Dialogue and tradition:
the open secret of language[1]

Jan Anward

Linköping University

Abstract: It is argued that a language, a *langue* in a modified Saussurean sense, is a regular outcome of conversation. Based on an analysis of a series of five Swedish telephone conversations, it is demonstrated through a turn-by-turn analysis of the first of these phone calls that an embedded and dynamic system of linguistic resources emerges in conversation and is stabilized in a tradition of conversations, and that the very methods which participants use to structure conversation - turn-taking, sequence organization, and repair - also structure conversation like a language.

Address: Department of Culture and Communication, Linköping University, SE 581 83 Linköping, Sweden

Mail: jan.anward@liu.se

In 1981, Charles Goodwin (1981: 170-173[2]) pointed out that in self-repairs such as (1),

(1) `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'[3], in the process of achieving such goals.

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

In traditional structuralist terms, the successive units produced in (1) are syntagmatically related, whereas the alternative units produced in (1) are paradigmatically related (Culler 1986). In other words, a *langue* (Saussure 1916, particularly ch. 4, Culler 1986), that is, a network, or system, of units related along an axis of combination (syntagmatic relations) and an axis of selection (paradigmatic relations; Jakobson 1956), emerges through the activities of sequencing, repetition, and contrasting involved in self-repair.

Language is thus 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.

Here, I will generalize Goodwin's observation and demonstrate that a language, a *langue* in a modified Saussurean sense, is a regular outcome of conversation.

This demonstration is based on an analysis of a series of five telephone conversations, involving a woman, here called Eva Andersson, and her neighbours, which were recorded and analyzed by Lindström (1994).

In this article, I will, for reasons of space, build my case on just the first ten turns of the first call, *Pippiperuk 1*.

The gist of my demonstration will be that an embedded and dynamic system of linguistic resources emerges in conversation and is stabilized in a tradition of conversations, and that the very methods which participants use to structure

---

[2] See also Goodwin 2006: 100-103.
[3] In the sense of Sacks (1992). See further sections 6 and 10.

conversation - turn-taking, sequence organization, and repair (Schegloff 2006) - also structure conversation like a language (to borrow a formulation from Lacan 1977).

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

1. First ten turns of a phone call

Let us now listen to the first ten turns of a phone call (of the old land-line type; Lindström 1994). 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.

(2) *Pippiperuk 1*

```
01    ((four signals))
02    Bodil:     >sex sju två fyra¿<
                 six seven two four
03    Eva:       >hej de e E:va.
                 hi it is Eva
                 hi this is Eva
04               har du mamma hemma¿<
                 have thou mammy home
                 is your mother at home
05    Bodil:     näe:.
                 noo:
06    Eva:       e >pappa hemma då?<
                 is daddy home then
                 is your father at home then
07    Bodil:     näe:.
                 noo:
08    Eva:       hä.
                 ok.
09               e ru själv hemma?
                 are thou alone home
                 are you alone at home
```

```
10      Bodil:      nej: men ja e hemma hos Veronika,=
                    no but i am home at Veronika
                    no but i am at Veronika's home
11      Eva:        =jaha.
                    ok
12                  .hh hörru hörre du:
                    .hh listen listen thou
                    .hh listen listen)
13                  har du nån pippilångstrumpsperuk¿
                    have thou any pippi långstrump whig
                    do you have any pippi långstrump whig
14                  de ä Henriks 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
```

In what follows, I will track the progress of this piece of a phone call, turn by turn, and demonstrate how a *langue* emerges as the conversation develops. At the same time, I will note the distinctive characteristics of this emerging *langue*, characteristics which makes it both comparable to and fundamentally different from a traditional Saussurean *langue*.

In order to carry out this demonstration, I will assume no further initial articulation of turns than an articulation into intonation units. This is, in all probability, a counter-factual assumption, 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.

2. Turn-taking

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

Turn-taking 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 update a current articulation of an ongoing social activity into participants and relations.

The first four turns of (2), repeated in (3), with no further articulation than intonation units, provide an example.

(3) *Pippiperuk 1*, opening

```
01      ((four signals))
02      Bodil:   >sexsjutvåfyra¿<
                 sixseventwofour
03      Eva:     >hejdeee:va.
                 hiitise:va
04               hardumammahemma¿<
                 havethoumammyhome
05      Bodil:   näe:.
                 noo
```

Here, Eva and Bodil work to achieve a phase in a social activity, namely the opening of a communicative channel, and each of the turns in the sequence contributes to that end.

The first two turns of (3) is 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 01), makes a second action, an answer (line 02), 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, 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 03), and it is preceded by a greeting, which makes a second greeting relevant. However, Eva does not wait for a second greeting. Instead, 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 *langue*. Their unfolding responsory 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.

