Evidence for a Dialogical Grammar: Reactive constructions in Swedish and German

Abstract: The present chapter deals with reactive constructions in Swedish and German, especially with two constructions which will be called x-och/und-x (i.e. x-and-x) and 'double initial auxiliaries' (= DIA) constructions. As reactive constructions we define constructions involving the speaker's repetition of an expression x used in a prior utterance by another or by the speaker him/herself. This first segment is followed by a negotiation of the situated meaning of x. The function is to react to or against the previous speaker's way of expressing him/herself, his/her use of the expression x.

Our observations confirm a general view of online languaging (= 'language use'), that utterances are incrementally built. Moreover, our data show that reactive constructions are evidence for a dynamic and dialogical conception of language and languaging, including grammatical constructions.

1 Introduction: Reactive constructions in dialogue

This chapter takes its empirical point of departure in a couple of - in some ways rather peculiar - responsive constructions which have been attested mainly for Swedish, but also in other languages, and at least marginally for German (Mertzluft/Linell, f.c.). These constructions belong to a subclass of responsive constructions that we will call reactive constructions. (The meaning of this term will be explicated at length in the following text.) The two constructions that we will focus on will be called x-och/und-x (i.e. x-and-x) 'double initial auxiliaries' (= DIA) construction.

The purposes of the paper are twofold. We use the constructions in a discussion of what one might mean by a grammar for dialogical language (a dialogical grammar). Secondly, we are interested in why two such closely related languages as Swedish and German are both similar and different in the forms and uses of these reactive constructions.
For a start, here are some examples:

(1) Swedish x-och-x: Transcribed from a trailer (March 2007) for an upcoming series of talk-shows on Swedish state television (Carin tjutt å trettå ‘Carin 21.30’) to be led by a well-known journalist, Carin Hjulström; S = background speaker voice, C = Carin Hjulström who appears on the screen

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S:</td>
<td>Carin tjutt å trettå (.) e tibaka.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carin twenty-one thirty () is back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C:</td>
<td>tibaka å tibaka ja har ju vatt här helå tiden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>back and back I have PRF been here all the time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X-och-x builds upon the fact that an expression x has been used in the situated interaction, more precisely in an adjacent prior utterance. In (1), C repeats, and “reacts” to, the expression t(l)ibaka ‘back’ (in the x-och-x frame, bold in line 2) taken from S’s prior utterance. (Note that å is the colloquial spoken variant of och ‘and’ in Swedish.) In line 1, S makes an announcement, and C’s problem is that she can neither completely confirm nor disconfirm this. This is why she uses the reactive construction x-och-x. The term reactive thus refers both to the fact that the speaker starts a rejoinder by repeating an expression (x) used just before in the local context, and the fact that this new utterance (the rejoinder) implies that (s)he does not find the use of x situationally quite adequate. The point in (1) is that the talk-show Carin tjutt å trettå, named after its leader Carin, has not been on the air for some time. However, the person Carin herself has appeared in other programs (“has been here all the time”). The x-och-x segment functions as a retrospective problem-signalling expression (Papantoniou 2012). The whole x-och-x construction, that is, the x-och-x segment plus the following explication, is a metacommunicative method commenting on the polyvalency of x in the local context.

---

1 The transcription conventions for excerpts of spoken language used in this chapter are basically those of Conversation Analysis (see e.g. Atkinson & Heritage 1984: ix-xvi). Note, however, the following points:

- Spoken utterances are given in Courier New. Parts given in boldface are parts that the analyst wants to highlight; thus, boldface does not index physical properties of the utterances. Underlinings of letters (vowel signs) marks syllabic nuclei in focally stressed words.
- Excerpts from the Internet are given in italics. Spellings in the Internet originals have not been changed, despite the fact that they often deviate from the written norms. Layout details have been levelled and simplified (differences in fonts, font sizes, boldface etc. have been eliminated).

