemplar turns on which it is based. Rather, Björn’s act of recycling with différance Arne’s turn in doing his turn makes available a possible articulation of these two turns into parts, and this articulation can then serve as a resource for the creation of further turns. A construction, when observed in its natural habitat, conversation, is one possible articulation of a temporally evolving series of turns.

Another construction

In lines 7 and 9, repeated below,

7. Arne: näej aktive de där förstår du att du helt enkelt slår ihjäl [folk.]
   näej active is that you see that you simply kill people
8. Clara: [gör] fel. ((skrattar))
   do wrong
9. Arne: på ett eller annat sätt [passiv e bara att du skiter i dom]
   in one or another way passive is only that you don’t care about them

a construction is also created, but in a different way.

In line 5, as we saw, Björn made a proper analysis of lines 2 and 3 into two parts, and proposed a paradigmatic alternative to one of these parts. This mode of recycling with différance might be called paradigmatic expansion² (Anward 2000). It corresponds closely to Daneš’s second mode of textual progression (Daneš 1974), where a recurrent theme (T) is combined with a succession of rhemes (R):

---

² Expansion refers to the effect on the linguistic resources emerging from a particular interaction.
Note that it is precisely this mode of recycling with différance, where the overall format of an old turn is retained, and a new expression substitutes for a part of the old turn, which makes series of a turns articulable as a construction. As I will show below, in chapter 5, a constant overall format typically indicates a common ongoing activity, like describing or defining. Thus, the hallmark of constructions, a constant part and a variable part, emerges quite naturally from a series of individual contributions to a common activity.

In lines 7 and 9, Arne uses another mode of recycling with différance, which we might call syntagmatic expansion (Anward 2000), and which corresponds to Daneš’s first mode of textual progression, where a rheme is made into a following theme and then combined with a new rheme:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
T1 \rightarrow R2 \\
T1 \rightarrow R3 \\
T2 \rightarrow R3
\end{array}
\]

In this mode of recycling with différance, something is added to a previous turn or turn part, and the addition does not form a paradigmatic alternative to any part of that to which it is added. In lines 7 and 9, Arne uses Björn’s proper analysis of his own first turn, recycles one part of that turn, aktiv à passiv, and expands it into a full turn. In fact, he does this in two steps, first expanding aktiv, and then passiv, using the same basic format in both cases. By modelling his expansion of passiv on the expansion of aktiv, he also makes a proper analysis of these expansions into the parts shown below. Note also that Clara, in her supporting turn in line 8, contributes a paradigmatic expansion of one of these parts.
(5) Recycling of *aktiv å passiv*

```
Arne: aktiv å passiv
...
Arne: aktiv e dedär att du helt enkelt slår ihjäl folk
Clara: gör fel
Arne: passiv e bara att du skiter i dom
```

The highly articulated turn in lines 7 and 9 potentially lends itself to many further recyclings. As the conversation continues, one such possibility is explored. As we have seen, after Clara’s feedback in line 11, Björn’s mild protest in line 12, and Arne’s proposed wrapping up of the discussion in line 13, Daniel offers further support for Arne, by producing, in lines 14 and 15, his own variation on Arne’s definition of the distinction.

10. Björn: [( ) ja
11. Clara: ja
13. Arne: [så de å de e även där e de ju väldit mycke, so it and it is even there is it ju very much
14. Daniel: de aktiva e att stänga droppe. (p)
   *the active is to shut off the drip*
15. de passiva att aldrig sätta (. ) [in droppe.]
   *the passive is to never set in the drip*

Daniel aligns with Arne by recycling, with some minor variations of his own, the entire complex format of Arne’s second turn, and making a paradigmatic expansion in each of its two major parts. Thereby, the already established articulation of this turn is reinforced, as shown below.
(6) Recycling of *aktiv å passiv*, 2

Arne: aktiv å passiv

... Arne: aktiv e dedär att du helt enkelt slår ihjäl folk

Clara: passiv e bara att du gör fel

Arne: de aktiva e att stänga droppe

Daniel: de passiva att aldrig sätta in droppe

This network of turns potentially supports more compact constructions. To begin with, it supports the complex construction shown below, which stays fairly close to the actual turns on which it is based.$^3$

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{aktiv} & \quad \text{e} \quad \text{att} \quad \text{du} \quad \text{helt enkelt slår ihjäl folk.} \\
\text{de aktiva} & \quad \text{gör fel.} \\
\text{passiv} & \quad \text{e} \quad \text{att} \quad \text{du} \quad \text{stänga droppe.} \\
\text{de passiva} & \quad \text{skiter i dom} \\
\end{align*}
\]

It also supports the following more abstract construction.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{aktiv} & \quad \text{e} \quad \text{att} \quad \text{du} \quad \text{helt enkelt slår ihjäl folk.} \\
\text{de aktiva} & \quad \text{gör fel.} \\
\text{passiv} & \quad \text{skiter i dom} \text{ stänga droppe.} \\
\text{de passiva} & \quad \text{aldrig sätta (.) in droppe.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

In the first case, the semantic composition is something like $A \supset E$ and $P \supset E'$, where $A$ and $P$ are sets of active and passive euthanasia events, respectively, and $E$ and $E'$ are sets of concrete formulated events, e.g. *gör*

---

$^3$ I have omitted *de där förstår du* and *bara*, for the sake of simplicity.
fel ‘do wrong’, stänga droppe ‘to shut off the drip’, skiter i dem ‘don’t care about them’. In the second case, the semantic composition is something like $A \cup P \supset E \cup E'$. However, a crucial point of the sequence is lost in these abstract representations, namely that the events that make up E and E’ are designed precisely to undermine turn 6, by being deliberate events - first on a general level, in turn 7,9, and then on a more specific level, in turn 14-15. Again, we have a case where the full sequential contexts of the paradigmatic alternatives crucially determine their further use.

The second, and most abstract of the two constructions in addition allows for combinations that actually contradict what is arrived at during the sequence, for example that passive euthanasia is that you kill people. Being able to say also what is ‘wrong’ is of course a pervasive trait of human language, but in this case it is precisely the distinction between wrong and right, determinable from the full sequential contexts of the paradigmatic alternatives, which disappears in the construction format.

**Interim summary**

We arrive again at the conclusion that a construction never substitutes for or absorbs a series of fully specified exemplar turns, but is a socially negotiated interim structuring of a series of turns, potentially open to new modifications. Since activities can be continued or reintroduced, the possibility for a next contribution must always be there. Any interim structuring of a series of turns is, as we have seen, a potential resource for further conversation. Thus are corroborated both Hopper’s original contention that constructions are always emerging and open-ended, embedded in, and ‘dispersed’ across longer conversational stretches (Hopper 1987, 1998, 2011; see also Couper-Kuhlen & Thompson 2006), and Auer & Pfländer’s extended argument that such dispersed constructions nevertheless serve as powerful resources for

But the productivity of a particular structuring of a series of turns, a potential construction, is not primarily a linguistic question, but basically a social question, as we have also seen. Rule-governed creativity, so central to Chomsky’s notion of linguistic competence (Chomsky 1964: 22-23), is socially circumscribed.4

4 See also Anward 1998.
An emergent and dynamic system

The piece of conversation we have been looking at does not dissolve into abstract patterns, then, but remains accessible to its participants as a resource for future conversations - as a network of differentially voiced and authored turns, which are structured along the dimensions of sequence and similarity.

One possible version of this network is shown in (1).¹

¹ Similarity is of course a multidimensional phenomenon, which can only partially be represented on a two-dimensional page.
1. Arne: sen e ja eh: (1) Aktiv å passiv
sen e där ju
hela
2. eutanasi
problemets
ändringar ju
som (p)
3. sem ni vet i två
begrepp nämligen aktiv å passiv eutanasi
också ju.
hela
hela
eutanasi
problemets
ändringar ju
som (p)
5. Clara: mm (p)
6. Björn: medveten å omedveten. (p)
7. Arne: näej aktiv å passiv e de där förstå du
att du helt enkelt slår ihjäl [folk.]
8. Clara:
9. Arne: [passiv e bara att du skiter i dom]
[medveten å omedveten. (p)]
10. Björn: [(...) jaa
11. Clara: ja
12. Björn: ja ja jo
[men
13. Arne: [så de å de e även där e de ju väldigt mycke,
14. Daniel: de aktiva e att stänga droppe. (p)
15. Arne: [just precis de.]
16. Arne: de passiva e att aldrig sätta (. [in droppe]
17. Clara: jaha just de ja [mm
18. Arne: [just precis de.]
A system

The network in (1) is structured towards a language, or langue in a slightly modified Saussurean sense, that is, as a system of relations between turns and turn parts (Saussure 1916, particularly ch. 4, Culler 1986). Relations of sequence translate straightforwardly into syntagmatic relations, and relations of similarity translate into associative relations, and, sometimes, paradigmatic relations.

Associative relations, relations of similarity, in form and/or meaning, are the system-defining relations introduced by Saussure (1916 [1967]: 170-175) alongside syntagmatic relations. Paradigmatic relations, i.e. relations between units which are alternatives in a single sequential position (Hjelmslev 1963: 36), were only introduced by Hjelmslev and other later structuralists. These structuralists also proposed to do away with associative relations, thus paving the way for the classical Jakobsonian conception of language as a system of systems, structured along an axis of combination (syntagmatic relations) and an axis of selection (paradigmatic relations; Jakobson 1956). However, both types of relation capture essential features of conversational structure.

Paradigms in Hjelmslev’s and Jakobson’s sense\(^2\) arise in the context of particular conversational practices. One such practice is the supporting reformulations we have observed in Aktiv à passiv. Other such practices, to which we will return, are repair, reformulations, and successive responses to dispreferred responses. In all these cases, participants are not just doing similarity, they are also doing selection, trying out alternatives. In other contexts, similarity is not accompanied by selection. In fact, most cases of recycling in conversation described in the literature, beginning with Sacks (1992) and Jefferson (1996), are of this type. Thus, associative and paradigmatic relations are at least partially independent relations which both structure conversation and language.

\(^2\) Note that members of a traditional paradigm, e.g. a noun paradigm, need not be paradigmatically related.
An emergent system

The system in (1) emerges from conversation in the classical sense of emergence (Holland 1998, particularly ch. 7), where repetition of an action, in this case turn construction, produces a pattern which the action itself does not produce.

However, as Dahl (2004: 27-39) points out, there is no reason why emergence should be understood as merely an unintended consequence of something else.\(^3\) We have every reason to assume that conversationalists in doing conversation are also cultivating a medium in which, and often only there, certain social activities become possible.

Indeed, I have argued that the emerging system is not just produced but is deliberately done, that the sequences and similarities which constitute the system are achieved sequences and similarities, in Sacks’ sense.\(^4\) In other words, they are meant to be heard, and can fulfill their interactive functions only if they are heard. Arne, Björn, Clara, and Daniel are not just doing conversation, they are doing (achieving) language.

A dynamic system

And the system is also, as we have seen, a dynamic system, changing with every turn. The dynamic character of *langue* was recognized already by Karcevski (1929), in an interpretation of Saussure which unfortunately never became the standard one (but see Anward 1996, and Marková 2003: 76-78).

Saussure (1916 [1967]: 37) saw clearly the dynamic interplay between *parole* (practice) and *langue* (system):

“la langue est nécessaire pour que la parole soit intelligible et produise tous ses effets ; mais celle-ci est nécessaire pour que la langue s’établisse ;


historiquement, le fait de parole précède toujours.”

But it was Karcevski who, by focussing on practice rather than the system, pointed out that a linguistic system must be flexible enough to be adaptable to the exigencies of any new communicative action (and all upcoming communicative contexts are new), and that in adapting to a new context, the system necessarily changes. A verbal action is thus, as we have seen, both system-dependent and system-changing. New practice transforms the system-so-far, and the system-so-far acts as a resource for and a constraint on further practice.

Much later, essentially the same point was made by Derrida, in his critical reading of Saussure (Derrida 1967, ch. 2), which is why I have used his notion of différance, and by Giddens (1984), in his theory of structuration.
OF FORMATS, STANCE, AND RHEMES

FIVE

Of formats, stance, and rhemes

Having argued that an embedded and dynamic system of linguistic resources emerges from a turn design oriented to situating participants in a tradition, I will now use another sequence from the conversation we are following to further explore how turns are structured by recycling with différance. In this case, the participants orient to the room in which the conversations take place.
About five more minutes into the planning session, Arne spots a map on the wall of the room they have borrowed, and almost seamlessly changes the topic of the conversation, right then the social dimensions of euthanasia, and starts talking about the map. The other participants join him in trying to figure out what they are looking at. This goes on for a couple of minutes, until the nature of the map has been satisfactorily identified. After that, the map is not further mentioned.

(1) *Oskyldig*

1. Arne: 'hhh de där e minsann tillåme sionistisk propaganda. *that is minsann even Zionist propaganda*
2. Daniel: ((MUTTERING))
3. Björn: °( ) där° (p) jaså *there jaså*
4. X: ((LAUGHTER))
5. Björn: de e inte turistartat? *it is not a-tourist-thing*
6. Arne: näej _absolut inte._ *näej absolutely not*
7. Björn: de e de inte nähä. *that is it not nähä*
8. Arne: undrar var _iallsindar_ han fått tag i den. *wonder where _iallsindar_ he got hold of that*
9. Daniel: titta där de e liksom _slag_, *look there there are like battles*
10. Arne: _hel:a_ faderullan. *the-whole faderullan*
11. Daniel: Israel _air-strikes,¹_
13. Daniel: de e _luftslage va._ *it is the air-battle isn’t-it*
14. Arne: de va _katten_, *that was _katten_*
15. de e tydligen ifrån _israeliska propagandaministeriet_ *it is apparently from the-Israeli _the-ministry-of-propaganda_
16. å sen e där en lampa bak som lyser precis (p)  
and then is there a lamp in-the-back which shines precisely

17. överallt [där] israelerna slogs.  
everywhere where the Israeli fought

18. Clara: [’hja]

that was ju som sjut:ton

what where have we ended-up really

21. Clara: ja

22. X: [((LAUGHTER))]

23. Arne: [ja just de ja e oskyldig]  
ja just de I am innocent

okej we believe you

25. Arne: ’hhh mm

As in Aktiv å passiv, I have refrained from translating response particles and epistemic stance particles in (1). In addition, I have not translated a number of assessment items in (1). The meanings of these expressions will be explicated as we proceed.

Oskyldig has three phases to it. In the first phase, lines 1 to 8, Arne offers a first description of the map, gets responded to, and then expresses his wonder about the map. In the second phase, lines 9 to 14, Daniel contributes further description of the map, and gets responded to. Arne then, in line 14, provides a second assessment, and proceeds to sum up what they have arrived at, in lines 15 to 17, after which there are assessments by Björn and Daniel, rather minimal responses by Clara, and unison laughter. The sequence ends with a coda where Arne pleads his innocence.