Note that the units of this system, intonation units and turns, are not classical Saussurean signs. In Saussure's original theory, signs are of word size. Since then, however, many linguists, from different perspectives, have convincingly demonstrated that all linguistic units are indeed signs, in the Saussurean sense (Jakobson & Waugh 1979, Chafe 1967, Langacker 1998).

3. 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).

In short, dialogical actions are designed to strike a balance both between progression and coherence, and between alignment and individuality.

Thus, as is evident when we inspect it, the system in (3) is not just a network of syntagmatic relations, differences along the axis of combination (Jakobson 1956: 60). It is also a network of sequentially organized, and differentially voiced and authored turns, within an evolving tension and collaboration between at least two 'contextures' (Mukařovský 1977: 87), distinct perspectives on the topics talked about, in this case, the perspective of Eva, and the perspective of Bodil.

In other words, the system in (3), and, à fortiori, all systems produced in conversation, are inextricably embedded in their ongoing social activities. By taking turns at dialogical actions, participants in a conversation structure their conversation as an embedded system of syntagmatically related units.

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 effected by their turns at talk.

In the second turn of Pippiperuk 1 (line 02), Bodil introduces herself as a participant in the social activity of the phone call, through her voice. She also introduces another participant, through a direct address. Moreover, she provides an identification of herself, which makes a following identification by her addressee relevant.

Let us transcribe this in the following way:

1   2
s̲e̲xsjutv̲å̲fyra¿ (1, 2)

What we have here is a scene with two participants, 1 and 2, and a relation between 1 and 2, established by the saying of s̲e̲xsjutv̲å̲fyra¿ by 1 to 2, something on the order of '1 says s̲e̲xsjutv̲å̲fyra¿ to 2; 1 identifies herself to 2 through s̲e̲xsjutv̲å̲fyra¿'.

This mode of transcription also allows a straightforward account of how dialogical actions make meaning in context.

The basic idea, going back to at least Gardiner (1951), is that a dialogical action serves to update an ongoing social activity, by introducing and maintaining participants and relations among them in the activity. Some of these participants and relations are

---

[4] Inspired by Discourse Representation Theory (Kamp & Reyle 1993, Geurts & Beaver 2011).

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.

4. Going triadic[5]

The scene accomplished by the second turn of *Pippiperuk 1*, repeated below,

```
1    2
sexsjutvåfyra¿   (1, 2)
```

is then modified by the following turns.

In the first intonation unit of the third turn, Eva identifies with the second participant, as a physically present participant, through her voice. She also provides an identification of herself, and a greeting, which makes a second greeting relevant.

```
1    2
sexsjutvåfyra¿   (1, 2)
>hejdeee:va.     (2, 1)
```

Then, in the second intonation unit, she 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, in all probability 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.

---

[5] I am borrowing this term from Hurford (2007, ch. 7).

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 may be inferred from the ongoing interaction format. A participant may be interactionally present without being either physically or symbolically 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 participant on the current scene.

Then, after Bodil has refused to comply with Eva's request, the conversation is structured in the following way.

(4) *Pippiperuk 1*, opening, 2

```
 01     ((four signals))
 02     Bodil:    >sexsjutvåfyra¿<
                  sixseventwofour
 03     Eva:      >hejdeee:va.
                  hiitise:va
 04               hardumammahemma¿<
                  havethoumammyhome
 05     Bodil:    näe:.
                  noo
```


```
    1    2    3
    sexsjutvåfyra¿    (1, 2)
    >hejdeee:va.      (2, 1)
    hardumammahemma¿<  (2, 1, 3)
    näe:.    (1, 2)
```


5. Recycling with différance

A second kind of structuring of a conversation emerges from the similarities and differences participants create between successive turns in a conversation.

Let us return to *Pippiperuk 1*.

When Eva gets a negative answer to her request in line 04, she makes another attempt, in line 06 (see below). These two turns are linked not only as connected actions, they are also similar in form, exhibiting what Goodwin and Goodwin (1987) call format tying, the tying of a turn "not only to the type of action produced" through a previous turn "but also to the particular of its wording" (Goodwin and Goodwin 1987: 216).