---

X-och-x is quite a frequent construction in Swedish talk-in-interaction. The construction occurs in Danish, Norwegian and Finnish too, and at least marginally in German. Finkbeiner (2012) has documented a number of the instances from the Internet, but apparently so far no recorded examples from ordinary conversations. Here is an example from the Internet:

(2) German x-und-x (Internet; Finkbeiner, 2012: 11, translated by the authors (about horse-claths))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A:</th>
<th>Hab grad geschaut, die gibts zB bei Schockemühle für 79 euro. Total geil sehen sie aus!? [...] Schade, dass sie so teuer sind!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I've just checked it, they are available for example at Schockemühle for 79 Euros. They look totally great! [...] What a pity that they are so expensive!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B:</th>
<th>Naja, teuer und teuer, wenn die Qualität stimmt dann finde ich den Preis okay. Im Vergleich dazu kostet eine gute Eskadron Schabracke das Gleiche.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well, expensive and expensive, if the quality is right, then I agree with the price. In comparison with this a good Eskadron saddle pad is the same price.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By using the x-und-x construction, B suggests that A’s statement about saddle pads of a certain brand being teuer (‘expensive’) has to be reconsidered. This is even more highlighted by the use of the preceding discourse marker naja in the pre-front field. As Finkbeiner (2012:16) points out, the use of the discourse marker naja in the pre-front field is a characteristic feature of the German x-und-x construction. The x-und-x segment is followed by a conditional clause in which B elaborates on the concept of expensive: not an absolute price, but a great value for money should be the major reason for something being worth money (Finkbeiner 2012: 11). Thus, x-und/xoch-x expresses, or constructs, a semantic scalability (Norén & Linell 2007).

Our second reactive construction in this paper (there are several other constructions, as shown in (5) below) is DIA:

(3) Swedish DIA: A and B have engaged a carpenter C to discuss a number of renovative jobs. Here the topic is what to do with a worn-out and stained wooden board in the kitchen; should it be exchanged altogether, or could one polish up the old board? The latter alternative is currently discussed, and A asks C:

---

2 The same holds for Hrnal (2011).
Here we find in the reactive utterance first an infinitival form of a modal verb used in the prior utterance, followed by the same verb in the present tense. DIA is used by B in order to express that the pre-condition mentioned in the prior question (permission to masquerade oneself as adolf) does hold but that this is irrelevant since there is another, opposed pre-condition (it is distasteful) which is specified in the subsequent but-clause. The latter pre-condition is regarded by the speaker to be situationally more important and relevant than the first one.

English does not seem to be a language where reactive constructions of these types thrive, something which you can glean from our awkward attempts at translating them by following the originals closely.

A general definition of reactive construction (according to our theory) would run basically as follows: A reactive (utterance or construction) involves the speaker’s repetition of an expression x which has been used in a prior utterance by the another speaker or (less commonly) by the speaker him/herself. Repetition can be used in different functions, for example, confirmation, repair or challenge (Sidnell 2010, Curl 2005, Tannen 1987). Here, it is the last-mentioned function; the speaker reacts to or against the previous speaker’s way of expressing him/herself, his/her use of the expression x. The repetition(s), or quote(s), regularly occur(s) in the beginning (technically: the pre-front field or front field) of the new utterance or TCU. After this first segment containing the repeat(s), the speaker starts to negotiate the situated meaning of x and to relativise its applicability in the particular situation.

This chapter will proceed according to the following plan. In the two following sections (2–3), we account for our debt to two contemporary traditions in usage-based grammar, namely, on-line syntax and Construction Grammar. We will then (section 4) outline some principles for a dialogical meta-theory of human sense-making, with special regard for a dialogical description of interactional language (language use) (“dialogical grammar”). In order to flesh out some features of dialogical grammars, we will then discuss our two reactive constructions in more detail in the next section (5). We use data from both spoken interaction and the Internet. Since Swedish and German exhibit some differences of form and function of the two constructions, we shall also briefly discuss some tentative explanations of the differences between these two rather closely related languages (section 6). Finally, we discuss how these reactive constructions provide evidence for a dialogical grammar.
2 On-line syntax

The theory of on-line syntax has been developed and elaborated in a number of influential texts by Peter Auer (2005, 2009a, 2009b, 2013). Other important work includes that of Günthner (2011). On-line syntax aims at accounting for the syntactic units and processes at play in dynamic, temporally distributed utterance building (and recognition). In part it builds upon ideas from emergent grammar (e.g. Hopper 2011).