By his first turn, Arne sets the scene for the whole sequence. He introduces a descriptive format, de (där) e X, which is used in all descriptive turns in Oskyldig, and by his (characteristically) drastic choice of words and the surprise marker minsann\(^2\), he also establishes the affective climate of the sequence. After that turn, there is some commotion, while the other

\(^2\) minsann can approximately be translated as ’indeed’, and carries a strong element of surprise. The expression derives from a phrase meaning ’on my truth’. 
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participants focus their attention on the map. Björn, who has first reacted with a non-committed news receipt token, jasâ – ja (yes) augmented with så (so) – in line 3, then proceeds to suggest an alternative interpretation, in line 5, namely that the map is a ‘tourist thing’. Björn does this in a rather tentative way, combining a negative statement with a rising intonation. Björn’s alternative interpretation is then emphatically rejected by Arne, in line 6 – remember that the negative response item näej used by Arne is a strengthened version of the ordinary negative response item nä (no) – and Arne also qualifies his inte (not) with a stressed absolut (absolutely). Confronted with all this, Björn yields and accepts Arne’s interpretation, in line 7. The first de (it) in line 7 is anaphoric, picking up turistartat (‘touristy’) of line 5. The final nähä in line 7 is another version of nä3, which is used to acknowledge a fact which is not (or no longer) up for discussion. This first part of the sequence is concluded by an assessment, an expression of wonder from Arne, in line 8. The lexicalized noun phrase ialsindar (in-all-his-days), as well as the stress on that particular item, unambiguously marks the turn as an exclamation.

**Recycling with différance, again**

In producing his alternative description of the map on the wall in line 5, Björn recycles, as already mentioned, the format introduced by Arne in line 1. And this format is also recycled in Arne's rebuttal of Björn’s proposal in line 6, where the format is only retained, not repeated, and in Björn's acceptance of Arne’s rebuttal in line 7. In diagraph form:

---

3 More precisely, it is a nä with a pre-aspirated reduplicated vowel, just like jaha, which we have already met.
The method of turn construction used is, as we recall, recycling with
différance, an essentially poetic method, whereby a core turn in the
Jakobsonian sense undergoes successive transformations, which strike, in
different ways, a balance between continuity and change.

In lines 5, 6, and 7, we see successive transformations of the descriptive
core turn of the sequence, the turn in line 1. And, as shown in the diagraph
above, these transformations effectively articulate the turns in lines 1,
5, 6, and 7 into five parts: i) a common format, or frame (Peters 1983,
through all these turns; ii) a paradigm of rhemes, i.e. the part of a turn
which is most relevant to the topical progression of a sequence and which
typically contains the content words and the accented syllable(s) of the
turn, in this case the phrases tillåme sionistisk propaganda and turistartat;
iii) a paradigm of stance markers, the sentence adverbials minsann, inte,
and absolut inte; (iv) a paradigm of response items, näej and nähä, at the
beginning or end of the turn; and v) two types of contour over the turn,
falling (.) and rising (?). In what follows, I will refer to the combination of
(iii), (iv), and (v) in a turn as the stance marking, or just stance, of that turn.

In line 5, Björn repeats the format of Arne’s turn in line 1 and substitutes
a new rheme for the rheme of line 1. In addition, he substitutes a new
stance (inte and rising intonation) for the stance in line 1 (minsann and
falling intonation). The progression from line 1 to line 5 thus comes close
to Daneš’ second mode of textual progression, and can more precisely be schematized as (where S is stance and F is format):

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
F1 & S1 & R1 \\
F1 & S2 & R2 \\
\end{array}
\]

In line 6, Arne retains, without repeating them, the format and rheme of Björn’s preceding turn, and upgrades the stance of that turn to a much stronger negative stance (a combination of näej, absolut inte, and falling intonation). Schematically:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
F1 & S1 & R1 \\
F1 & S2 & R2 \\
S2' & & \\
\end{array}
\]

In line 7, finally, Björn repeats the format of line 5. He also repeats the rheme of line 5, but in reduced form (the anaphoric pronoun de) and in initial position, and produces yet another version of his original stance (a combination of inte, final nähä, and falling intonation). This is a variety of Daneš’ first mode of textual progression, a variety which does not introduce a new rheme. Schematically:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
F1 & S1 & R1 \\
F1 & S2 & R2 \\
S2' & & \\
R2 & S2'' & F1 \\
\end{array}
\]

\[4\text{ And the format used, with an initial anaphoric de is the favorite format for that type of progression. I will return to that format in chapter 10.}\]
**Turn design and interactional structure**

Through the pattern of recyclings in the first phase of *Oskyldig*, the participants index its interactional structure: which turns are responses to which turns, and what kind of responses they invite.

The turns in lines 1 to 7 are contributions to the same activity, an initial description of the map on the wall, and they share the same format. In contrast, the turn in line 8, repeated below

8. Arne: undrar var iällsindar han fått tag i den.

makes an assessment of the situation, and has no descriptive import. Hence, the turn in line 8 introduces a new activity, and its unique format can be heard as an index of that. The method used is a simple one:

(2) Format

A new format indicates a new activity.

And just as a new format indicates a new activity, a new rheme indicates a new contribution. The turn in line 5 is both subordinate to and parallel to the turn in line 1, in that Björn both challenges Arne’s contribution and proposes a new contribution to the ongoing descriptive activity. The two turns are united by a common format and differentiated by unique rhemes.

In contrast, the turns in lines 6 and 7 are only being used to negotiate the proposed contribution of line 5, and offer no further contribution. These turns are united by a common format, which is retained in Arne’s rejection of Björn’s proposal in the turn in line 6, and repeated in Björn’s compliance with Arne in the turn in line 7, and by a common rheme, which is retained in the turn in line 6, and repeated in reduced, anaphoric form in the turn in line 7. Thus:
(3) Rhemes

A new rheme indicates a new contribution within the ongoing activity.

And, finally, the second contribution in *Oskyldig* is concluded and bracketted off through a repetition of the initial format of that contribution. I will return to this kind of design in a little while.

Sequence organization

What we see being practised in *Oskyldig* is a method of sequence organization which goes beyond organization in terms of next action, and structure-building through deferral of next action (Schegloff 2007). The two methods are perfectly compatible, though. A substantial part of *Oskyldig* (lines 5 to 17) can unproblematically be interpreted as successive deferrals of a projected surprised acknowledgment of Arne’s initial information, an acknowledgement which is only forthcoming in lines 19 to 21. However, sequence organization through recycling with différance has a much greater potential for structure-building than sequence organization in terms of next action, not only with regard to cohesion and progression, but also with regard to the social organization. Thus, as we will see, Arne can, through recycling with différance, tie a current action not only to a previous action, but also to earlier actions, and by doing so both align with these actions and their speakers, and accomplish a new contribution.

---

5 And note that all cohesive devices described by Halliday & Hasan (1976): anaphoric reference, ellipsis, substitution, and lexical cohesion, are part of recycling with différance.

6 In the sense of Goodwin (1990).
Oskyldig, the second phase

In the second phase of “Oskyldig”, lines 9 to 14, shown below, Daniel offers another description of the map on the wall, that it shows battles, in fact air battles. This is done in three steps: line 9, with feedback from Arne, line 11, with feedback from Clara, and line 13. The second phase is then, like the first phase, concluded by an assessment, an expression of surprise by Arne, in line 14.

9. Daniel: titta där de e liksom slag, look there there are like battles
10. Arne: hel:a faderullan. the-whole faderullan
11. Daniel: Israel air-strikes, 
13. Daniel: de e luftslage va. it is the air-battle isn‘t-it 
14. Arne: de va katten, that was katten

The structure of the descriptive turns in the two first phases of Oskyldig is shown below:

1. Arne: · hhh de där e minsann tillåme
   sionistisk . propaganda.
2. Daniel: ((MUTTERING))
3. Björn: °() där° (p) jaså
5. Björn: de e inte turstartat ?
7. Björn: de e de inte
   näå .
10. Arne: hel:a faderullan .
12. Clara: jaha
What Daniel does in lines 9-13 is clearly a new, independent contribution to the ongoing descriptive activity, parallel to Arne’s contribution in line 1. Thus, as we would by now expect, Daniel recycles the format of the turn in line 1, but substitutes a new rheme for the rheme in line 1. Interestingly, Daniel also repeats the *där* (there) of the turn in line 1, although in a different position. It is natural to take this as a further signal of the parallelism between the two turns.

And like in the second descriptive contribution to the first phase of *Oskyldig* (lines 5-7), we have in line 9-13 a sequence where a first turn of a contribution is followed by turns which retain the format of the first turn and continues the contribution, and where the contribution is then concluded by a turn which repeats the format of the first turn.

The shape of such sequences suggests that participants operate with a scale of independence: new format > repeated format > retained format, which allows them to link turns not only to their immediately preceding turns, but also to more remote turns. The method involved is something along the following lines:

(4) Format II

A turn is subordinate to the closest preceding turn of higher rank, and is parallel to the closest preceding turn of equal rank.

It is through this method that a contribution can be heard as concluded and bracketted off by a repeated format following one or more retained formats, the repeated format connecting back not only to the immediately preceding turn, but also to the initial turn of the contribution, as well as opening up for a following new contribution.\(^7\)

---

\(^7\) This structure-building use of formats is highly reminiscent of the structure-building use of referential expressions. See Källgren 1979, Fox 1987, Anward 1989, and Öqvist 2005.
Related rhemes

We would expect by now that a single contribution uses a unique, recurring rheme, as in the second contribution of the first phase of *Oskyldig*, with some variation as to whether that rheme is retained or repeated, or, if repeated, repeated in anaphoric form or not. In lines 9 - 13 in the second phase of *Oskyldig* there is, as we have seen, a straightforward single contribution pattern of a retained and repeated format. However, the rhemes in these lines are, as shown below, much more varied than we would have expected.

10. Arne:  hel: a  faderullan .
11. Daniel:  Israel  air  strikes  ,
12. Clara:  jaha
13. Daniel:  de e  luftslage

The initial turn of Daniel’s contribution in line 9 is followed by two turns which retain the format of the initial turn, but also offer new rhemes, before the contribution is concluded by the turn in line 13, in which the format of the turn in line 9 is repeated, and yet another rheme is introduced.

Clearly, though, the rhemes involved center on the same notion. The second rheme, *hela faderullan* (everything, the whole thing), is a hyperonym of *slag* (battles), and the two further rhemes, *Israel air-strikes* and *luftslage* (the-air-battle), are hyponyms of *slag*. Thus, *hela faderullan*, *Israel air-strikes*, and *luftslage* are not really new rhemes, but variations on *slag*. And note that in producing the last of these variations, Daniel is recycling the initial rheme, and doing morphology on it. He embeds *slag* in a compound and inflects the resulting word by adding the suffix –e (neutre definite singular).

So what we have here in lines 9 - 13 of the second phase of *Oskyldig* is

---

8 Note that *hela faderullan* is a set noun phrase, with the meaning of ‘everything’ or ‘the whole thing’, and thus fits into the rhematic position,
one contribution, summed up in the turn in line 13, when we look at the pattern of recycled formats, and several related contributions, when we look at the pattern of rhemes. And this is a fairly adequate description of the sequence in lines 9 - 13, where Daniel, with the help of Arne and Clara, tries out several formulations of the same contribution. Whereas a new rheme would signal a new contribution, and a repeated or retained rheme would signal an ongoing contribution, a rheme which is recycled with variation seems to signal a new formulation of an ongoing contribution.

Oskyldig, the third phase

In the third, and final, phase of Oskyldig, shown below, Arne, after the assessment in line 14, summarizes, in his own phrasings, the two descriptions of the map established so far. He then, finally, receives surprised feedback from the three others, which gives way to unison laughter, overlapped by a concluding coda from Arne, which gets feedback from Daniel.

14. Arne: de va katten,
   that was katten
15. de e tydligen ifrån israeliska propagandamneriet
   it is apparently from the-Israeli the-ministry-of-propaganda
16. å sen e där en lampa bak som lyser precis (p)
   and then is there a lamp in-the-back which shines precisely
17. överallt [där] israelerna slogs.
   everywhere where the Israeli fought
18. Clara: [ˈhja]
   that was ju som sjut:ton
   what where have we ended-up really
21. Clara: ja
22. X: [((LAUGHTER))]
23. Arne: [ja just de ja e oskyldig]
   ja just de I am innocent
   okej we believe you
25. Arne: ˈhhh mm
In line 15, Arne reformulates his own description from the turn in line 1, and in line 16, he reformulates Daniel’s description from the turns in lines 9 - 13. In reformulating the two descriptions established in the first and the second part of *Oskyldig*, Arne recycles the format which was used to introduce them. In line 15, the format is simply repeated. In line 16, the last descriptive turn in the sequence, the format is slightly altered. A temporal expression is fronted and the subject is placed after the verb. Note also that the subject is *där* (there) rather than *de* (it). This is most likely because Arne speaks a Scanish dialect, where there is a distinction between *de e* and *där e*, which is highly similar to the distinction between *it is* and *there is* in English. However, beside that, it is also the case, as I have already noted, that *där* is strategically placed in *Oskyldig*. In its first and second phases, *där* is used to introduce the two major descriptions of the map on the wall. In both cases, *där* precedes the verb. In the third phase, *där* is used in the turn which concludes the descriptive part of the whole sequence, and in that turn it is placed after the verb. Thus, we might take the variation on the descriptive turn format in line 16 as a kind of boundary marker, signalling the end of the descriptive phase of *Oskyldig*.

Moreover, the rhemes in the complex turn in lines 15 and 16 are variations on the rhemes in lines 1, 9, 11, and 13. In line 15, Arne ties this turn to his own turn in line 1, by recycling the adjective *sionistisk* (Zionist) as the semantically related adjective *israelisk* (Israeli), and the noun *propaganda* (propaganda) as the derivationally related noun *propagandaministeriet* (the ministry of propaganda). In line 16, he ties the turn to Daniel’s formulations in lines 9, 11, and 13, by recycling *Israel* as the derivationally and inflectionally related noun *israelerna* (the Israelis), and producing yet another variation on the nouns *slag* (battles), *strikes*, and *slage* (the-battle), namely the derivationally related verb form *slogs* (fought). Schematically:

```
1. sionist-isk propaganda
9. slag
11. Israel
13. strikes
15. israel-isk-a propaganda ministeriet
16. israel-erna slogs
```
The descriptive part of the third and final phase of *Oskyldig* is then Arne’s summary and reformulation of his own and Daniel’s descriptive contributions in its first and second phase, an instance of what I have called text talk (Anward 1997, cf. also chapter 2), a formulation of a preceding sequence, which can serve as a memo of what has been achieved there.