(5) *Pippiperuk 1*, first nine turns

```
01      ((four signals))
02      Bodil:      >sexsjutvåfyra¿<
                    sixseventwofour
03      Eva:        >hejdeee:va.
                    hiitise:va
04                  hardumammahemma¿<
                    havethoumammyhome
05      Bodil:      näe:.
                    noo
06      Eva:        e>pappahemmadå?<
07      Bodil:      näe:.
                    noo
08      Eva:        hä.
                    ok.
09                  erusjä↑lvhemma?
                    arethoualonehome
10      Bodil:      nej:menjaehemmahosveronika,=
                    nobutiamhomeatVeronika
11      Eva:        =jaha.
                    ok
```

And not only Eva's turn in line 06, but also Eva's turn in line 09, and Bodil's turn in line 10, are modelled on the second intonation unit in line 04.

This method of turn construction 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 & Goodwin1987), repetition (Tannen 1989, Fant 2000, Blanche-Benveniste 2000), resonance (Du Bois 1996, 2004), and quotation (Gasparov 1998), is, as Sacks and Tannen emphasize, a poetic method.[6] 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).

Consider again the units in lines 04, 06, 09, and 10.

It is plain to see that the turns in lines 06, 09, and 10 are repeated transformations of the intonation unit `hardumammahemma¿<` (*havethoumammyhome)* in line 04. In line 06, `hardumammahemma¿<` is articulated into `hardumamma` and `hemma¿<`, `e>pappa` (*isdaddy*) substitutes for `hardumamma`, and `då?<` (*then*) *i*s added at the end. In line 09, `erusjä↑lv` (*arethoualone*) substitutes for `hardumamma`, and, finally, in line 10, `menjae` (*butiam*) *s*ubstitutes for `hardumamma`, and `hosveronika`, (*atveronika*) is added at the end.

Linguists often find it natural to assume that concrete turns, and with them their contexts of practice, are dissolved in memory, leaving only a residue of general patterns, from which new turns can be formed.[7]

However, as we have just seen, there is a much simpler assumption available, namely that Eva and Bodil directly model their new turns on old turns.

Such a modelling takes the form of an incremental (Linell 2011), or on-line syntactic (Auer 2009), replication of and variation on already produced turns. Old turns serve as a resource for improvisation and meaning-making, which at each, negotiable, step in an unfolding new turn inform the decision what to do next.

---

[6] However, in conversation, this method is not primarily driven by aesthetic, but by social, considerations. See Anward 2004.

[7] See Anward & Lindblom 1999 for a thorough discussion of such models.

And this process of replication involves a number of simple operations: segmentation, copying, substitution, and addition, which are well-known from other domains of human action.

6. Recycling and sequence organization

By modelling her second turn on the second intonation unit of her first turn Eva is creating a resemblance between the two units. This is the kind of resemblance which Bloomfield, in his set of postulates for linguistics as a science, took as absolutely fundamental to linguistic structure: "Within certain communities successive utterances are alike or partly alike." (Bloomfield (1966 [1926]: 26).

As Douglas (1996) eloquently reminds us, following Goodman (1970), similarity comes cheap to any observer and needs to be secured in a demonstration of its practical relevance to participants, in order to have any descriptive value. In this case, though, the resemblance has an unproblematic practical relevance.

By modelling her second turn on the second part of her first turn, Eva indicates that she is renewing the projection of her previous dialogical action[8]. She is still looking for an adult to talk to. Thus, similarity in form is used to indicate similarity in function.

The similarity between Eva's second turn and the second intonation unit of her first turn is then an achieved similarity, in Sacks's sense (Sacks 1992, Vol. II, p. 4). Eva produces her second turn in such a way that its similarity to the second intonation unit of her first turn "will be seeable" (ibid.). And it is precisely through this visible similarity of the two turns that Eva is able to pursue her project.

7. A second (and a third) dimension

In creating a resemblance between her successive turns, in order to structure her phone call, Eva is also building a multi-dimensional structure which is characteristic of conversation. In this structure, which is displayed here in diagraph format (Du Bois 2004), dialogical actions are not only following each other, they are also similar to each

---

[8] See Schegloff 1996 and 2007 for a detailed description of this aspect of sequential organization.

other, and alternatives to each other. When Eva models her second turn on the second intonation unit of her first turn, she adds a dimension of similarity (displayed on the vertical axis of a diagraph) to the system in (4). And when Bodil once more has refused to comply, the system in (6) results.

(6) *Pippiperuk 1*, first six turns

```
01      ((four signals))
02      Bodil:      >sexsjutvåfyra¿<
03      Eva:             >hejdeee:va.
04                                 hardumammahemma¿<
05      Bodil:                                      näe:.
06      Eva:                        e>pappahemmadå?<
07      Bodil:                                      näe:.
```

```
1     2     3     4
((four signals)) (2, 1)
        sexsjutvåfyra¿ (1, 2)
              >hejdeee:va. (2, 1)
                        hardumammahemma¿< (2, 1, 3)
                                        näe:. (1, 2)
                        e>pappahemmadå?<  (2, 1, 4)
                                        näe:. (1, 2)
```

From this two-dimensional structure of conversation, we can read off a two-dimensional *langue*. Relations of temporal precedence translate straightforwardly into syntagmatic relations, as before. Relations between vertically aligned items 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 and an axis of selection (Jakobson 1956).