According to the on-line theory, utterances are built incrementally, piece-by-piece, rather than laid out from a prior, comprehensive plan (Linell 2013). Important ingredients in the utterance-building process is the generation of projections of possible continuations of the evolving utterance, and then the fulfillment (or partial fulfillment due to on-line changes) of projections. That is, earlier segments often project more to come, and later segments may constitute fulfillments of these projections (unless the speaker redirects his/her utterance in the course of its development). In addition to this utterance-internal projection, the utterance as a whole may of course point backwards to prior utterances, and project forwards to possible next utterances. The latter point motivates our use of the terms responsive and projective utterances (and constructions).3

Research has shown that in on-line activities, pragmatic, syntactic and phonological aspects are processed in parallel in both speakers’ utterance production and listeners’ understanding. The pre-front field and front field of an utterance, at least in languages like German and Swedish, tend to contain projection-rich material allowing listeners to identify the upcoming main utterance type (early identifiability: Linell 2013). In general, that sequences of actions and utterances evolve in real time is strongly highlighted in on-line syntax (Auer 2013).

3 Cf. Couper-Kuhlen/Fox/Thompson (in this volume).

3 Construction grammar

In recent years, Construction Grammar (CxG) has been promoted to an influential framework in the study of (especially) spoken language. Originally, it was inspired by work by Charles Fillmore (e.g. Fillmore et al. 1988). A concise introduction is Fried & Östman (2005). We summarise some of its ideas, supplemented here by some interactionist (dialogical) ideas:

- Constructions (as units of language) are dynamic and adaptable, and situated constructs in actual utterances are built on-line.
- CxG is, therefore, about real utterances, not about underlying structures of some mental language; in technical terms, the theory is monostratal and non-derivational.
- Grammatical constructions can be seen as entrenched patterns, or as methods for building utterances and recognising utterance types in real language (Linell, 2013).
- Specific utterances can realise or implement several constructions simultaneously.
- Constructions are often realised in different phases of utterances: initial and final peripheries, core clause, etc. Initial and final peripheries carry relatively more responsibility vs. projectivity, respectively. Utterance types (i.e. constructions) are often characterised by early identifiability (Linell 2013; and below).
- Constructions often have a defining segment (core segment); in reactive constructions, this is often the first segment. While this segment is followed by more material (which contains the elaboration of the problem that has elicited the reaction) in typical instantiations, reactive utterances can sometimes be truncated after the initial core segment (tibaka a tibaka or teuer und teuer in x-och/und-x (excerpts 1, 2), kan kan/dürfen darf in DIA (3, 4)). Truncability can thus be taken as evidence for their status as entrenched constructions.

Despite the points above, many influential variants of CxG still suffer from an interactional deficit, that is, they use a rather static structural framework and made-up examples out of context. It is therefore crucial to develop an interactional (or dialogical) understanding of constructions (Thompson & Ono 2005, Linell 2009: ch. 14). Indeed, much work has already been done, particularly in Germany, to bring together interactional linguistics with ideas from CxG (Imo 2007, Birkner 2008, Bückler 2012, and contributions to Günthner & Imo 2006, Günthner & Bückler 2009, Auer & Pfänder 2011). Several contributions to this volume, including the present paper, are designed to do the same.4

4 Cf. also Bückler (in this volume); Günthner (in this volume); Imo (in this volume).
4 Dialogical meta-theory

Both on-line syntax and CxG are usage-based (cf. Bybee 2010), that is, they deal with how language is actually used in languaging. This attitude is certainly part and parcel of our approach as well. However, we regard (inter)activities in actual situated cognitive and communicative projects as the “real phenomenon”, and we therefore prefer the action-based term languaging to language use/usage, since the latter suggests that the language system is after all primary and merely “used” in performance. However, this is obviously not to deny that there are systematic aspects in languaging (see below).