In addition, it serves to close down the descriptive activity of the entire sequence and open the floor for a new sequence in the ongoing conversation. As we have seen, the sequential position and impact of the third and final phase are precisely indexed by an intricate combination of recycled and modified formats, and variations on the original rhemes of the first and second phases.

**Assessment formats**

The third and final phase of *Oskyldig* ends with an elaborate construction of intersubjectivity. In line 18, Björn shows his alignment with Arne’s summary. In doing that, he recycles the assessment format used by Arne in line 14. In line 19, it is Daniel’s turn to show alignment with Arne’s summary and he uses a variation on the assessment format used by Arne in line 8. Then, in line 20, Clara agrees, with a plain *ja* (yes), and after that there is unison laughter, which overlaps with the final coda in lines 22 – 24.

I have already pointed out that descriptions and assessments have different formats in *Oskyldig*. The two assessment formats used in *Oskyldig* are shown in (5) and (6).

(5) First assessment format in *Oskyldig*:

8. Arne: undrar var i allsindar han fått tag i den.
19. Daniel: va var har vi hamnat riktit

(6) Second assessment format in *Oskyldig*:

14. Arne: de va katten
18. Björn: de va ju som sjutton
The first assessment format is basically a rhetorical question format, built around the question word var (where), a finite form of the verb ha (have), which is optional, and a main verb, in the Supine (the special Swedish perfect form). The second assessment format – de va X – consists of de va (it was), followed by a stance marker, and an evaluative expression, such as katten and som sjutton⁹.

One might well wonder why two different assessment formats are used, particularly since turns in the two formats are essentially interchangeable. The meaning would not have been drastically different, had the contents of turns 8 and 14, say, been substituted for each other.

What might be relevant is that the assessment made by Arne in the first phase follows what is essentially his own descriptive contribution, while the assessment made by Arne in the second phase follows Daniel’s descriptive contribution. The rather sharp contrast between the descriptive frame de e X and the assessment frame har + Supine in the first phase thus occurs when it is the principal of the descriptive activity who introduces a new activity, whereas the rather small contrast between the descriptive frame de e X and the assessment frame de va X occurs when it is not the principal of the descriptive activity but another participant who introduces the new activity.

That a simultaneous change of speaker and activity is indexed by a closer fit between successive formats may be a generalizable observation. Fast, heavily dialogical, and goal-directed activities, such as auctions (Kuiper 1996), typically seem to select a narrow range of formats, as well as an extensive use of retainment, whereas slower, more monological and less goal-directed activities, such as story-telling, typically seem to allow for more repetition, and for a broader range of formats.

The two formats are also well used in the establishment of the concluding intersubjectivity in the final part of Oskyldig. Note that both Björn and Daniel use assessment formats from the parts where they were

⁹ Both these expressions are idiomatic. Katten means literally ‘the cat’ and som sjutton, ‘as seventeen’. However, in this context, they both mean something like ‘surprising’.
not active, the second part, in the case of Björn, and the first part, in the case of Daniel. In this way, they not only support Arne’s reformulations in the final part, they also increase the support of the original turns underlying these reformulations.

Speaker-specific rhemes

Through recycling with différance, conversationalists not only manage coherence and progression, they also, as we have seen, establish and maintain a social organization, a particular balance between alignment and individuality, where individual contributions are played out against a common background and assimilated (or not) into a mounting consensus. An interesting aspect of this balance between alignment and individuality is the speaker-specific nature of the rhemes in the two episodes we have been listening to.

Consider again the rhemes in the explanatory turns of Aktiv å passiv, repeated below:

... 
Arne: näej aktiv e de där förstår du att du helt enkelt slår ihjäl [folk.]
Clara: [gör] fel. ((laughs))
Arne: på ett eller annat sätt
... 
[passiv e bra att du sköta i dom]
Daniel: de aktiva e att stänga droppen. (p) att aldrig sätta (.) [in droppe].

10 For further demonstrations of the subtle interplay between progression, coherence, alignment, and individuality achieved by means of repetition and ‘ellipsis’, see Fox 1987 and Öqvist 2005 on reference and topic, Pomerantz 1984 and Linell 2005, § 8.2, on (dis) agreement, and Schegloff 1987 on recycled turn beginnings.
What is striking is that, except for the initial subjunction *att*, there is no lexical overlap between Arne’s, Clara’s, and Daniel’s rhemes. And the same holds for the rhemes of the first two descriptive contributions to *Oskyldig*, repeated below, as well as for the rhemes in the assessments in *Oskyldig*, also repeated below. There is no lexical overlap between Arne’s, Björn’s, and Daniel’s rhemes in these sequences.

1. Arne:  `hhh de där e minsann tillåme
         zionistisk
          Propaganda.

2. Daniel: ((MUTTERING))

3. Björn:  ?(p) där °(p)
          jaså

5. Björn:  de e inte turstartat ?

6. Arne:  näej absolut inte

7. Björn:  de e de inte

11. Daniel:  titta där de e liksom slag

12. Clara:  jaha

13. Daniel:  de e luftslage va

14. Arne:  de va katten

18. Björn:  de va ju som sjutton

What we see here then is a method of turn design where conversationalists index their alignment through recycled formats, and their individuality through a unique rhematic vocabulary.

And given such a background of shared formats and individual rhemes, participants can choose to partially recycle other participants’ rhemes in
order to enhance alignment. This is precisely what Arne does in his summary of the first two descriptive contributions in *Oskyldig*, but note that even here, there is an achieved balance between alignment and individuality. Although Arne partially recycles his own and Daniel’s previous rhemes, he does not actually repeat any word forms from these contributions.

**Assonance**

Individuality, indexed by a unique rhematic vocabulary, can be mitigated by similarity of sounds, or assonance, a cohesive device, whose presence in conversation was first described by Sacks (Sacks 1992, Vol. II, Parts V and VI), followed by Jefferson (1996), Tannen (1989), and Anward (2006).

In the rheme of line 5, Björn recycles a substantial part of the sound structure of Arne’s rheme in line 1. The rheme in line 1, *tillåme sionistisk propaganda*, has two accented syllables, *nist* and *gan*, and the latter syllable is directly followed by another syllable with the vowel *a*. The rheme in line 5, *turistartat*, has one accented syllable, *rist*, which rhymes with the first accented syllable of the rheme in line 1, and which furthermore is followed by two syllables with the vowel *a*, the first of which has secondary stress.

Assonance seems to index continuity. Thus, when Daniel introduces a new contribution in line 9, there is no striking assonance between the rheme of that line and the rheme of line 1. In contrast, when Arne, in line 10, supports Daniel’s new contribution, Arne recycles the syllable *la* of the rheme in line 9, twice.

The same pattern can be observed in line 18, where Björn’s assessment not only recycles the format of Arne’s assessment in 14, but also uses a rheme (*som sjutton*) which is strongly assonant with the rheme of line 14 (*katten*), and in the concluding lines 23 and 24, repeated below,

---

23. Arne:  
   [ja just de ja e oskyldig]  
   ja just de *I am innocent*  

24. Daniel:  
   okej vi tror dej.  
   okej *we believe you*
where in both lines an accented syllable with o is followed by a syllable beginning with d.

And, finally, this pattern can also be observed in the rhemes of the explanatory turns of *Aktiv å passiv*, repeated below:

7. Arne: aktiv e att du helt enkelt slå ihjäl [folk.]
8. Clara: [gör] fel. ((laughs))
9. Arne: [passiv e att du skiter i dom]
14. Daniel: de aktiva e att stänga droppe. (p)
15. de passiva att aldrig sätta (.) [in droppe.]

In Daniel’s reformulation of the contrast in lines 7 and 9, he first recycles the vocalism of the rheme in line 7 in the rheme of line 14, where in both cases, the vowel ä in the stressed syllable of the accented word is followed by o as the vowel of the stressed syllable of the next word. Then, the vocalism of the rheme in line 9 is recycled in the rheme of line 15. In both rhemes, the vowel i in the stressed syllable of the accented word is followed, again, by o as the vowel of the stressed syllable of the next (phonological) word, a syllable which, moreover, starts with d. And in Clara’s reformulation, in line 8, of the rheme in line 7, we find a recycled consonantism. In both rhemes, the penultimate syllable starts with [j] and the final syllable, with [f].

Assonance, then, is a method whereby a participant can index a turn as a continuation of a previous turn, and still maintain a unique rhematic vocabulary, as an index of her individuality.
Of speaking and nonsense

Systems of linguistic resources are, then, not ‘inside’ speech, but come forth as a consequence of dialogue and tradition. It is in and through conversation that stretches of speech are being structured towards a language.

Speaking is independent of language

In our halcyon days, some of us were intrigued by the idea of a language machine, sitting in our heads, and cranking out well-formed sentences for us. Linguistics was all about reconstructing the design of that machine. And early psycholinguistic studies (see Greene 1972 for an overview) seemed to corroborate that view, managing to link design features of the machine directly to mental processes.

However, the language machine did not last long. McCawley (1968) fairly soon showed that well-formedness did not result directly from any productive device, but must be understood as conditions on the output of such a device. Grammar, if anything, is a filter on independent productions. And the short-lived experiment of Generative Semantics conclusively demonstrated that well-formedness, if at all a meaningful notion, is inextricably context-dependent (Lakoff 1989).

The obvious conclusion is that humans have a capacity for a particular mode of sound production, speaking, which is appropriated in doing language, but which is not necessarily constrained by linguistic norms. Speaking is the iteration of syllables, grouped into intonation units (see Szczepek Reed 2010 and Anward 2010 for a recent discussion). Speaking precedes language, and may even be an appropriation of pre-existing action schemata, and thus evolutionarily independent of language (MacNeilage...
Language emerges when speaking is appropriated for interactive purposes, and in that process is structured through turn-taking and recycling with différance.

Nonsense

If languaging is speaking in a tradition, using previous turns in that tradition as models for new turns, then we should also be able to use speaking to step out of an ambient tradition, by producing turns which are not modelled on previous turns in any recognizable tradition. And this we sometimes do. Glossolalia (Samarin 1972, Holm 1996), and sound poetry (Keith 2005, Olsson 2005: ch. 6) are two such cases.

Consider a simple example of glossolalia:

sánto balaman-ki:di stalaman-kéndia
al:éidi spí:di sténdi
o-lamastí:-daman-kídi stalándi
lebytjí:dalal-kído-stiká:di
endo-latjí:na:dispéndi káidi sténdi

This small piece of glossolalia was recorded by Nils G. Holm in a Swedish-speaking Pentecostal congregation in Finland in the 1970s (Holm 1996: 41). It is clearly structured into syllables and prosodic units (demarcated in Holm’s transcription by spaces and line breaks), but it is not ’in’ any language known to the members of the congregation (or to Holm, for that matter).

As is demonstrated by Samarin (1972) and Holm (1996), glossolalia sets into motion a complex dialectic of inside and outside in any congregation where it appears. To be able to produce glossolalia is prestigious, and makes you more integrated into your congregation. On the other hand, it is essential that what you produce is not comprehensible to anyone else in the congregation. In the words of S:t Paul (1 Corinthians 14:2), you should be
identified as speaking ”an unknown tongue”.

In order to accomplish the double task of staying inside and speaking outside, you are faced with two problems: first, what kind of material can you use to construct your turns; secondly, how can you ensure progression in your speech, in the absence of dialogue and any contexture (in Mukařovský’s sense; Mukařovský 1977).

The solution to the first problem is rather simple. As Samarin (1972) and Holm (1996) show, glossolalists do not feel the need to be radically different. They are content with being sufficiently different. Thus, familiar sounds are recycled, sometimes with an added twist of exotica (Jakobson & Waugh 1979), keywords (such as sáanto in our example), and/or onomatopoeia.

And the solution to the second problem is the use of a mode of progression which we have already encountered: assonance. As can be seen from the diagraph below, the small piece of glossolalia we are looking at can be analyzed as composed of three sound units, which are being repeatedly recycled with différance.

What this shows is again that language is not the cause of speech. Language emerges in a tradition of speaking, through interactive work being done by means of turn-taking and recycling with différance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Word 1</th>
<th>Word 2</th>
<th>Word 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>st</td>
<td>sánto</td>
<td>balaman-</td>
<td>kí:di</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp</td>
<td>st</td>
<td>alaman-</td>
<td>kéndia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp</td>
<td>al:</td>
<td>í:di</td>
<td>éidi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>st</td>
<td>sp</td>
<td>éndi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>st</td>
<td>o-lama</td>
<td>í:-d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>st</td>
<td>st</td>
<td>aman-</td>
<td>kí:di</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>st</td>
<td>st</td>
<td>alán</td>
<td>di</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp</td>
<td>leb</td>
<td>y tjí:d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>st</td>
<td>alal-</td>
<td>kí:do</td>
<td>iká:di</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp</td>
<td>st</td>
<td></td>
<td>éndi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>tjí:nadi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>st</td>
<td>sp</td>
<td></td>
<td>káidi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>st</td>
<td>st</td>
<td></td>
<td>éndi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interaction formats

As we have seen, an updating of a tradition and an updating of a local context both lead to updated linguistic resources. And the embedded and dynamic systems emerging from these two activities are fairly similar. Let us now further explore the nature of such systems.
The resulting systems

Consider the networks (compacted here, for reasons of space) established through the two sequences of conversation we have been listening to in the preceding chapters.
(1) Aktiv å passiv

Arne: sen e ja eh:
    sen e där ju
    hela
eutanasiproblemet
sönderfaller ju
som (p)
som ni vet i två
begrepp
nämligen aktiv å passiv
eutanasi också ju.

Björn: jaha.
Clara: mm (p)
Björn:
Arne: näej
Björn: [(...) jaa
    Clara: ja
    Björn: ja ja jo
    men
    Arne: [så de
        å de e
        även där e de
    väldigt mycke,
    Daniel: ju
    de aktiva e
    att stänga droppe. (p)
    de passiva e
    att aldrig sätta (. [in droppe]
    Arne: [just
        precis
dede.]
    Clara: jaha just
    de ja [mm
    Arne: [just
        precis de.
1. Arne: 'hhh de där e minsann tillåme sionistisk propaganda.

5. Björn: de e inte turistartat?


7. Björn: de e de inte nähä.

8. Arne: undrar


10. Arne: hela faderullan.

11. Daniel: Israel air-strikes,

12. Clara: jaha


14. Arne: de va katten,

15. de e tydligen ifrån israeliska propagandamini steriet
16. å sen e där

17.

18. Björn: de va ju som sjutton


20.

21. Clara: ja ja e oskyldig

23. Arne: ja just de

If these networks are read across the page, from left to right, we find that they display the recurrent turn structure which we have already identified: a response item is combined with a format item\(^1\), a stance item, and a rheme. Different formats indicate different activities, different rhemes indicate different contributions, and different stance items indicate different relations between speaker, hearer, activity, and contribution.