However, both types of relation capture essential features of conversational structure.

Paradigms in Hjelmslev's and Jakobsons's sense[9], arise in the context of particular conversational practices. One such practice is the one observed in *Pippiperuk 1*, where Eva receives a dispreferred response to her first turn, and then makes another attempt in her second turn. In such cases, participants are not just doing similarity, they are also doing selection, trying out alternatives. Another such practice is repair, as in Goodwin's example of self-repair. Here, similar items are also structured as 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.

This indicates that associative and paradigmatic relations are at least partially independent relations which both structure conversation and language. In addition to a second dimension of similarity, then, we also need to recognize a third dimension of equivalence.

8. Articulation of turns

When a turn is recycled with différance, the turns involved in the process are typically 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 articulates `hardumammahemma¿<` (*havethoumammyhome*) into `hardu,` `mamma` and `hemma¿<` (*havethou, mammy,* and *home*), and the first intonation unit, `>hejdeee:va.` (*hiitiseva*), into `>hejde, e,` and `e:va.` (*hiit, is,* and *Eva*), whereupon she substitutes `e for hardu,` and `pappa` (*daddy*), for `mamma.` Finally,

---

[9] Note that members of a traditional paradigm, e.g. a noun paradigm, need not be paradigmatically related.

då?< (*then*) is added at the end. In this way, the first six turns of *Pippiperuk1* are articulated into parts as shown below in (7).

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 sjä↑lv (*alone*). The resulting system is shown in (7).

(7) *Pippiperuk 1*, first seven turns

```
01      ((four signals))
02      Bodil:      >sexsjutvåfyra¿<
03      Eva:              >hejde e e:va.
04                              har du mamma hemma¿<
05      Bodil:                                      näe:.
06      Eva:                    e> pappa hemma då?<
07      Bodil:                                      näe:.
08       Eva:                                       hä.
09                              e ru sjä↑lv hemma?
```

```
1    2    3    4
((four signals)) (2, 1)
        sexsjutvåfyra¿ (1, 2)
                >hejde e e:va. (2, 1)
                        har du mamma hemma¿< (2, 1, 3)
                                        näe:. (1, 2)
                    e> pappa hemma då?<  (2, 1, 4)
                                        näe:. (1, 2)
                                        hä. (2, 1)
                    e ru sjä↑lv hemma? (2, 1)
```

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 shows that she has heard Eva's articulations of the preceding turns, and can use the system in (7) as a resource for bringing the conversation forward.

The principle that allows Bodil to hear Eva's articulations 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):

(8) *Segmentation*

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

And what Bodil does is substitute `ja e` for `e ru`, and add `hosveronika`. The following system results.

(9) *Pippiperuk 1,* first nine turns

```
01     ((four signals))
02     Bodil:     >sexsjutvåfyra¿<
03     Eva:              >hejde e e:va.
04                            har du mamma hemma¿<
05     Bodil:                                  näe:.
06     Eva:                    e> pappa hemma då?<
07     Bodil:                                  näe:.
08     Eva:                                 hä.
09                            e ru sjä⇑lv hemma?
10     Bodil:                                nej:
11                            men ja e hemma hosveronika,=
12       Eva:                                  =jaha.
```

```
1     2     3     4
((four signals)) (2, 1)
          sexsjutvåfyra¿ (1, 2)
                  >hejde e e:va. (2, 1)
                              har du mamma hemma¿< (2, 1, 3)
                                             näe:. (1, 2)
                              e> pappa hemma då?< (2, 1, 4)
                                             näe:. (1, 2)
                                             hä. (2, 1)
                              e ru själv hemma? (2, 1)
                                             nej: (1, 2)
                              men ja e hemma hosveronika,= (1, 2)
                                             =jaha. (2, 1)
```

9. Reference

As turns are articulated into parts, certain parts can be identified with physically or interactionally present participants, and these participants then become symbolically present[10], 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 (in the sense of Heidegger 1927; see also Pöggeler 1989), that is, separated from its background.[11]

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[12], a method whereby articulation and

---

[10] As detailed in section 3.
[11] See also Anward & Lindblom 1999: 30-33, and Hurford 2007: 239, for further discussion, and Freud 1909, and Piaget & Inhelder 1966, for the unfolding of unconcealment in children.
[12] For this notion, see Linell 2009, section 9.7.