Human existence is characterised by dialogality, that is, we live in a world which we make meaningful with the help of others. Indeed, we are born into a world which has already been meaningfully constructed by earlier generations and their artifacts. Accordingly, it is not individuals who make meaning by themselves. A dialogical meta-framework for theories of human sense-making therefore emphasises other-interdependence between participants and their contributions to discourse, as well as more generally interactivity and contexts (Linell 2009). The approach may be called meta-theoretical since it is very comprehensive and hence abstract; an interactional theory of grammatical constructions or an on-line theory of situated emergence of utterances are in comparison more concrete theories.

As regards language and languaging, dialogical principles of sense-making naturally come to the fore-front. These principles include aspects such as the following:

- Contributions to a sequence of interaction with two or more participants are interlinked. There is a tendency for participants to reuse the others’ (and their own) words with variation (Anward, in this volume); there is resonance or affinity (Du Bois 2009) between utterances, that is, a speaker may repeat some of the other’s words, in lexico-grammatically the same or similar form but often prosodically reaccentuated. Such inter-turn links may emphasise agreement and consensus, or difference and competition (cf. intersubjectivity and alterity in dialogical theory; e.g. Linell 2009). In terms of Goodwin’s (1990: 177ff.) related notion of format tying, partial repetition of others’ utterances is used mainly for competitive purposes (Goodwin is particularly concerned with ritual insults among young Black girls).

- Accordingly, utterances have external relations to prior actions (responsive relations) and to possible next actions (projective relations). Such properties may also be built into grammatical constructions of the language system; we may talk about responsive or projective constructions, and some constructions have both these external relations at the same time. In this paper, we will focus on a few particular types of responsive constructions (reactives) in Swedish and German.

- The preceding point has a turn- or utterance-internal counterpart. Utterance building is analysable in terms of projectivity and fulfillment or alteration of projections (the latter points are equal to internal responsivity) (Linell 2013; Günthner 2011). This is a corner-stone of on-line syntax (see section 2), and can be seen as an indication of a speaker’s internal dialogue: the speaker orients to different positions (or voices), his own, those of the other participants and those of others not even present.

- The fact that continuations of utterances can be anticipated, due to projection, implies that speaker and listener can process on-line utterance building and utterance understanding partly in parallel. This synchronisation enables listeners to complete a speaker’s utterance which is still in progress (collaborative, or competitive, completion), or they can take over the turn immediately, without any lapse at all, after the previous speaker’s turn completion (e.g. Lerner 2002). Such synchronisation implies that speaker and listener coordinate their activities on-line in a truly dialogical way (Howes 2012): these activities are not purely individual or mutually independent (Auer 2013).

- If parties to a dialogue (at least sometimes) strive to determine the degree to which they mutually understand each other (establish intersubjectivity), the phenomenon of third-position repair (Schegloff 1992) seems particularly interesting: here a speaker A – in a third-positioned response – tries to remedy what seems to be a misunderstanding on the part of speaker B in his second-positioned response to A’s first-positioned turn (the trouble source). This is a “dialogical” process; it takes two to communicate.

- The deployment of linguistic resources (lexical items, grammatical constructions) is subject to activity-grammar interdependence: constructions, as entrenched patterns of languaging, are characterised not only by their grammatical structures and local pragmatic functions but also by their links to communicative activity types (Linell 2010) and communicative genres (Günthner & Knoblauch 1995).

These, and other, points have to be accounted for in a dialogical grammar. However, there is not yet a full-blown theory of dialogical grammar. Would such a grammar be different from, for example, a grammar for interaction (cf. also Schegloff’s (1979) early term syntax for conversation) or interactional linguistics? We will have to await further work. However, we would like to point out that a dialogical grammar cannot deal exclusively with specific interactions, since it...
has to incorporate systematic aspects of language too. Indeed, participants in specific interactions often orient to different grammatical options offered by their language (cf. below). In Linell’s (2009) terms, the grammar must deal with languaging at different time-scales, both situated interactions and practices or traditions that transcend specific situations. Yet, the “systematic aspects” would most probably be less far-reaching than in most types of present-day formal grammars (e.g. generative hyperstructuralism). For example, there would be less of extensive hierarchies, and more of fragmented features (e.g. combinations of different constructions and “pre-fabricated” segments) and “richly specified” units (formally exhibiting “redundance”) (Bybee 2010).5

5 Data

Our main data deal with reactive constructions as defined in the introduction. The Swedish examples are drawn from a corpus collected in the years 2007–2013 and consisting of about 40 authentic spoken instances of x-och-x and 10 of DIA from everyday settings and mediated discourse (radio, TV) (transcribed or sometimes noted down on the spot) and a corpus of (written) Internet data, about 100 each for x-och-x and DIA (for details, see Linell 2011). For German, we used a corpus of everyday conversations collected and transcribed in the years 1999–2012 at the University of Freiburg and a corpus of Internet data collected by one of the authors (CM).