And it is this articulation of turns which forms the basis of emergent constructions, where (variations on) a recurrent format gets syntagmatically related to a paradigm of stance items, and a paradigm of rhemes, members of which have a potentiality to combine in new ways.

**‘Form words’ and ‘content words’**

The embeddedness of such constructions in episodes of conversations, themselves embedded in social activities, allows us to derive several emergent features of them.

To begin with, a (scalar) distinction between ‘form words’ and ‘content words’ will naturally emerge.

Since formats are used for general activities, such as description and assessment, and since a single episode involves only a few such activities, a single network of turns will support only a small number of constructions. Moreover, if formats are recycled across episodes, which we will see that they are, the resulting linguistic resources will also make available only a small number of constructions. And since formats then will be few and frequent, they will tend to be phonetically reduced and semantically bleached (Bybee 2003), both in the course of single conversations (Fowler and Housum 1987, Bard, Lowe and Altmann 1989), and as a long-term effect over several successive conversations (Zipf 1935). As a consequence, component expressions of formats will also be phonetically reduced and

---

1 A consequence of the diagraph representation is that each new format introduces a new column.
semantically bleached.

Rhemes, on the other hand, tend to be unique for each contribution which means that a network of turns will support fairly large paradigms of rhemes. Even if such paradigms are recycled, which we will see that they are, their members will be much more infrequent than format items, and will hence stay comparatively unreduced and semantically unbleached.

Recycling with *différance* will then order component expressions of turns on a scale from strongly reduced and grammaticalized form words with high text frequency to phonetically full and semantically unbleached content words with very low text frequency. Formats and parts of formats will be found at the reduced end of the scale, rhemes and parts of rhemes typically at the unreduced end. Stance markers, which have much the same flexibility as formats, being usable in sequence after sequence, yet have some of the individualizing force which rhemes have, may occupy an intermediate position, but closer to the reduced end of the scale.

However, as Walker (2009, 2010) has shown, repetition does not always mean reduction. There are interactive contexts, such as self-repairs, where repeated items may retain their phonetic and prosodic properties, or even become more prominent prosodically and phonetically. The self-repair in line 6 in the following example (3), where ÄR (is/are) is made prominent, is an instance of the latter case.
(3) Blåslagna

1. Lisa: nä men (0.2) [(de e ju] f:ylla människor som faller¿ no but it is you know drunk people who fall no but you know it is drunk people who fall
2. Malin: ja¿ (0.6) yes
3. Lisa: dom: (0.4) kan ju klara vasomhelst, (1.4) they can you know manage anything they can you know survive anything
4. Hanna: hmf [:
5. Lisa: [förutom att dom blir hemst blåslagna dan efter men, (0.4) except that they get terribly blue beaten the day after but except they get beaten black and blue the day after but
6. Lisa: eller att dom ÄR [hemst blåslagna dan °efter¿? or that they ARE terribly blue beaten the day after or they ARE beaten black and blue the day after

And, of course, rhematic items may also be reduced when recycled. In Oskyldig, the rhematic item propaganda is used twice by Arne. The first time, in line 1, propaganda is pronounced with a [d] in the final syllable. In line 15, the last two syllables of the word are pronounced as [an:a].

Thus, recycling might be better viewed as a source for a hypo-hyper scale (Linell 1979, ch. 3, Lindblom 1986), creating a range of variants of expressions, from strongly reduced (hypo-) to over-articulated (hyper-) versions. Form words will then have their most frequent versions near the hypo end of the scale, while typical content words stay close to the hyper end of the scale, with only occasional excursions away from that end.

What Walker’s data suggest, though, is that versions of a single expression are not sequentially neutral. Hence, hypo-hyper scales also have an irreducible temporal dimension. This is in fact precisely the temporal dimension of différance, an indication of the fact that a recycled turn never comes back as itself, but as something similar in a new sequential context. A recycled turn uses différance in order to both create a past and project a future.
Variations on formats

This is also evident when we look at the recycling of formats within an episode. As we have seen, when a format is recycled, it is adapted to the sequential context of its turn. And this produces a number of variations on a single format. Consider, for example, the variations on the descriptive format in *Oskyldig*, shown below.

```
de där e
de e
Ø
de e de
de e
Ø
Ø
de e
de e
e där
```

However, these variations are not simply paradigmatic alternatives. Whether a format is repeated, reduced, or retained (indicated by Ø above) is dependent on the sequential work it is designed to do. Thus, here, too, we find an irreducible temporal dimension in what would appear to be just a matter of selection, in Jakobson’s sense (Jakobson 1956).

The nature of paradigms

The same phenomenon, an irreducible temporal dimension, is also found in emergent paradigms of rhemes. As we have seen, participants ground their proposed paradigmatic expansions quite robustly in the paradigm-so-far, having to negotiate any extension of an ongoing paradigm. In doing this, they overlay simple paradigmatic equivalence with a network of associative relations (Saussure 1967: 170-175), creating a morphosemantic field,
in Guiraud’s sense (Guiraud 1966). Recall, for example, the associative relations among the rhemes of *Osskyldig*, repeated below.

1. sionist-isk propaganda
9. slag
11. Israel air strikes
13. luft slage-e
15. israel-isk-a propaganda ministeriet
16. israel-erna slogs

And this pattern is a pattern we see writ large in studies of large corpora, which show that actual paradigms are in fact less general and display much less semantic variation than is normally assumed in grammatical descriptions (“co-selection of lexis and grammar”; Stubbs 1996: 36 – 41).

But the associative relations involved (semantic similarity, assonance, and morphological similarity) are not abstract patterns, but means to achieve sequential ends, parts of the negotiation involved in any paradigmatic extension. In finding a semantically related expression for an expression used so far, in doing assonance, in extending a word or a larger unit to a new function, and in doing morphology, inflecting an old word in a new way, deriving a new word from an old word, creating a compound involving old lexical material, or promoting old lexical material from part of a compound to an independent word, participants are not primarily interested in elaborating linguistic resources at hand\(^2\). Their chief concern is striking a balance between alignment and individuality, and developing a communicative project towards a resolution.

\(^2\) This is not to say, as I pointed out earlier, that participants are unaware of or uninterested in that aspect of their practice.
Interaction formats

While it is quite possible, then, as we have seen, to read networks across the page, from left to right, the observations above suggest that this mode of reading misses a crucial aspect of them, what I have called an irreducible temporal dimension inherent in them.

Thus, we should refrain from immediately decontextualising networks such as those in (1) and (2), and turn them into more abstract combinatorial systems. Rather, let us see them as practical achievements, as possible ways to carry out communicative projects, which can be used as scripts for further practice. In other words, the networks in (1) and (2), and others like them, are best interpreted as recyclable interaction formats, tuned to local communicative projects.

This affords a simple conception of practical linguistic competence: a repertoire of interaction formats, each one constituting an embedded and open-ended system of linguistic resources.

New practice involves activating a collection of such formats, which resonate with the situation and the project at hand, and use them as models for the ongoing interaction. This means accessing interaction formats as they unfold in time (from top to bottom and from left to right in a diagraph representation), and construct new turns through a process of incremental (Linell 2011), or on-line syntactic (Auer 2009), replication of and variation on already produced turns. In this way, old turns serve as a blueprint for improvisation and meaning-making, which at each, negotiable, step in an unfolding new turn (Schegloff 1996, Steensig 2001) inform the decision what to do next.
Monologue

In principle, though, nothing but interactional concerns prevents participants from treating actualised formats as abstract systems, utilizing a coalition of sequential contexts of a turn under way as a web of combinatorial possibilities, and by making a ‘feast’ on turn parts in those contexts, combine them in new ways. The Jakobsonian axes of combination and selection (Jakobson 1956) are clearly available in the interaction formats we have been looking at. Thus, the network in (2) affords the production of, for example, *de e absolut inte slag* (that is absolutely not battles). The challenge is to find a social context where this can be done.

Monologic discourse, particularly written monologic discourse, seems to provide such contexts, where speakers and writers can allow their production to be governed not only by ongoing communicative projects but also by the ‘material’, language, as Simon (2008) puts it.

What can be said how and when has few degrees of freedom in an ordinary conversation, where participants are involved in a joint communicative project, which furthermore is entrenched in a well-practised social activity. “If talk strays away too far from the received stocks of linguistic resources on which normal talk about familiar topics in familiar activities typically rely, if ”people begin to toss around old words in new senses, to throw in the occasional neologism, and thus to hammer out a new idiom”, as Rorty (1991:88) puts it, then words begin to stand out as words and meaning becomes problematic, since words thereby lose their character of transparent vehicles of meanings, which allow us to ’hear meanings’ in an almost unmediated fashion.” (Anward 2003a: 189).

However, in monologic discourse, we can observe the connection

---

3 Öyvind Fahlström’s term. See http://www.fahlstrom.com/paintings-1950-59
4 For a discussion of how this might be done, see Anward & Lindblom 1999, section 7.
5 This is not the place to discuss the relationship between speech and writing. Let me just make clear that I assume a continuity between speech and writing. In particular, I assume, with Pettersson (1991, 1996) that written language is a recycling with différance of spoken language, in another medium, and under different conditions of production.
between low (stimulus-)control and rule-governed creativity which Chomsky (1959) took as central to languaging. When a communicative situation is not on-line, and when it affords a range of relations to a future addressee, and a corresponding range of topics and perspectives, then more options come into play, especially if ordinary demands on accessibility and acceptance are waived, and the situation also involves a high degree of self-monitoring (Carroll, Bever & Pollock 1981).

Simon (1964/2008: 147-148) describes this variety of languaging in the following way:

“Lorsque j’écris (je m’en rends compte de plus en plus), je n’”exprime” pas quelque chose qui préexisterai à l’écriture. Certes, il y a ce que l’on pourrait appeler un “point de départ”: ce vague et confus magma que je porte en moi et dans lequel je vais puiser.

Mais au fur et à mesure que j’écris, il se produit un curieux phénomène: ce langage dont je croyais pouvoir me servir comme d’un instrument déplie ses lignes de forces. Par la profusion des images que suscite chaque mot (si je dis par exemple que l’encre dont je me sers est bleue, ce sont aussitôt tous les objets bleus du monde qui sont évoqués, s’introduisent, par le biais de cette qualité commune dans ma pensée et par conséquent dans un discours où, initialement, ils n’avaient pas leur place), je suis sans cesse dévié de mon propos premier qui est ainsi, au fur et à mesure que j’écris, gauchi, modifié par les obstacles ou au contraire les perspectives, également imprévus, qui se présentent à tout instant.

… Comme tout artiste, l’écrivain est tout autant guidé par son matériau que par ses intentions.”

What Simon so eloquently describes is a form of languaging where the writer utilizes an available web of linguistic relations as a means of a progression. In the absence of dialogue and other contextures, progression becomes a problem, just as we saw it did in glossolalia. And the solution is the same: base progression on the material, language.
The same experience would seem to underlie Novalis’s drastic and paradoxical statement in his short text Monolog from 1798 (Novalis 1963:5):

"Gerade das Eigentümliche der Sprache, daß sie sich bloß um sich selbst bekümmert, weiß keiner. Darum ist sie ein so wunderbares und fruchtbares Geheimnis, - daß wenn einer bloß spricht, um zu sprechen, er gerade die herrlichsten, originellsten Wahrheiten ausspricht. Will er aber von etwas Bestimmtem sprechen, so läßt ihn die launige Sprache das lächerlichste und verkehrteste Zeug sagen."

Of course, progression becomes a problem only when you want to write something ‘new’. The majority of written texts are just made from old texts in the same genre on the same topic.

And ‘new’ texts as a genre seem to have developed new means of progression, as well, beyond a basic reliance on ‘language’. For example, double-entendres, homonyms, which have always been a primary resource in jokes (Freud 1905):

- Have you taken a bath?
- Why, is one missing?

or even a way of hiding a secret message, as in so-called phonetic kabbala, where the initiated naturally reads *l’art scénique* as *l’arsenic* (Lekeby 1996: 71), have been recruited as means of progression in modernist and post-modernist art. They are all over the place in Duchamp’s works, and Raymond Roussel (1935) claims to have used this means of progression as the main compositional principle for several of his novels.

In other words, although interaction formats are sedimentations of dialogic practice, and primarily resources for and constraints on further dialogical practice, it is unproblematic to see them as resources for other varieties of linguistic practice, as well.
Ideologizing

The notion of languages as abstract combinatorial systems results from an ideologizing process of decontextualisation and recontextualisation well described by Smith (1974)\(^2\).

Following Marx & Engels’s critique of Hegel in ‘Die deutsche Ideologie’ (Marx & Engels 1932), Smith identifies three steps in an ideologizing process. In the first step, a practice is decontextualized, by being dissociated from its activity context. In the second step, the practice is recontextualized into a theoretical framework. And, finally, in the third step, the theoretical framework is ascribed ontological priority over and above the actual practice.

In our case, we may proceed like this. In the first step, we abstract away from sequentiality and activity, and concentrate just on the structure of turns. The two dimensions of a diagraph then reduce to the Jakobsonian axes of selection and combination. If we treat the network in (2) in the previous chapter in that way, the following is a possible result.

---

1 I am of course indebted to Lévi-Strauss 1983.
2 See also Harris 1980.
(1) *Oskyldig*, abstract version

1. Arne: 'hhh
de där e minsann
tillåme sionistisk propaganda.

5. Björn: de e inte

6. Arne: näaj

absolut inte.

7. Björn: de e inte

nähä.

8. Arne: undrar var i allsindar han fått tag i den.


10. Arne: hel:a faderullan.

11. Daniel: Israel air-strikes,

12. Clara: jaha


14. Arne: de va katten,

15. de e tydligen ifrån israeliska propagandaministeriet

16. å sen en lamp bak som lyser precis (p)

17. överallt [där]israelerna slogs.