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 takes but a little stretch of imagination to conjecture that the variable and accented parts of the turns in lines 02 and 04, that is e:va, mamma, and pappa are tuned to Eva's project and identify such potential participants.

And by a similar reasoning, we conjecture that when Eva makes up her mind to talk to Bodil, in the turns from line 09 onwards, the variable and accented parts of these turns no longer identify such participants, while the recurrent and unaccented ru which substitutes for pappa in line 06 is a symbolic counterpart of Bodil, Eva's stable other in this on-going project.[13]

This results in the following identifications of participants and turn parts, which are shown as (i: λ), where i is a participant index, and λ is a turn part, in the first nine turns of *Pippiperuk1*.

(10) *Pippiperuk 1*, first nine turns, 2

```
01     ((four signals))
02     Bodil:     >sexsjutvåfyra¿<
03     Eva:            >hejde e e:va.
04                          har du mamma hemma¿<
05     Bodil:                              näe:.
06     Eva:                   e> pappa hemma då?<
07     Bodil:                              näe:.
08      Eva:                              hä.
09                          e ru sjä↑lv hemma?
10     Bodil:                              nej:
11                          men ja e hemma hosveronika,=
12     Eva:                              =jaha.
```

---

[13] 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.

```
1    2    3    4
((four signals)) (2, 1)
        sexsjutvåfyra¿ (1, 2)
                >hejde e (2: e:va). (2, 1)
                    har (1: du) (3: mamma) hemma¿< (2, 1, 3)
                                                 näe:. (1, 2)
                    e> (4: pappa) hemma då?<  (2, 1, 4)
                                                 näe:. (1, 2)
                                                 hä. (2, 1)
                    e (1: ru) sjä⇑lv hemma? (2, 1)
                                                 nej: (1, 2)
                    men (1: ja) e hemma hosveronika,= (1, 2)
                                                 =jaha. (2, 1)
```

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

'2 says to 1 about 3: har du mamma hemma¿;

2 says to 1: har hemma¿ may hold between 1,

identified through du, and 3, identified through mamma;

2 wants 1 to say:

har hemma¿ holds between 1 and 3

or har hemma¿ does not hold between 1 and 3.'

The structure of interaction, participants and relations established between them,
is thus reproduced in the structure of turns, where, just as in the embedding stuation (see
section 3), symbolically present relations are established between symbolically and/or
physically present participants.

10. An emergent system

The system in (10) 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.[14] 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, in this demonstration, 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's sense.[15] In other words, they are meant to be heard, and can fulfill their interactive functions only if they are heard.

Thus, following Sacks (1992, Vol. II, Part I, Lecture 1, and Part IV, Lecture 1), I conclude that Eva and Bodil are doing (achieving) language, not just producing language.

11. A dynamic system

A system which emerges from conversation is also a dynamic system, something which I have underscored by using Derrida's notion of différance, elaborated in his critical reading of Saussure (Derrida 1967, ch. 2).

This point was made 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):

---

[14] This understanding of emergence is not completely absent from Anward 2004.
[15] See section 6.

"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 adaptible 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 both system-dependent and system-changing, at the same time rule-governed and rule-changing (Chomsky 1964: 22-23). 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 Giddens (1984), in his theory of structuration, which is why I have appropriated his term, as well.

12. An interaction format

So, where are we now? What did Bodil and Eva achieve in eight (and a half) turns?

An embedded, emergent, and dynamic system of linguistic units is the answer I have just given. But above that, (10) can also be seen as a practical achievement, as a recyclable interaction format, tuned to a local communicative project.

Apart from the initial summons-answer sequence, and if I am allowed to split `hejde` into `hej` and `de`, (10) is made up from four pieces.

The first piece is a greeting: `hej`. The second piece is an identification: `de e e:va`. The third piece is the format used for finding an addressee, centered on the recurring `har/e hemma`. And the fourth piece is the response items following these attempts.

In the third piece, the turns and intonation units which resonate through `har/e hemma`, we see the makings of a (fully lexicalized) construction:

(11) A construction

```
1    2    3    4
          har  (1: du) (3: mamma)   hemma¿<        (2, 1, 3)
          e>   (4: pappa)           hemma då?<     (2, 1, 4)
          e    (1: ru) sjä↑lv       hemma?         (2, 1)
     (1: ja) e                      hemma hosveronika,=  (1, 2)
```

And this constructional structure has a straightfoward 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 (12). The result is shown in (13).