18. Björn: de va ju som sjuutton


21. Clara: ja

23. Arne: ja just de ja e oskyldig

In the second step, the abstract representation resulting from the first step is fitted into a theoretical framework, where the structure of concrete turns can be taken as instances of a theoretically motivated structure, for example the positional structure commonly assumed in the Scandinavian grammatical tradition (Diderichsen 1946, Anward 2003b, Lindström 2008). In this kind of framework, (1) would look like this (*an* is annex, or pre-front field, *f* is foundation, or front field, *v* is finite verb, *s* is subject, *adv* is sentence adverbial, and *o* is object (in a fairly wide sense)).
(2) Oskyldig, theoretically motivated version

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Arne:</td>
<td>'hhh</td>
<td>de där</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>minsann</td>
<td>tillåme sionistisk propaganda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Björn:</td>
<td>de</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>inte</td>
<td>turistartat?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Arne:</td>
<td>näej</td>
<td>de</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>absolut inte.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Björn:</td>
<td>de</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>de</td>
<td>inte</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Arne:</td>
<td>undrar</td>
<td>var i</td>
<td>allsindar</td>
<td>han</td>
<td>fått tag i den.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Arne:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hel:a faderullan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Daniel:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Israel air-strikes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Clara:</td>
<td>jaha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Daniel:</td>
<td>de</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td>Luftslage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Arne:</td>
<td>de</td>
<td>va</td>
<td></td>
<td>katten,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>de</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>tydlig</td>
<td>ifrån israeliska propagandaministeriet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>å</td>
<td>sen</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>där</td>
<td>en lamp bak som lyser precis (p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>överallt [där] israelerna slogs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Björn:</td>
<td>de</td>
<td>va</td>
<td>ju</td>
<td>som sjuotton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Clara:</td>
<td>ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Arne:</td>
<td>ja just de</td>
<td>ja</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>oskyldig</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the third step, the theoretically motivated representation is given primacy over actual practice. Competence is conceptualized as knowledge of abstract patterns, and practice is seen as performance of one of the possibilities allowed by an abstract pattern.

A major trouble with these ideologizing steps is that they result in what Mulhall (1990), following Wittgenstein (1953), calls meaning-blindness. That is, having dissociated a turn from the interactional context in which it makes sense, ascribing a meaning to it becomes a theoretical problem. Once we stop treating a turn as a transparent vehicle of meaning, as a means of updating an ongoing interaction, and its parts as contributions to that end, we must somehow reconstruct the action it is used to perform and its sequential contexts from its formal structure.

I submit that this is both unnecessary and impossible\(^3\).

Conceptualizing linguistic competence as practical mastery of already achieved meaning-making, as a repertoire of embedded, recyclable, and open-ended interaction formats, which together make up one or more traditions of languaging, avoids the impasse of meaning-blindness. At the same time, as we have seen, practice suffices to provide turns inside interaction formats with structure, structure that would otherwise have to be postulated.
Metalanguage

The ideologizing process I have outlined rides on a natural metalinguistic ability, an ability to talk about language itself, which is part and parcel of human linguistic competence.

As Harris (1988) points out, natural languages are their own metalanguages. And this should not surprise us, since there are no real restrictions on what can be talked about in human activities.

In ordinary conversation, metalanguage is often involved in repair, where a problem of formulation or understanding is indicated, and resolved through the offer of an expression or a definition. We have already encountered one such repair sequence, in chapter 2, repeated below.

(3) **Dödshjälp**

1. Daniel: nu e de så att eutanasi e väl samma som dödshjälp.  
   now is that so that euthanasia is väl same as death-help
2. e de inte så va,  
   is that no so eh
3. Arne: joo
4. Daniel: dödshjälp e de inte de,  
   death-help is that not that
5. Arne: mm
6. Daniel: hjälp (p)  
   help
7. Clara: m

While such repairs can be said to form part of an ongoing negotiation of a common language, this negotiation is not an end in itself, but is subordinate to solving problems having to do with obstacles to full participation in the ongoing social activity. It is only in more monologic contexts, where as we saw in the last chapter, speakers and writers may orient to language itself as
a means of progression, that they may get the opportunity to reflect on the potentialities and boundaries of a language. And such reflection seems to have been almost always initially occasioned by a political agenda, where a ‘correct’ language is pitted against a ‘corrupt’ variety, or where education in a second language is deemed necessary. Contrast seems to be the mother of description.

**Examples**

And it is in such contexts that we find the very special genre developed by linguists, example sentences, with such classical cases as

*Socrates albus currit bene*

(Thomas of Erfurt; cf. Covington 1984)

*The farmer killed the duckling*

(Sapir 1921)

*Sincerity may frighten the boy*

(Chomsky 1965)

*Floyd broke the glass*

(Ross 1967)

Such sentences are said but not meant. And this is precisely why examples like

"(45) Damn Lyndon Johnson."

(46) *Shit on Lyndon Johnson.*

(47) *To hell with Lyndon Johnson*

(48) *Hooray for Christine Keeler.*“

(Dong 1969:48)
have the effect that they have. The intended message is rather a two-tiered message of the type explored in Haiman 1998 (see also Anward 1990), namely

*The farmer killed the duckling*

can be said where the displayed turn or sentence (*The farmer killed the duckling* in this case) retains a skeletal interpretation, grounded in some tradition of languaging. And they typically rely only on ingrained combinatorial patterns.

However, there are also more complex cases. The most famous of all example sentences

*Colorless green ideas sleep furiously*

(Chomsky 1957)

relies both on an ingrained combinatorial pattern and a systematic and repeated use of contradictio in adjecto.

And examples of ungrammatical sentences seem to require the operation of proportional analogy. Thus, given *We bought bread, Bread was what we bought*, and *We bought wine and bread*, it is possible to form *Bread was what we bought wine and* (Ross 1967).
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Structure

We have seen how constructions, paradigms, and associative relations emerge in conversation, through repeated use of recycling with différance. In this chapter, I will demonstrate how a language, in the guise of an interaction format, that is a basic articulation of turns, coupled with a corresponding articulation of their embedding situation, can emerge from scratch through this method of turn construction.

First ten turns of a phone call

Let us return to the phone call we listened to in chapter 1. Recall that Eva calls a neighbour in a practical matter, and that Bodil, a young girl who is visiting the neighbours’ house to play with their daughter Veronika, answers the phone. Here are the first ten turns of the call.

(1) Pippiperuk 1

1. ((four signals))
2. Bodil: >sex sju två fyra<
   six seven two four
3. Eva: >hej de e E:va.<
   hi it is Eva
   hi this is Eva
4. har du mamma hemma<
   have thou mammy home
   is your mother at home
5. Bodil: näe:.
   noo:
6. Eva: e >pappa hemma dår<
   is daddy home then
In what follows, I will track the progress of this piece of a phone call, turn by turn, and demonstrate how a basic articulation of these turns, and a corresponding articulation of their embedding situation emerge.

In this demonstration, I will assume no further initial articulation of turns than an articulation into intonation units.

In this case, the telephone conversation has, in all probability, more initial structure than just intonation units, which means that I will often treat reproduced old structures as new structures. But that does not invalidate my demonstration. Conversationalists, in going about conversation, produce linguistic structure, reproduced or not.
Going triadic

Recall also that Eva and Bodil through their first four turns achieve a system of syntagmatically related intonation units and turns, where each intonation unit is demarcated by a contour, and each turn is demarcated by a change in voice.

1. ((four signals))
2. Bodil: >sexsjutvåfyra<
4. hardumamahemma<
5. Bodil: näe:

In the extended transcription introduced in chapter 1, the two first turns are articulated in the following way.

Remember that the outer rectangle depicts an entire conversational scene, including its participants (1, 2, ...), a space m (inside the inner rectangle), where symbolic relations are managed, and a sequence of turns (<2,1>, ...), through which relations and participants are introduced and manipulated.

What we have here then are two participants (1 and 2), who are physically present through a summons, and a voice, respectively, and one turn by 1, Eva, directed at 2, Bodil, followed by another turn, by 2, directed

---

1 I am borrowing this term from Hurford (2007, ch. 7).
at 1. And in the second turn, 2 also becomes symbolically present, in the intermediate space m, by being identified, by herself, as *sexsjutvåfyra*.

This scene is then modified by the following turns.

The first intonation unit of the third turn is composed of a greeting, which makes a second greeting relevant, and an identification, through which Eva makes herself symbolically present.

To simplify my argument, I will assume an articulation of this intonation unit into these two components. This leaves us with the following scene.

![Table](image)

In the second intonation unit of the third turn, then, Eva cancels the relevance of a second greeting by Bodil, and introduces another potential addressee. This introduction of a third participant on the scene is, in this particular phone call, of course done partially by the *mamma* part of the second intonation unit. However, suppose that part of the second intonation unit had been garbled, would not Bodil anyhow have recognized the introduction of a third party on the scene? I think she would. The interactional architecture of Eva’s turn is one where she cancels a direct response by Bodil but still maintains the relevance of a response to her turn. This suggests rather strongly that Eva wants to be responded to by someone else than Bodil. And given the context of an adult talking to a child, it is no wild guess that this person should be another adult. Thus, the presence of a third participant can be heard as being strongly signalled by
Eva, through the way she designs the interaction. A participant may then be interactionally present without being in any other way physically present.

So I will assume, in this analysis, that the so far unarticulated second intonation unit of Eva’s turn suffices to introduce a third (projected) participant on the current scene.

After Bodil has refused to comply with Eva’s request, in the fourth turn, we have the following scene, then.

Recycling with différance (ritorno)

As we have seen, a further articulation of turns, and a corresponding articulation of their embedding situation emerge from the similarities and differences participants create between successive turns in a conversation, through recycling with différance.

When Eva gets a negative answer to her request in her second turn (line 04), she makes another attempt, in her third turn (line 06; see below). In doing this, she is recycling with variation the format of line 04, thereby indicating that she is renewing the projection of her previous action\(^2\). She is still looking for an adult to talk to.

---

\(^2\) See Scheglof 1996 and 2007 for a detailed description of this aspect of sequential organization.
(2) *Pippiperuk 1*, first nine turns

1. ((four signals))
2. Bodil: >sexsjutväfyra<
   sixseventwofour
   hiitise:va
4. hardumammahemma<
   havethoumgammyhome
5. Bodil: näe:.
   noo
6. Eva: e>pappahemmad?<
7. Bodil: näe:.
   noo
8. Eva: hä.
   ok.
9. erusjälvhemma?
   arethoualonehome
10. Bodil: nej:menja_hemmahosveronika,=
    nobutigmhomeatVeronika
    ok

Eva’s turn in lines 08 - 09, and Bodil’s turn in line 10, are likewise modelled on the second intonation unit in line 04, in pursuit of a project, finding an addressee, which is only terminated by Bodil’s turn in line 10, where she, after two minimal responses, repeats the full recycled format.

**Articulation of turns**

Through this repeated use of recycling with différance, the turns involved in the process are articulated into parts.

In doing her second turn, Eva actually recycles not only the second intonation unit of her first turn, she also uses material from the first intonation unit of that turn. To do that, she treats *hardumammahemma<* (havethoumgammyhome) as being articulable into *hardu, mamma* and
hemma¿< (havethou, mammy, and home), and the second part of the first intonation unit, *dee:va.* (itiseva), as being articulable into *de, e,* and *e:va.* (it, is, and Eva), whereupon she models her turn on *hardu mamma hemma¿<*, substituting *e* for *hardu,* and *pappa* (daddy), for *mamma,* and adding *då?<* (then) at the end.

And, as demonstrated by Bodil’s use of the articulated format in line 10, Bodil hears not only the similarities and differences between the intonation units in lines 04 and 06 but also their articulation into parts. The principle that allows her to do that is the fundamental ‘discovery procedure’ of structural linguistics (see e.g. Gleason 1961, chs. 5-7; and also Peters 1983: 37, and Anward & Lindblom 1999: 28):

(3) *Segmentation*

A turn which contains a recurrent part is articulated into that part, a preceding environment, and a following environment.

Thus, the first six turns of Pippiperuk 1 are articulated into parts as shown below (in diagraph form).

(4) *Pippiperuk 1,* first six turns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>((four signals))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Bodil: &gt;sexsjutväfryra¿&lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Eva: &gt;hej de e e:va.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Bodil: hardu mamma hemma¿&lt; näe:.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Eva: e&gt; pappa hemma då?&lt; näe:.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Bodil:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Bodil:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

87
I have previously identified two modes of recycling with différance: paradigmatic expansion, and syntagmatic expansion.

In paradigmatic expansions, a unit is treated as articulable into parts, and is recycled in a version where something substitutes for one part of the old unit, typically against the background of an aspect of the current scene becoming unconcealed (in the sense of Heidegger 1927; see also Pöggeler 1989), that is, separated from its background, in the ongoing interaction. Paradigmatic expansion may involve an ‘analytic’ step, where a slot is formed in a previously unarticulated unit to accommodate a new paradigm, but it may also be limited to the addition of a member to an existing paradigm.

In syntagmatic expansions, an old unit, or a part of an old unit, is recycled with something added to it, again typically against the background of an aspect of the current scene becoming unconcealed in the ongoing interaction. Just like paradigmatic expansion, syntagmatic expansion may involve an analytic step, where a previously unarticulated unit is treated as a part of a larger unit.

Both modes are involved in the production of line 06. In doing line 06, Eva tries out another configuration of the ongoing scene, and to do this, she articulates, through paradigmatic expansion, her turns in resonance with the now unconcealed variability of that scene. In the first step of this expansion, a slot is created, when hardumammahemma< is articulated into hardu, mamma and hemma<, and in the second step, when pappa substitutes for mamma, a paradigm is formed, comprising the old filler mamma and the new filler pappa. This paradigmatic expansion is combined with a syntagmatic expansion, the addition of a final då. In Swedish conversation, final då signals that a unit is part of a list, or even an alternative to a previous unit. In this case, final då marks explicitly that line 06 is a second attempt.

---

3 'Expansion’ refers to the effect on the resulting system. See chapter 2, and also Anward 2000.
4 See also Gruber 1975a,b, Anward & Lindblom 1999: 30-33, and Hurford 2012, ch. 8.2, for further discussion.
5 Hurford 2012, ch. 8.5.
Then, after a second dispreferred response (in line 07), Eva changes strategy in her third turn (line 08), and starts talking directly to Bodil. But we are still at the same point in the phone call, Eva is still searching for someone to transact her business with. So in doing her third turn, Eva once more recycles her second turn, but she also uses material from her first turn. Thus, she splits hardu into har du (have thou), substitutes du (or, to be more precise, the sandhi variation ru) for pappa, and adds själv (alone). The result is shown below.

(5) *Pippiperuk 1*, first seven turns

1.           ((four signals))
2. Bodil:      >sexsjutvåfyra<
3. Eva:    >hej de e e:va.
4. har du mamma hemma<
5. Bodil:          näe:.
6. Eva:         e> pappa hemma då?<
7. Bodil:          näe:.
8. Eva:         hä.
9. e ru själv hemma?

Again, we have a combination of paradigmatic expansion and syntagmatic expansion. The substitution of ru for pappa uses an already available slot, and simply adds another paradigm member. But through this second paradigmatic expansion, Eva unconceals yet another possible configuration of the ongoing scene: there might be no adult at home with Bodil. And the addition of själv is done against the background of that possibility becoming unconcealed.

At this point in the phone call, Bodil, for the first time, makes a substantial contribution. She stays on the activity of finding someone for Eva to talk to, and proposes herself. And for the fourth time, the format of the second intonation unit of Eva’s first turn is recycled, this time by Bodil.