(12) A construction, 2

```
1    2    3    4
          har  (1: du) (3: mamma)      hemma¿<        (2, 1, 3)
          e>   (4: pappa)              hemma då?<     (2, 1, 4)
          e    (1: ru)       sjä↑lv hemma?            (2, 1)
     (1: ja) e                         hemma hosveronika,=  (1, 2)
       a    h¹⁶   a      a      m      h      m
```

Note though that the construction and the paradigms that emerge in (10) do not emerge in any compact and final form but are interim structurings of syntagmatically related turns and intonation units within the interaction format achieved by Eva and Bodil. They are but one aspect of the embedded system in (10).

---

[16] `har/e hemma` is to be interpreted as one discontinuous head.

This corroborates Hopper's original contention that constructions are always emerging and open-ended, embedded in, and 'dispersed' across longer conversational stretches (Hopper 1987, 1998, 2011)[17].

13. Tradition

However, having once been achieved, an interaction format becomes a powerful resource for further conversation. A number of studies (Couper-Kuhlen & Thompson 2006, Günthner 2006, 2011, and Doehler 2011, among others) have demonstrated this with respect to a variety of syntactic constructions and the point is also thoroughly argued and theorised by Auer & Pfänder (2011).

In my formulation, conversationalists use the interaction formats of earlier conversational episodes, including the interim constructional structures entrenched in such formats, as a resource for new episodes. And this is precisely what happens in the ninth turn of *Pippiperuk 1*.

When Eva has accepted Bodil as her conversational partner, she essentially restarts the phone call in her fourth turn (lines 11 through 14):

(13) *Pippiperuk 1*, turns 9 and 10


```
11    Eva:      =jaha.
                ok
12              .hh hörru hörre du:
                .hh listen listen thou
                .hh listen listen
13              har du nån pippilångstrumpsperuk¿
                have thou any pippi långstrump whig
                do you have any pippi långstrump whig
14              de ä Henriks mamma, .hh
                it is Henrik's mammy .hh
```

---

[17] See also Couper-Kuhlen & Thompson (2006) for an extended demonstration of this, with respect to Extraposition.

> *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*

And when she does this, she recycles the interaction format arrived at in the first eight turns, in modified form.

She substitutes a reduplicated attention-getter (`hörru hörre du:`) for the greeting `hej`, and re-identifies herself by means of a self-description (Henrik's mammy) which is obviously specifically designed for Bodil, and which moreover recycles material from her first turn. Finally, she recycles `har du`, to start an inquiry after another object of desire, this time not an adult conversational partner, but a Pippi Longstocking whig.

Note that in this mode of recycling with différance, Eva does not have to split old turns and intonation units, in order to create models for her new turns. Rather, she can rely on a system of already articulated turns, which means that recycling with différance comes to emulate the standard Jakobsonian operations of selection and combination of available units.

In this way, a system achieved in one conversational episode may get stabilized in a tradition of further conversational episodes and conversations, and become a resource for and a significant constraint on further practice.

And in this further practice, other processes become possible, as well, most notably grammaticalization (Hopper & Thompson 2003, Dahl 2004).

Transcription conventions

`men`	accented syllable
`°men°`	low volume
`.h`	inbreath
`.hja`	ingressive speech
`[`	overlap starts
`]`	overlap ends

`:`	lengthened sound
`(p)`	pause
`(   )`	inaudible
`((signal))`	transcriber's description
`.`	falling contour
`,`	continuation contour
`¿`	slightly rising contour
`?`	rising contour

References

Anward, Jan1996: 'Om språkets roll i olika skeden av livet'. *Språk och stil* 6. 27-37.

Anward, Jan 2004: 'Lexeme Recycled. How Categories Emerge from Interaction'. *Logos and Language* V:2. 31-46.

Anward, Jan 2010: 'Making units: Comments on Beatrice Szczepek Reed "Intonation phrases in natural conversation: A participants' category?"'. In: Dagmar Barth-Weingarten et al. (eds.): *Prosody in interaction.* Benjamins. 213-216.

Anward, Jan & Lindblom, Björn 1999: 'On the rapid perceptual processing of speech: From signal information to phonetic and grammatical knowledge'. http://www.liu.se/ikk/medarbetare/jan-anward/filarkiv-publikationer/1.209284/ja-1999b-anward-lindblom.pdf

Auer, Peter 2009: 'On-line syntax: thoughts on the temporality of spoken language'. *Language Sciences* 31. 1-13.

Auer, Peter & Pfänder, Stefan 2011: 'Constructions: emergent or emerging?'. In: Peter Auer & Stefan Pfänder (eds.): *Constructions: emergent and emerging.* De Gruyter. 1-21.

Blanche-Benveniste, Claire 2000: *Approches de la langue parlée en français.* Paris: Ophrys.