In doing this, Bodil, as we have already noted, overtly shows that she has heard Eva’s articulations of the preceding turns, and can use the system in (5) as a resource for bringing the conversation forward.
And what Bodil does is substitute *ja e* for *e ru*, and add *hosveronika*, with the following result.

(6) *Pippiperuk 1*, first nine turns

1. ((four signals))
2. Bodil: >sexsjutvåfyra<
3. Eva: >hej de e eva.
4. har du mamma hemma<
5. Bodil: näe:
6. Eva: e> pappa hemma då<
7. Bodil: näe:
8. Eva: hä.
9. e ru själv hemma?
10. Bodil: nej:
11. men ja e hemma hosveronika,=

And through her use of the full turn format, Bodil steps in as an equal partner to the conversation.

Reference

As turns are articulated into parts, parts can be identified with physically or interactionally present participants, and these participants then become symbolically present, as well, on the current scene.

Reference, identification of turn parts with participants which are already there on a pre-articulated scene, is thus an affordance of articulated turns. As Hurford shows in his careful discussion of the roots of reference in human language (Hurford 2007, ch. 7), reference, in order to be established, requires a triadic interaction, an interactional scene where a third component already has become unconcealed.

How would conversationalists go about making and understanding such identifications of turn parts with participants?

Remember that recycling with différance is not an end in itself, but a
method for organizing a current communicative project, a method whereby articulation and transformation of turns build on and effect articulation and transformation of a current scene of interaction.

In this case, Eva’s project is to find a relevant addressee for her business. What is under negotiation, then, is potential participants in the ongoing phone call, and it is quite natural, then, to assume that she tunes her recyclings to her ongoing communicative project, and that Bodil is able to hear Eva’s recyclings as so tuned, which means that the variable part of the turns in lines 02, 04, 09, and 11, their rhemes, that is eva, mamma, pappa, ru and ja⁶, are intended to identify successive potential participants, and are also heard in this way.⁷

This results in the following identifications of participants and turn parts in the first nine turns of Pippiperuk 1. I display identifications as (i: λ), where i is a participant, and λ is a turn part, for example (2: du).

---

⁶ I treat själv hemma in line 09, and hemma hosveronica in line 11 as variations on hemma.
⁷ This account owes much to a contextualized version of Greenfield’s Principle of Informativeness (Greenfield & Zukow 1978). For pertinent discussion, see Wootton 1997: 39-41.
(7) Pippiperuk 1, first nine turns, 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1,2&gt;</td>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2,1&gt;</td>
<td>((four signals))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2,1&gt;</td>
<td>(2: du)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2,1&gt;</td>
<td>(3: mamma)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1,2&gt;</td>
<td>hemma¿</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1,2&gt;</td>
<td>näe:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2,1&gt;</td>
<td>e&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2,1&gt;</td>
<td>(4: pappa)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2,1&gt;</td>
<td>hemma då?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2,1&gt;</td>
<td>näe:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1,2&gt;</td>
<td>hä.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1,2&gt;</td>
<td>e (2: ru)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1,2&gt;</td>
<td>själv hemma?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2,1&gt;</td>
<td>nej:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1,2&gt;</td>
<td>men (2: ja)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1,2&gt;</td>
<td>e hemma hosveronika,=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1,2&gt;</td>
<td>=jaha.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(An extended transcription, such as /<1, 2, 3>: har (2: du) (3: mamma) hemma¿/ may be explicated along the following lines, in a vocabulary inspired by Natural Semantic Metalanguage (Goddard 2001):

'1 says to 2 about 3: har du mamma hemma¿;
1 says to 2: har hemma¿ may hold between 2, identified through du, and 3, identified through mamma;
1 wants 2 to say:
har hemma¿ holds between 2 and 3
or har hemma¿ does not hold between 2 and 3.')
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The structure of interaction, participants and relations established between them, is thus reproduced in the structure of turns, where symbolically present relations are established between symbolically present participants.

In other words, the basic predicate – argument structure of turns and sentences, where the predicate item serves as head, and the argument items, as dependents, is firmly grounded in the very structure of interaction. It is not, contra Carstairs-McCarthy (1999), an arbitrary and secondary feature of linguistic units.  

**Another interaction format**

In eight (and a half) turns, Bodil and Eva have achieved another recyclable interaction format, tuned to a local communicative project.

And this interaction format is made up from four components. The first component is what we might call phatic actions, actions designed to establish, maintain, or close down a communicative channel (Jakobson 1960). Phatic actions in (7) are the summons in line 01 and the greeting *hej* in line 03. The second component is identifications: \( >\text{sexsjutvåfyra} < \) in line 02 and *de e:e:va* in line 03. The third component is a repeated inquiry after an addressee, which follows a pattern of request – answer – optional feedback. The fourth component, finally, is response items.

If we compare this interaction format to the ones we have already seen, we may note that the main business of the format, the inquiry after an addressee, starts with a verb-initial turn. In contrast to the declarative turn formats of *Oskyldig* and *Aktiv å passiv*, the use of which commit the speaker to what is the case, and signals that the speaker wants to tell this, they do not.

---

8 Note that Carstairs-McCarthy’s suggestion that syntactic structure is an appropriation of syllable structure fails to account for predication. A syllable has a head-dependent structure, but it makes no sense to say that a syllabic head, normally a vowel, is predicated of its onset and rhyme.
the *har du* format in line 04 is an ignorative\(^9\) format. An ignorative format leaves open what is the case, and signals that the speaker wants to be told what is the case.\(^{10}\)

This contrast resonates with a contrast between the contexts in which the interaction formats are established. Following Heritage (2013) and Mondada (2013), let us recognize that turns are designed not only with respect to an ongoing communicative project, but also with respect to a presupposed epistemic status of the participants involved. In Heritage’s conception, epistemic status is a relation between the different participants’ knowledge about the topic at hand. Both *Aktiv å passiv* and *Oskyldig* presuppose a common (lack of) knowledge, which is then transformed along with other relations between the participants and the topic, towards a resolution of the ongoing communicative project, which in both cases is quite simple: Arne wants to tell the other participants how it is, and have them accept that. In *Pippiperuk 1*, in contrast, the verb-initial turn in line 04 projects an imbalance between the participants: Bodil knows more about who are present at her location than Eva does.

In addition to being tuned to a communicative project, and to a presupposed epistemic status, an achieved interactional format also sets into play a particular balance of power\(^{11}\). In Anward (1997), I separated three dimensions in such a balance of power:

Activity: who controls opening, closing, turn-taking, and topic(s) in an activity;
Topic: who controls what can be said about each topic;
Text: who controls what is ‘saved’ of what is said about a certain topic.\(^{12}\)

*Aktiv å passiv* and *Oskyldig* are extracts from a basically egalitarian

---

9 Ignorative was proposed as a cover term for, among other things, interrogative and irrealis by Karcevski 1927.
10 This is in line with a traditional analysis of questions. An analysis in terms of ‘want to be told’, as opposed to ‘want to know’, also has the advantage that it easily covers exam questions. See also Anward 1997.
11 See also Stevanovic & Peräkylä 2014.
12 See also the examples of text talk in chapters 2 and 5.
conversation, where turn-taking follows the model described in Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson (1974), where everyone is free to introduce new topics, and where what can be said about each topic, and what is saved of what is said must be agreed on by all participants.

*Pippiperuk 1* is an ordinary telephone call (of the landline type), with a routinized opening (Schegloff 1968), and negotiated closing (Schegloff & Sacks 1973). And as we have seen, Eva sets out to control both topic and turn-taking, treating Bodil as a mere go-between, but has to back down and allow Bodil to enter into the conversation as a ratified participant. Still, Eva keeps control of the topic, and an ignorable format is well-suited for doing that, since it limits the options of the other participants.

Thus, we expect differences in turn format, among other things, between different interaction formats to resonate with differences in communicative project, epistemic status, and balance of power.

**Socio-historical conditions**

But interaction formats also respond to and reproduce historical and social conditions.

The interaction format in (7) responds to and reproduces the historical and social conditions of land-line phone calls, at the time when Lindström recorded her material (early 1990:s). The pattern we see in (7), where a summons makes a first identification relevant, where this first identification makes a first greeting and a second identification relevant, and where the first greeting makes a second greeting relevant, is a socio-historical product.

Consider just the pattern of identifications.

In ordinary face-to-face conversation, it is normally not a problem to identify who is speaking. The source of the voice speaking a particular turn is, for all practical purposes, the speaker of that turn (Anward
2002). New media of communication, though, ‘unconceal’\textsuperscript{13} aspects of the communicative situation taken for granted in ordinary conversation. In land-line phone calls, there is an obvious need for callers to identify themselves, and thus make explicit something which need not be said in ordinary conversation. Interestingly, receivers do not seem to have felt that need originally. As detailed by Mårdsjö (1992), it was only after a ‘civilizing’ process spanning several decades, that receivers learnt to identify themselves by name or by number.\textsuperscript{14} In contemporary mobile communication (Laursen 2006, Arminen & Weilenmann 2009), in contrast, things are different. Since mobile phones are personal, and callers are displayed on the phone, there is often no need for explicit spoken identification of either caller or receiver. The opening of a communicative channel in mobile communication can be reduced to a sequence where a summons typically just makes a first greeting by the receiver relevant, and this first greeting makes a second greeting relevant. In revenge, there is another aspect of the communicative situation which is obvious in land-line phone calls but which becomes unconcealed in mobile communication. This is the location of the receiver, which frequently is made explicit, and sometimes topical (cf., e.g., Weilenmann 2003), in mobile communication, precisely because mobile phones are mobile.

In sum, the pattern of identifications in (7), both their occurrences and their forms, is the outcome of a historical development, and responds to and reproduces specific social conditions, including technology, and ideology.

The system in (7) is thus doubly entrenched, both in a surrounding and ongoing social activity, and in a wider socio-historical context.

\textsuperscript{13} Again in the sense of Heidegger 1927.

\textsuperscript{14} This process appears to be culture-specific, producing a contrast between Sweden and other countries. See Lindström (1994), for further details.
A constructional structure

In the third component of the achieved interaction format, in the turns and intonation units which resonate through *har/e hemma*, we also see the makings of a (fully lexicalized) construction:

(8) A construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1,2&gt;</td>
<td>har (2: du) (3: mamma) hemma¿&lt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1,2&gt;</td>
<td>e&gt; (4: pappa) hemma då?&lt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1,2&gt;</td>
<td>e (2: ru) själv hemma?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2,1&gt; (1: ja)</td>
<td>e hemma hosveronika,=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This constructional structure has a straightforward interpretation in terms of grammatical relations. We simply ascribe the rôle of head (h) to the recurring unit *har/e hemma*, the rôle of argument (a) to any referring expression, and the rôle of modifier (m) to all other turn parts. We can then map a relational structure, of a kind which was originally proposed by Jespersen (1937; see also McCawley 1970) onto the construction in (8). The result is shown in (9).

(9) A construction, 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1,2&gt;</td>
<td>har (2: du) (3: mamma) hemma¿&lt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1,2&gt;</td>
<td>e&gt; (4: pappa) hemma då?&lt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1,2&gt;</td>
<td>e (2: ru) själv hemma?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2,1&gt; (1: ja)</td>
<td>e hemma hosveronika,=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| a | h¹⁵ | a | a | m | h | m |

And if we make a further distinction between first argument, subject (s), and second argument, object (o), the following construction results.

---

15 *har/e hemma* is to be interpreted as one discontinuous head.
(10) A construction, 3

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1,2&gt;</td>
<td>har</td>
<td>(2: du)</td>
<td>(3: mamma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1,2&gt;</td>
<td>e&gt;</td>
<td>(4: pappa)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1,2&gt;</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>(2: ru)</td>
<td>själv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|<2,1> | (1: ja) | e |           | hemmå hosveronica,=

Remember, though, that the constructions and the paradigms that emerge in (9) and (10) do not emerge in any compact and final form but are, as I have already argued in chapter 2, interim structurings of syntagmatically related turns and intonation units within the recyclable interaction format achieved by Eva and Bodil. They are but one aspect of the embedded system in (7).

**Language formation**

The very methods which conversationalists use to update a working system of linguistic resources can thus be used to construct, from scratch, an interaction format which is structured towards a language.

Let me recapitulate the scenario of language formation that we have arrived at.

We start with social activities where participants produce holophrastic (semantically unarticulated) units in dialogue, which identify the current scene of the ongoing social activity.

While such units are not semantically articulated, they are phonetically articulated, into syllables and intonation units.

Some of these units stay holistic during the course of interaction, at least in the sense that they are not articulated into parts which identify participants and relations. Examples in Pippiperuk 1 are the phatic item
hej, and the response items näe:, hà, nej, and jaha.

But some units are articulated in the course of interaction, through recycling with différence, as we have seen. And through recycling with différence, and its interplay of analysis and construction (or ‘synthesis’\(^\text{16}\)), an embedded system, what I have called an interaction format, featuring structure, grammatical relations, and reference, emerges.

Language development, which I take to be a life-long process (Anward 1996), is then the dynamic accumulation of interaction formats. And, reflecting the interactional work that builds its constituent formats, it has both an ‘analytic’ and a ‘synthetic’ side. Speakers continuously negotiate the analyzability\(^\text{17}\) of linguistic resources at hand (Peters 1983, 1997, Lindblom 1986, Wray 2000), as well as expand both paradigms and syntagms (Anward 2000, Tomasello 2003).

Language change is the effect of differential language development of successive generations. This involves, among other things, a re-negotiation of syntagms and paradigms: which slots are obligatory, and which are optional; which fillers are unmarked, and which are marked. For example, in the grammaticalization of pas as a marker of negation in French, where plain n’aime is replaced by n’aime pas, a postverbal slot becomes obligatory, and pas, its unmarked filler - with later effects on the hypo-hyper scales of the units involved. This re-negotiation presupposes an analytic step, where the articulation of turns is partially redrawn\(^\text{18}\), but its outcomes mostly show up on the synthetic side of language development, in the shape of syntagms and paradigms.

To the extent that we can make any informed guesses about language origins (see Hurford 2007 and 2012 for a useful summary), we have no reason to assume that original negotiations of meaning differ from observable, contemporary negotiations of meaning. From the few studies we have of contemporary coinings, for example, we learn that coinings

\(^{16}\) Hurford 2012, ch. 8.5.
\(^{17}\) What Saussure calls their motivation (Saussure 1967:180-181).
may well be introduced through paradigmatic expansion (Rundgren 2008), and need not follow the adamitic script (Genesis 2:19-20), where what is coined are holophrastic units. And there is, of course, no reason why original coinings could not have been established in both ways, as well\textsuperscript{19}.

There is some scepticism in the literature, though, about the rôle of segmentation in original coinings. In their genesis story, Heine & Kuteva (2007) motivate their exclusive preoccupation with the synthetic side of language change by a claim\textsuperscript{20} that analytic changes, such as segmentation, are “rare”. However, they present no empirical support for their claim, and it does not square with standard treatments of language change, such as Ullmann (1962), where folk etymology, and other analytic changes, are described as one of the four major types of language change. Hudson (2012, ch. 8.5) conjectures that recurrent form-meaning combinations would have been too infrequent for original coiners to notice. However, if ordinary interaction was in place from the beginning of language, which we have no reason to doubt (Enfield & Levinson 2006), then achieved similarities would certainly have been frequent enough, as we have seen, to provide quite sufficient input for segmentation.

I submit, then, that our scenario of language formation is also valid for the origin of language.

\textsuperscript{19} Swadesh 1971: 132.

\textsuperscript{20} Which has since been repeated in other places; see Carstairs-McCarthy 2010, and Hudson 2012, ch. 8.5.
Once an interaction format has been achieved, it can be included in an ongoing tradition, and join forces with other interaction formats, and together with them serve as a resource for and a significant constraint on further practice. In the process, the interaction format is not only recycled, but also stabilized and elaborated.

It is to this we now turn.
A communicative project

When we listen to the remainder of *Pippiperuk 1*:

(1) *Pippiperuk 1*, second phase

   ok

12.        .hh hörre hörre du:
   .hh listen listen thou

13.        har du nån pippi långstrumpsperuk¿
   have thou any pippi långstrump wig
   do you have any Pippi Longstocking wig

14.        de ä Henrik's mamma, .hh
   it is Henrik's mammy .hh
   this is Henrik's mother .hh

15. (0.8)

16. Bodil:   näe: de har ja'nte [men-
   noo: it have I'nt but
   noo: I don't but

17. Eva:                        [de har'u'nte¿
   it have you'nt
   you don't

18.        vet du nån som har de (d)å?
   know you anyone who has it then
   do you know anyone who has then

   yes Sofia. Berglund.

20. Eva:     sofia har en sån¿
   Sofia has one such
   Sofia has one

   yes Sofia Berglund has it
   yes Sofia Berglund has one

22. Eva:                    [de har hon?
   it has she
   she has

23. Bodil:   .hja¡
   yes
24. Eva: men då kan ja ringa å prata me henn[e.
but then can I ring and talk with her
but then I can call and talk to her

25. Bodil:                      [hm
ok

26. hej[ê
hi
bye

27. Eva:           [de e bra. hejdâ?
it is good bye-bye

the nature of Eva’s communicative project becomes clear. What Eva wants
to do is to borrow a Pippi Longstocking wig:

(to be used in an upcoming local carnival). In order to do that, she has to talk to someone who has such a wig, and get that person to lend it to her.
A recycled interaction format: the second phase of Pippiperuk 1

In the ninth turn of the call (lines 11 through 14), Eva effectively restarts this project:

     ok
12.        .hh hörru hörre du:
     .hh listen listen thou
13.        har du nån pippi långstrumpspérüks
     have thou any pippi långstrump wig
     do you have any Pippi Longstocking wig
14.        de ä Henrik's mamma, .hh
     it is Henrik's mammy .hh
     this is Henrik's mother .hh

And when she does this, she recycles the interaction format arrived at in the first eight turns of the phone call, using all of its four components as crucial resources: a phatic item, in line 12; an identification, in line 14; a har du unit, in line 13; and a response item, jaha in line 11.

These four components also provide the structure for the remainder of the second phase of the phone call. This is shown below. The only exception is line 24, which announces yet another re-start of Eva’s project.
1. ((fyra signaler))
2. Bodil: >(sex sju två fyra)¿<
3. Eva: >hej de e Eva.
4. Eva: har du mamma hemma¿<
5. Bodil: näe:.
6. Eva: e >pappa hemma då¿<
7. Bodil: näe:. e ru själv hemma?
8. Eva: hä.
9. Eva: men ja hemma hos Veronika,=
10. Bodil: nej: de är ja'nte [men-
12. Eva: .hh hörру hörre du:
13. Eva: har du nån pipplångstrump speruk¿
14. de är Henrikis mamma, .hh
15. (0.8)
16. Bodil: näe: de har ja’nte [men-
17. Eva: [de har’u’nte¿
18. vet du nån som ha’ r de (d)å?
20. Eva: Sofia har en sån¿
22. Eva: [de har hon?
23. Bodil: .hjai men dår kan ja ringa
24. Eva: [pråta me henn[e.
25. Bodil: [hm
26. he[j¿
27. Eva: [de e bra.
hejdå
Recontextualization

The recycling of the interaction format of the first phase of *Pippiperuk 1* in its second phase indexes a fundamental continuity between the two phases.

Eva’s communicative project is still under way, and she has progressed to the next item on her agenda. Whereas the first phase was oriented to the following condition:

Eva talks to Bodil

and the following goal:

Eva wants to talk to an adult

Eva can now turn her attention to her main business, borrowing a Pippi Longstocking wig. She is still talking to Bodil, but she now has another goal:

Eva wants to borrow a Pippi Longstocking wig from someone

If Bodil has a Pippi Longstocking wig,

then Eva wants to borrow a Pippi Longstocking wig from Bodil

Moreover, the scene that was articulated in the first phase still provides the background for what is to come. Using a simple film metaphor to describe the dynamics of a scene, the scene of the first phase unfolds in the following way. In line 04, Eva lets the addressee appear in a location, later identified as *hemma* (home), where the addressee is then joined by another participant, mother. Then, in line 06, the scene changes. The addressee disappears from sight, and mother is replaced by father. In line 09, the addressee becomes visible again, and father disappears. And finally, in line 10, the addressee changes role. She is now speaker, and still visible. But in
What has changed is Eva’s relation to Bodil. The epistemic status is still the same: Bodil knows something that Eva does not know. But the power of balance has shifted, and Eva and Bodil are now ready to collaborate on a joint project.

So, in recycling the interaction format of the first phase in the second phase, Eva has to take account of both similarities and differences between the contexts of the two phases. In other words, Eva has to recontextualize the interaction format, that is, adapt it to a transformation of its original context (Linell 1998:140-158).

To begin with, Eva needs to re-affirm the contact with Bodil, and acknowledge Bodil as addressee for what follows. Eva does this by recycling her greeting and her identification from the first phase, but with differences tuned to the new context. The phatic item in line 12 is not a repeated greeting (which would have been rather strange), but a reduplicated attention-getter (hörru hörre du:’), used to re-establish the channel, and in the identification in line 14, she re-identifies herself by means of a self-description (Henrik’s mommy) which is obviously specifically designed for Bodil, but which also recycles material from her first turn, as a mark of continuity.

And then, Eva needs to introduce another object of desire, a Pippi Longstocking wig. This is what she does in line 13, recycling the har du format of line 04. As we will see, it serves Eva well when she now turns her attention to her main business, borrowing a Pippi Longstocking wig.

First, the interactive work done by means of this format, introducing a new participant in relation to an already established participant, is well-suited for the task at hand.

Secondly, Eva can use the second argument position of the format to introduce a hypothetical participant. That is, an established argument

---

1 The attention-getter hörru is composed of hör (hear) and ru (you), i.e. ‘hear, you’; hörre is a reduced form of hörru, which in this case is enforced by a more articulated du (you).
position can be used to introduce a non-referential argument, provided that
the argument is appropriately marked. In this case, it is the quantifier nån
(any) which blocks the identification of the argument with a referent on
the current scene. And in an extended transcription of line 13, it is this
non-identification of nån pippilångstrumpsperuk with any referent on the
current scene which shows that it is non-referential.

And finally, as I have already pointed out, the har du format is an
ignorative format, which signals that the speaker wants to be told what is
the case. And this format resonates well with the epistemic status at hand,
where Bodil, but not Eva, knows whether Bodil has a Pippi Longstocking
wig.

However, Eva can not rely entirely on the interaction format of the first
phase to achieve what she wants. She must also categorize her object of
desire. That is, she must activate a model for nån pippilångstrumpsperuk.

Thus, in order to construct the turn in line 13, Eva must combine the
interaction format of the first phase with another interaction format, one
which provides a model for nån pippilångstrumpsperuk, and produce a
blend of partially recycled turns from these two interaction formats.

In the framework developed here, lexical retrieval becomes then just
a special case of recycling with différance. As already Wegener (1885)
pointed out, lexical retrieval, just like recycling with différance, involves a
combination of decontextualisation and recontextualisation, where certain
features of a past turn are freed from their original context and used as
models for a new turn in another context. When a word is used in a new
context, the new context must resonate with past contexts of the word\(^2\), and the meaning of the word in the new context will be negotiated on the basis of this resonance. This also holds for new words (Aronoff 1980), whether derived by analogy (Itkonen & Haukioja 1997) or by blending (Fauconnier & Turner 2002).

**Looking back**

In chapter 5, I treated, no doubt counter-factually, the first phase of *Pippiperuk 1* as a conversation without precedent, in order to demonstrate the structure-building impact of conversation.

If we now return to this phase, armed with the preceding discussion, it would be more realistic to view it, too, as a blend, of general turn formats, and a collection of interaction formats, activated by Eva, and centered around a specific Membership Categorization Device (Sacks 1972, Silverman 1998, ch. 5), that of (nuclear) family.

And this allows to hear Bodil stepping in, in line 10, as an equal partner to the conversation, not only through her use of a full turn format, but also, through her non-use of the interaction formats activated by Eva. By locating herself exclusively in relation to a friend (Veronika), Bodil manages to resist the categorization of herself in family terms that is immanent in Eva’s use of *mamma* and *pappa*.

\(^2\) See also Norén & Linell (2007) on lexical potentials.
Moving on

We have already (in chapter 5) encountered the mode of progression used by Bodil in her response (in line 16) to Eva’s question.

13. Eva:  *har du nån pipilångstrumpsperuk?*
           *do you have any pippi longstocking wig*

         ...

16. Bodil:  *näe: de har ja’nte [men-
               no:: I don’t but*

As we saw, this is a variety of Daneš’s first mode of textual progression, a variety which does not introduce a new rheme. Bodil repeats the rheme of line 13, but in reduced form (the anaphoric pronoun *de*) and in initial position, and substitutes a negative stance (a combination of *näe* and *’nte*, an enclitic variey of *inte*) for the ignorative stance of line 13. Schematically:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
F1 & S1 & R1 \\
R1 & S2 & F1 \\
\end{array}
\]

This format\(^3\) often combines continuation and conclusion and seems to be a favorite format for this double task in Swedish conversation. In this case, Bodil’s turn is most plausibly interpreted as an attempt to conclude the ongoing contribution, and move on. Witness the final *men* (but). Eva, however, does not seem to notice Bodil’s *men*. Instead, she produces a turn in overlap, using the same format (in fact, she mirrors Bodil’s preceding turn), and thus takes over the conclusion of the ongoing contribution. And then she moves on to a new question.

---

3 First described, I believe, by Andersson 1974.
17. Eva: [de harˈu̯nteː]
you don’t

18. vet du nån som har de (d)å?
do you know anyone who has then

Abstraction

What does de (written form det; it) in line 16 mean? Note that nån pippilångstrumpsperuk is not a possible antecedent for this pronoun, since nån pippilångstrumpsperuk is a non-referential argument. Moreover, de is a neutre pronoun, while pippilångstrumpsperuk is a non-neutre noun4.

Instead, as Dahl & Hellman (1995) show, a backwards-looking de, as in line 16, has an other kind of antecedent, a preceding (discontinuous) verb phrase, in this case har nån pippilångstrumpsperuk (have any Pippi Longstocking wig) from line 13. A hyper version of the turn line 16 would thus run something like näe har nån pippilångstrumpsperuk har ja inte (no have any Pippi Longstocking wig I don’t have).

Dahl & Hellman treat de as an abstraction operator, an analysis which fits very well into the present framework. By producing, in the turn in line 16, a response to the turn in line 13 which connects back to the earlier turn with the pronoun de, Bodil introduces an additional structuring5 of that turn, as being composed of du and har nån pippilångstrumpsperuk, and this structuring can then serve as a resource for further turn construction.

If we use a small letter i to index verb phrases, we then arrive at the following extended transcription of lines 13, 16, and 17.

4 Swedish nouns (and noun phrases) are either neutre or non-neutre (utre). Neutre noun phrases can serve as antecedents for the pronouns de (singular; it) and dom (plural; they / them). Utre noun phrases can serve as antecedents for the pronouns hon / henne (singular; she / her), han / honom (singular; he / him), den (singular; it), and dom (plural; they / them).

5 For the notion of co-existing structurings of linguistic units, see Haas 1978.
Finding someone else

Having determined that Bodil does not have any Pippi Longstocking wig, Eva and Bodil are faced with the following conditions:

Eva talks to Bodil

Bodil has a Pippi Longstocking wig

and the following goal:

Eva wants to borrow a Pippi Longstocking wig from someone

And once again, in moving forwards, Eva recycles the *har du* format. But this time it is not the object of desire which varies, but its possessor. Thus, in order to adapt to the new context, Eva needs to recycle the question in line 13 as a question to Bodil after another possessor than Bodil. And this is what Eva does in line 18, where she substitutes *nån* (again a non-referential argument) for *du*, adds an initial *vet du* (do you know), and adds a final *då*, to mark the turn as a second turn about the same thing (just as she did in line 06).
18. vet du nån som har de (d)å?
know you anyone who has it then
do you know anyone who has then

yes Sofia Berglund.

20. Eva: sofıa har en sån¿
Sofia has one such
Sofia has one

yes Sofia Berglund has it
yes Sofia Berglund has one

22. Eva: [de har hon?
it has she
she has

23. Bodil: .hja¿
yes

24. Eva: men då kan ja ringa â pråta me henn[e.
but then can I ring and talk with her
but then I can call and talk to her

At that point, Bodil is able to contribute something substantial to Eva’s project, which is now a joint project between Eva and Bodil. In line 19, following yet another Swedish response item, a lengthened a, a variety of ja (yes)\(^6\), Bodil names, in two steps, a possessor of a Pippi Longstocking wig. Eva seeks confirmation of that in line 20, using a strengthened version of har de, namely har en sån (literally ’have a such’)\(^7\), which, as we have learnt about the structure of contributions, prepares for a conclusion of the ongoing contribution, and in line 21, Bodil confirms what she has just said, using a strengthened recycling of line 19 to do that. Then, Eva engages in yet another search for confirmation, using a minimal version of the recurring format, and receives yet another confirmation, this time in the form of a single response item, a ja (yes) spoken on inhalation (a Swedish shibboleth). These two turns, in lines 22 and 23, not only conclude the ongoing contribution, they are also what I have called text talk (Anward

---

\(^6\) Cf. Lindström 2008: 81-86.