Bloomfield, Leonard 1966 [1926]: 'A set of postulates for the science of language'. Reprinted in Martin Joos (ed.) *Readings in Linguistics I.* 4th edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 26-31.

Chafe, Wallace 1967: 'Language as Symbolization'. *Language* 43. 57-91.

Chomsky, Noam A. 1964: *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory.* Mouton.

Couper-Kuhlen, Elisabeth & Thompson, Sandra A. 2006: '*You know, it's funny*: Eine Neubetrachtung der "Extraposition" in Englischen'. In: Susanne Günthner & Wolfgang Imo (eds.): *Konstruktionen in der Interaktion.* De Gruyter. 23-58.

Culler, Jonathan 1986: *Ferdinand de Saussure.* Revised edition. Cornell University Press.

Dahl, Östen 2004: *The Growth and Maintenance of Linguistic Complexity.* Benjamins.

Derrida, Jacques 1967: *De la grammatologie.* Les Éditions de Minuit.

Doehler, Simona Pekarek 2011: 'Emergent grammar for all practical purposes: the on-line formatting of left and right dislocations in French conversation'. In: Peter Auer & Stefan Pfänder (eds.): *Constructions: emergent and emerging.* De Gruyter. 45-126.

Douglas, Mary 1996: *Thought Styles*. SAGE

DuBois, John W. 1996: 'Dialogic Syntax'. 5th International Pragmatics Conference. Mexico City, Mexico, July 1996.

Du Bois, J. W. 2004: 'Towards a Dialogic Syntax'. Ms.

Fant, Lars 2000: 'La repetición como recurso para la negociación de identidades en la conversación espontánea'. In: Jane Nystedt (ed.): *XIV Romanistkongressen, Stockholm 10-15 augusti 1999* [Proceedings from the XIVth Conference of Scandinavian Romanists, Stockholm, 10-15 August 1999]. Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis. Romanica Stockholmiensia 19. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Freud, Sigmund 1909: 'Analyse der Phobie eines fünfjährigen Knaben'. In: *Gesammelte Werke* 7 (1941). S. Fischer Verlag. 243-377.

Gardiner, Alan Henderson 1951: *The Theory of Speech and Language.* Second edition. Clarendon Press.

Gasparov, Boris 1997: *Iazyk, pamiat', obraz: Linguistika iazukovogo sushchestvovaniia [Language as Memory]* Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie.

Geurts, Bart and Beaver, David I. 2011: 'Discourse Representation Theory'. In: Edward N. Zalta (ed.): *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2011 Edition). http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2011/entries/discourse-representation-theory/

Giddens, Anthony 1984: *The constitution of society: outline of the theory of structuration*. Polity Press.

Gleason, H. A. 1961: *An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics*. Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Goddard, Cliff 2001: 'Lexico-semantic universals: A critical review'. *Linguistic Typology* 5:1. 1-66.

Goodman, Nelson 1970: 'Seven Strictures on Similarity'. In Lawrence Foster and John W. Swanson (eds.) *Experience and Theory*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press. 19-29.

Goodwin, Charles 1981: *Conversational Organization: Interaction Between Speakers and Hearers*. New York: Academic Press.

Goodwin, Charles 2006: ' 2006 Human Sociality as Mutual Orientation in a Rich Interactive Environment: Multimodal Utterances and Pointing in Aphasia'. In: Nick Enfield and Stephen C. Levinson (eds.): *Roots of Human Sociality*. London: Berg Press. 96-125.

Goodwin, Marjorie Harness & Goodwin, Charles 1987: 'Children's Arguing'. In Susan Philips, Susan Steele and Christine Tanz (eds.): *Language, Gender, and Sex in Comparative Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 200-248.

Greenfield, Patricia & Zukow, P.G. 1978: 'Why do children say what they say when they say it? An experimental approach to the psychogenesis of presupposition'. In: Katherine Nelson (ed.): *Children's Language.* Vol. 1. Gardner Press. 287-336.

Günthner, Susanne 2006: '"Was ihn trieb, war vor allem Wanderlust": Pseudocleft-Konstruktionen im Deutschen'. In: Susanne Günthner & Wolfgang Imo (eds.): *Konstruktionen in der Interaktion.* De Gruyter. 59-90.

Günthner, Susanne 2011: 'Between emergence and sedimentation: Projecting constructions in German interactions'. In: Peter Auer & Stefan Pfänder (eds.): *Constructions: emergent and emerging.* De Gruyter. 156-185.

Heidegger, Martin 1927: *Sein und Zeit.* Tübingen.

Hjelmslev, Louis 1963: *Sproget.* Gyldendals.