\(^7\) Note the assonance of sån in line 20 and nån in line 13.
1997, cf. also chapter 2), a formulation of a preceding sequence, which can serve as a memo of what has been achieved there.

And what has been achieved in this conversation is an impressive piece of cooperation. It is one thing to indicate to another person that you want something that you see that the other one has, and then succeed in getting hold of that object. In this case, though, through the use of languaging, not only does Eva manage to request a hypothetical object, but Bodil is also able to satisfy her request, at least provisionally, by pointing to an absent person who is in possession of an absent object. Thus, languaging allows us very quickly to reach truly advanced levels of cooperation.
An elaborated interaction format: a position with sequential impact

Moreover, a both stabililized and elaborated interaction format has been achieved.

Consider an extended transcription of those turns of *Pippiperuk 1* which are built on the *har* format.

(3) *Pippiperuk 1, har* turns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 &lt;1,2&gt;</td>
<td>har (2: du) (3: mamma) hemmač&lt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 &lt;1,2&gt;</td>
<td>e&gt; (4: pappa) hemma då?&lt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 &lt;1,2&gt;</td>
<td>e (2: ru) själv hemma?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 &lt;2,1&gt;</td>
<td>(1:ia) e hemma hosveronika=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 &lt;1,2&gt;</td>
<td>har (2: du) (nån Pippi Långstrumsperukǐ) (i: har ( ) (nån Pippi Långstrumsperukǐ))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 &lt;2,1&gt;</td>
<td>(i: de) har (2: ja) nte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 &lt;1,2&gt;</td>
<td>(i: de) har (2: u) nteč</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>vet (2: du)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(nån) som har (i: de) då?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 &lt;2,1&gt;</td>
<td>(5: Sofī:a.) (5: Berglund.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 &lt;1,2&gt;</td>
<td>(5: Sofia)har (en sånč) (i: ( ) har (en sånč))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 &lt;2,1&gt;</td>
<td>(5: Sofia har (i: de). Berglund)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 &lt;1,2&gt;</td>
<td>(i: de) har (5: hon?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have already seen how variations in formats are used to build sequential structure. Reduced turn formats index continuation, while a return to a fuller format indexes a beginning closing.
What emerges in (3) is an indexing of sequential structure by a position in a turn format, as well. Such positions with sequential impact are of course well-described and well-discussed in the literature, most often nowadays in terms of Topic, Focus, Cleft, Pseudo-cleft, and Dislocation constructions (see e.g. Duranti & Ochs 1979, É. Kiss 1981, 2008, Molnár & Winkler 2006, Günthner & Imo 2006, Auer & Pfänder 2011), i.e. constructions which include designated positions which are specialized to indicate how a turn connects to previous turns or foreshadows upcoming turns.

Through the recycling of the turn formats of the first phase of *Pippiperuk* in its second phase, the pre-verbal position in (3) emerges as such a variable position with sequential impact. When empty, as in lines 04, 06, 09, 13, and 18, it indexes stance, and, when filled, by the subject, as in lines 10, 20, and 21, or the object, as in lines 16, 17, and 22, it indexes mode of progression.

This Swedish pattern is of course a heavily reinforced pattern, which is routinely reproduced in *Pippiperuk*. My point here is simply that such a pattern may stabilize fairly quickly in interaction, after only a few recyclings of a particular interaction format.

It is also interesting to note that the use of a verb-initial format to mark stance is an innovation in Swedish (as it is in other Western European languages, see Beckman 1934). In Old Swedish, verb-initial turn formats simply indexed mode of progression, typically the introduction of something new, as in *Liggår lik a wighwalli* (lies corpse at battlefield; ’there lies a corpse at the battlefield’; Wessén 1965: 217). Thus, the sequential impact of a turn position may be both negotiated and re-negotiated as a tradition develops.

---

8 For an overview of 19th and 20th century contributions to this discussion, see Ljunggren 1926 and Anward 1981, ch. 3. For an overview of Swedish possibilities, see Ekerot 2011.
9 What is called the Foundation position in Swedish grammar; cf ch. 8.
10 Since *ja* and *u* in lines 16 and 17, respectively, are tagged as subjects, in analogy with line 13, *de* is tagged as object in those lines, and, analogically, also in line 22.
A stabilized interaction format: participant order

A quick glance at (3) reveals that the order in which participants are introduced in the turns of the first phase of *Pippiperuk 1*:

(4) speech act participants\(^{11}\) \(>\) others

is stabilized and elaborated as

(5) speech act participants \(>\) humans \(>\) others

when the interaction format is recycled in the second phase of *Pippiperuk 1*. Every recycling of the turn formats in *Pippiperuk 1* preserves the participant order in (5).

Clearly, (5) can be taken as an approximation to the Animacy hierarchy, proposed by Silverstein (1976), and, as demonstrated in a large number of studies since then, an important determiner of, among other things, agreement, case marking, and word order.

Viewed as a hierarchy, (5) can be seen to govern a number of other features of the clauses in (3), as well. First of all, note that (5) governs the tagging of arguments as subject and object in (3). In the clauses in (3), objects are lower on (5) than subjects. Secondly, (5) governs the distribution of given and new information in (3). In each clause in (3), a new argument is lower on (5) than the other arguments. And finally, (5) governs the shape of arguments in (3). In each clause in (3), lexical noun phrases are lower on (5) than pronouns.

It is unproblematic to see these constraints as precursors to the universal constraints on preferred argument structure proposed by Du Bois (1987)\(^{12}\).

---

11 A cover term for speaker and addressee; cf. DeLancey 1981.
12 For discussion, see Dahl 2000 and Haspelmath 2006. For an attempted explanation of these constraints, see DeLancey 1981.
As Du Bois argues, preferred argument structure provides a baseline for much of the morphosyntax indexing grammatical relations and information flow in the world’s languages. Typically, only deviations from preferred argument structure are explicitly marked, by agreement, articles, case marking, and variations in word order. A very simple example is the use of specific non-subject forms for speech act participants in Swedish, a language which otherwise lacks a nominative – accusative distinction. Thus, in addition to the subject forms *jag* (spoken form: *ja*; I), *du* (thou), *vi* (we), and *ni* (you, plural), we have the non-subject forms *mig* (spoken form: *mej*; me), *dig* (spoken form: *dej*; thee), *oss* (us), and *er* (you, plural), to index cases where speech act participants are not used as subjects.

Again, I am not saying that the argument structure in (3) is an innovation by Eva and Bodil. It is certainly as routinely reproduced as the uses of the preverbal position discussed in the previous section. My point is only, as in the previous section, that a pattern of a universally recognizable type (a position with sequential impact, a particular kind of argument structure) can quickly emerge and be stabilized in interaction, through repeated use of recycling with différance.
Pace

A more subtle feature of the interaction format we are looking at that is also stabilized by recycling with différence is what might be called its interactional pace. Aspects of interactional pace have been discussed in the literature under the headings of ’One clause at a time’ (Pawley & Syder 1983a, 1983b, 2000, Chafe 1994) and ’One new thing at a time’ (Chafe 1994, and references cited there). In the simplest case, these two principles add up to a conversation where each intonation unit is made up from at most one clause, and contains at most one new piece of information. The first phase of *Pippiperuk 1* conforms to this pattern, and the pattern is then stabilized in the second phase of the phone call.

If we also take the level of turns into account, the pattern becomes slightly more complex. Turns are not always made up of single intonation units, but may consist of two intonation units, as in lines 03-04, 12-14, 19, and 27. They may also consist of up to three turn constructional units (TCU:s, units that may constitute complete turns; Selting 2000), as in lines 03-04, 12-14, and 19. Nevertheless, however we measure pace, the pace of the first phase of *Pippiperuk 1* is recycled in its second phase.

Clearly, not all conversations conform to this pattern. We have encountered more complex intonation units in *Aktiv å passiv* and *Oskyldig*, and already in 1973, Loman (1973) was able to demonstrate for a Swedish interview material that subordinate clauses typically do not form independent intonation units, but are integrated into the intonation units of their embedding clauses.

Differences in interactional pace between different interaction formats, even as extreme as that between *Pippiperuk 1* and, say, a Heidegger text, would result from different combinations of available interactional space and intended accessibility. Available interactional space has to do with how much you can put into a turn, how fast it must be delivered, and whether

---

13 For a number of illuminating case studies, see Kuiper 1996.
you have any possibilities of planning and editing before you talk or write. Intended accessibility concerns the kind of background knowledge you assume, and how much interpretive work is required of the addressee. The balance between ease of production and ease of perception (Trudgill 2011: 136-139) would also be one aspect of intended accessibility, as would expectations of re-listening or re-reading.

Thus, a particular interaction format embodies a certain interactional pace.

**Conclusion**

As I argued in chapters 7 and 9, interaction formats combine a sequential structure (top to bottom in a diagraph), and a number of turn-internal structures (left to right in a diagraph). And it is in this combination of structures that linguistic resources make sense.

In this chapter, we have seen how an interaction format, through recontextualization, can be recycled with différance, and how, in this process, it joins forces with other interaction formats in an ongoing tradition, and its sequential structure and turn-internal structures become stabilized and elaborated.

In addition, it comes to embody a particular interactional pace.
Eleven

Summa

What I have done here can be regarded as an explication of what Magritte so ingeniously demonstrated in his painting The art of conversation I (1950), where two people, through their conversation, have managed to articulate the material in front of them, gigantic slabs of stone, into a structure where two or three words appear: REVE (dream), TREVE (pause), and, possibly, CREVE (death)\(^1\): language is a regular outcome of conversation.

In real conversations, what is structured is of course not slabs of stone, but sequences of syllables and intonation units. As I argued in ch 6, speaking is not ‘inside’ language, but an independent activity, which is appropriated in languaging, and whose products, in the process, get structured towards a language.

---

\(^1\) I differ here from Foucault (1983:37), who does not attribute agency to the conversationalists involved, but to the slabs of stone, or to the words formed by those slabs.
Where we were

And my argument has proceeded like this.

In chapters 2 and 3, I argued that a construction never substitutes for or absorbs a series of fully specified exemplar turns, but is a socially negotiated interim structuring of a series of turns, which is also a potential resource for further conversation.

In chapter 4, I widened the perspective, and argued that what emerges in conversation is recyclable, and hence open and dynamic, embedded systems of linguistic resources, networks of differentially voiced and authored turns, which, through turn-taking and recycling with différance, are structured along the dimensions of sequence and similarity. Constructions are but aspects of such systems.

Chapter 5 took a closer look at how turns are articulated in such systems, and proposed that speakers index and negotiate activity, progression, alignment, and individuality through the recycling or not of turn parts that I call format, stance, and rheme.

The basic findings were the following. A new format indexes a new activity. A retained or reduced format indexes an ongoing contribution to a current activity. A repeated format indexes a conclusion of an ongoing contribution or the start of a new contribution. A new rheme indexes a new contribution. A retained, reduced, or repeated rheme indexes an ongoing contribution, while variations on a current rheme index new formulations of an ongoing contribution.

We also saw how participants balance their commitment to a joint activity with a unique rhematic vocabulary, indexing their individuality, and how they use assonance to both tie their turns to previous turns and maintain a unique rhematic vocabulary.

Using variations on someone else’s rhematic vocabulary, in, for example, text talk, is therefore a powerful way of indexing consensus and group cohesion.

In chapter 7, I argued that the systems we have been looking at have an irreducible sequential dimension. Thus, they are not abstract combinatorial
systems, but interaction formats, practical achievements, possible ways to carry out communicative projects, which can be used as scripts for further practice.

I also suggested that under monologic conditions, interaction formats might be treated as combinatorial systems, by speakers and writers. Progression then might become a problem, which is solved by an increased reliance on ‘language’, for example assonance (as in glossolalia; chapter 6).

Monologue is also the environment where the very idea of languages as abstract combinatorial systems can arise, through an ideologizing process of reflection. This was laid out in chapter 8.

In chapters 9 and 10, interaction formats were re-connected with communicative projects, and with the basic function of conversation, the updating of a current social scene. Turns could then be seen as interactionally motivated actions which articulate both a stream of syllables and intonation units, and a current social scene. In this way, turn parts can be identified with participants and relations on the current social scene, and be integrated into constructional structures, complete with grammatical relations. Thus, an interaction format makes available, as an aspect of an interactionally motivated sequential structure, turn formats where participants and relations on the current social scene can appear and re-appear.

Not all turns, though, are articulated in the same way. Some stay holophrases, and there are many intermediate articulations between holophrases and sentences, depending on ongoing interactive concerns.

In chapter 9, I demonstrated how interaction formats, now seen as combinations of a sequential structure with a collection of turn formats, can emerge from scratch.

In chapter 10, I then showed how an interaction format, through recontextualization, can be recycled with différance, and how, in this process, it joins forces with other interaction formats in an ongoing tradition, and its sequential structure and turn-internal structures become stabilized and elaborated.

I also briefly suggested that an interaction format embodies an interactional pace.
Coda

Every act of interpretation is an act of violence. Reading off a system of linguistic resources from a piece of conversation is no exception. I have tried to inflict as little harm as possible to the conversations I have looked at by staying as close as possible to systems of linguistic resources actually done in these conversations, thereby hoping to catch that rascal language, to speak with Novalis, in motion, and get a glimpse of its wonderful and fruitful secret.
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Transcription conventions

\textit{men} \quad \text{accented syllable}

\textit{°men°} \quad \text{low volume}

.h \quad \text{inbreath}

.hja \quad \text{ingressive speech}

[ \quad \text{overlap starts}

] \quad \text{overlap ends}

: \quad \text{lengthened sound}

(p) \quad \text{pause}

( ) \quad \text{inaudible}

((signal)) \quad \text{transcriber’s description}

. \quad \text{falling contour}

, \quad \text{continuation contour}

? \quad \text{slightly rising contour}

? \quad \text{rising contour}
Rough translations of French and German quotations

[p 34-35] *langue* is necessary for *parole* to be understandable and produce its effects; but the latter is necessary for *langue* to be established; historically, the fact of *parole* always precedes.

[p 71] When I write (I am becoming more and more aware of that) I do not 'express' anything that existed before my writing. Of course, there is something that one might want to call a 'point of departure', this vague and confused magma which I carry within me and into which I dive.

But as I write a curious phenomenon is produced: this language which I think I can use as an instrument unfolds its lines of force. Through the profusion of images which every word calls up … I am constantly led astray from my initial aim, which is also, as I write, twisted, modified by obstacles or, contrariwise, equally unforeseen perspectives which present themselves at every instant.

Like every artist, a writer is as much guided by his material as by his intentions.

[p. 72] The very special thing about language, that it only cares about itself, no-one knows. That is why it is such a wonderful and fruitful secret - that when someone speaks only to speak, he expresses the loveliest and most original truths. But if he wants to speak about something determinate, that rascal language lets him say the most strange and ridiculous things.