Holland, John H. 1998: *Emergence. From Chaos to Order*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hopper, Paul J. 1987: 'Emergent grammar'. *BLS* 13. 139-157.

Hopper, Paul J. 1998: 'Emergent Grammar'. In Michael Tomasello (ed). *The New Psychology of Language.* Mahwah, NJ & London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 155-176

Hopper, Paul J. 2011: 'Emergent Grammar and Temporality in Interactional Linguistics'. . In: Peter Auer & Stefan Pfänder (eds.): *Constructions: emergent and emerging.* De Gruyter. 22-44.

Hopper, Paul J & Traugott, Elizabeth Closs 2003: *Grammaticalization*. 2nd edn. Cambridge University Press.

Hurford, James R. 2007: *The Origins of Meaning.* Oxford University Press.

Jakobson, Roman 1956: 'Two aspects of language and two types of aphasic disturbances'. In: Roman Jakobson & Morris Halle: *Fundamentals of language*. Mouton & Co.

Jakobson, Roman 1960: 'Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics'. In: T. A. Sebeok (ed.): *Style in Language*. Cambridge, MA.: MIT Press.

Jakobson, Roman & Waugh, Linda 1979: *The Sound Shape of Language.* Harvester Press.

Jefferson, Gail 1996: 'On the Poetics of Ordinary Talk'. *Text and Performance Quarterly* 16:1. 1-61.

Jespersen, Otto 1937: *Analytic Syntax.* Levin & Munksgaard.

Kamp, Hans & Reyle, Uwe 1993: *From discourse to logic : introduction to model theoretic semantics of natural language, formal logic and discourse representation*. Dordrecht : Kluwer.

Karcevski, Serge 1929: 'Du dualisme asymétrique du signe linguistique'. Reprinted in Josef Vachek (ed): *A Prague School Reader in Linguistics*. Indiana University Press.

Lacan, Jacques1977: *Écrits: a selection.* Tavistock.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1998: 'Conceptualization, Symbolization, and Grammar'. In Michael Tomasello (ed.) *The New Psychology of Language*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 1-40.

Lindström, Anna 1994: *Language as social action.* Skrifter utgivna av Institutionen för nordiska språk vid Uppsala universitet 46.

Linell, Per 2009: *Rethinking language, mind, and world dialogically*. Information Age Publishers.

Linell, Per 2011: *Språkande: samtal, språk och grammatik.* Studies in Language and Culture, 17. Linköping: Department of Culture and Communication.

Marková, Ivana 2003**:** *Dialogicality and social representations: the dynamics of mind.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

McCawley, James D. 1970: 'Review of Otto Jespersen: Analytic Syntax'. *Language* 46:2. 442-449

Mukařovský, Jan 1977: *Word and Verbal Art.* Yale University Press.

Peters, Ann M. 1983: *The Units of Language Acquisition.* Cambridge University Press.

Piaget, Jean & Inhelder, Bärbel 1966: *La psychologie de l'enfant.* Presses universitaires de France.

Pöggeler, Otto 1989: *Martin Heidegger's Path of Thinking.* Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press International.

Riffaterre, Michael 1978: *Semiotics of Poetry.* Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press.

Sacks, Harvey 1992: *Lectures on conversation.* Vols. I & II. Blackwell.

Sacks, Harvey, Schegloff, Emanuel A., and Jefferson, Gail 1974: 'A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation'. *Language* 50:4. 696-735.

Saussure, Ferdinand de 1967: *Cours de Linguistique Générale.* Paris: Payot.

Schegloff, Emanuel. A. 1968: 'Sequencing in Conversational Openings'. *American Anthropologist* 70. 1075-1095.

Schegloff Emanuel A. 1996: 'Turn Organization: One Intersection of Grammar and Interaction'. In: Elinor Ochs, Emanuel A. Schegloff and Sandra Thompson (eds.): *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 52-133.

Schegloff Emanuel A. 2006: 'Interaction: The infrastructure for social institutions, the natural ecological niche for language, and the arena in which culture is enacted'. In: Nick J. Enfield and Stephen C. Levinson (eds.): *Roots of Human Sociality: Culture, cognition and interaction.* London: Berg. 70-96.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2007: *Sequence organization in interaction.* Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. & Sacks, Harvey (1973) 'Opening Up Closings'. *Semiotica* VIII. 289-327.

Szczepek Reed, Beatrice 2010: 'Intonation phrases in natural conversation: A participants' category?'. In: Dagmar Barth-Weingarten et al. (eds.): *Prosody in interaction.* Benjamins. 191-212.

Wootton, A. J. 1997: *Interaction and the develoment of mind.* Cambridge University Press.