Before going into x-och-x and DIA – our data for this study – in more detail, let us point out that these two are not the only ones in the family of reactive constructions, not even in Swedish and German. In order to illustrate the use of these constructions, let us imagine a situation in which two persons A and B are watching a rough and rocky, seemingly inconvenient coastline, and A asks:

Ran man båda här? “Can you swim here?” (the example is built on an authentic case quoted below as (9)). Suppose, furthermore, that B feels that she cannot answer a straight yes or no. She can then select a reactive construction that problematises the use of the modal auxiliary kan. There are a number of alternatives to choose from, in particular x-och-x (5a) below, free-standing x (5b), echo-Q (5c), DIA (5d), and vadda-x (5e).7

(5) (a) (nå/ja) kan och kan, det beror på.... x-och-x, se Lindström & Linell 2007
    can and can, it depends...; for German, see Finkbeiner 2012
(b) kan?, ja, det kanske man kan, men... (free-standing x in the pre-front field)
    can? well, perhaps you can but...
    (German: naja, können, was heisst schon können/ich weiss nicht)
(c) om man kan? ja, det kanske man kan, men... [echo question, in Swedish: “if” + subject + predicate of the source question]
    can one do it? (lit.: if one can?) yes, perhaps but...
(d) kan kan väl men vill vill man inte (XmaxXmax or DIA, Linell & Norén 2009)
    can one maybe but one would not want to (lit: wants wants one not)
(e) vadda kan? hur menar du då? (vadda-x, Linell & Norén 2012)
    (lit.: what then can? how do you mean? (for German, see Egbert & Vöge 2008; Hrcnal 2011; Günther 2013)

These alternatives differ in their degree of politeness. X-och-x (5a), free-standing x (b) and DIA (d) are more indirect methods of disagreeing with another speaker’s utterance. Both x-och-x and DIA are negative politeness strategies (Brown & Levinson 1987) since they are oriented towards the hearer’s negative face, as compared to the more confrontative (e).

In the following text, we will deal only with x-och/und-x and DIA. Since DIA is structurally and pragmatically more complex, and has not been treated for German before, we will use more space for that.

5 Yet, Bybee (2010), and many other proponents of “usage-based linguistics”, seem to underestimate the importance of the language and the individual users’ “usage” of the system. Moreover, the main features of “usage” taken into consideration concern frequencies. These are surely important for users’ knowledge of their language, but will not constitute a full theory of languaging.

6 We are grateful to Peter Auer for providing us with data from different research projects carried out at the University of Freiburg.

7 These have been described in some detail for Swedish by Linell (2011). However, this list of reactive constructions is not exhaustive, not even for Swedish. For example, there is also the “incredulity response construction” (IRC) (e.g. A: Vill du bada? ‘Do you want to swim? ’B: Jag bada! Å du galen? ‘Me swim? Are you crazy?’). However, this is infrequent in spoken Swedish. IRC has been analysed in detail for German (Bücker 2008).

8 This was the alternative actually chosen in the situation alluded to (see (9) below).
5.1 X-och/und-x in Swedish and German

X-och-x is much more common than DIA in Swedish. Indeed, it is applicable to x’s of virtually any lexical category (Linell 2011). We saw a first example in (1) above. Here we will provide only one more example, a slightly longer one:

(6) From a TV interview

(SVT: “Min sanning” 2013-02-05); I = interviewer, H = former Swedish archbishop K G Hammar; H is being interviewed about religious, political and professional issues. In this episode I brings up H’s ambivalent attitude to making a personal career. H has just said that for him it was almost embarrassing to come forward as “the world’s greatest careerist” climbing to ever higher ecclesiastical positions:

01 I: ja du gjorde karriär, vad de inte då rätt viktigt för dej då?
yeah you made a career, wasn’t that fairly important for you then?
02 H: ja (...) jo (...) viktigt att viktigt att (...) det var ju
vitakt att ha en position där man kunde göra
03 skillnad (0.5) och eh (...) men ja har ju inte sakta
04 ett jobb sen sen (...), att säga (0.3) det var senaste
05 gången jag sökte ett jobb så jag menar jag har
06 ikom härmot i situationen vare sej ja ville de
07 eller inte
08 yes well important and important, it was of course important to have a position in which you could make a difference, and I haven’t applied for a job since eighty-six, that was the latest time I applied for a job so I mean I have so-to-speak ended up in the situation whether I wanted to or not
09 I: du måste ju ha velat göra karriär;
you must have wanted to make a career?
10 H: ja, ja kunde ju ha sagt nej, just de. (...) oké.
11 men de viktiga har inte varit att bli dom här
12 positivernas, något till vilken jag stanna i Lund ...
13 Lynda stift, därför att tänkte att ja skulle ...
14 vilka göra man slags mental förändring att de mystika
15 hållet att de tar tid men ja har sagt hon själv är på
16 mej som biskop i Lynd. så låt oss börja långsamt att
17 metodist
18 ...
yes yes I could have said no, precisely, okay. but the important thing has not been to become those positions, actually I wanted to stay in Lund, in the diocese of Lund. because I thought that I would make a kind of
19 mental changes in the mystical direction and that takes times but I have
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sixteen seventeen years to go as a bishop in Lund, so let us start slowly and
methodically

Here both the concession (roughly lines 3–9) and counter-argument (lines 12–18, starting with men ‘but’ in line 12 and a recap of the word viktigt(‘important’).
In other instances, especially when the whole x-och-x response is relatively short, men occurs only occasionally in the counter-argument part of x-och-x, while it is very common in DIA (cf. below).

One important point is that the initial segments identify the upcoming utterance as a problematicating one. This illustrates that the utterance types are often projected at an early stage (early identifiability, Linell, see below). The fact that the utterance can be identified early also means that it can be truncated, that is, the full construction need not always be made manifest. Thus, x-och-x in Swedish can be interrupted immediately after the x-och-x segment, as in (7):

(7) Internet (W1: ville4)

Tack till Jan för hjälp med datorn och till Horst för att han ville vara med på
bilden (eller, ville och ville...)

Thanks to Jan for help with the computer and to Horst for the fact that he wanted to be part of the picture (or wanted and wanted...)

(note that vilja (present tense: vill) is a modal auxiliary in Swedish, although it is often used like a main verb meaning ‘want (to)’ or ‘wish (to)’)

Here, the writer evidently initiates an x-och-x construction but interrupts it immediately after the x-och-x phrase. In and through this, he suggests that Horst did not actually wish to be part of the picture, although he does not specify what for him (the writer) speaks for this interpretation. In any case, the truncability of the construction is evidence that it has a well-established identity in the language and that it can therefore be determined quite early (early identifiability).

Leaving this topic and finally turning to German examples, we can first notice that x-und-x is much less frequent than x-och-x in Swedish; Finkbeiner (2012) only attested it in electronic discourse. Our own corpus searches for instations of this construction in several German spoken language corpora gave no results. There are also some formal differences between the languages. A German example from the Internet is (8):
(8) (example from Finkbeiner 2012:12)
A: also ich dachte montag · freitag trockenfutter und samstag sonntag gibt es nassfutter.
   ist das gut??? dann futter also bei trockenfutter orfien und nassfutter real natur vom fressnapf

   [PRT] I thought dry food from Monday to Friday and Saturday, Sunday there’s wet food. Is this good??? Then food [PRT] if dry food “orfien” and wet food “real nature” ord “fressnapf”.

B: Naja, Gut und Gut, mir scheinen diese Futtersorten recht ausgewogen, aber gesundes Futter ist eh eine Wissenschaft für sich. Du kannst das gesündeste Futter anbieten, nun müssen es Deine Samtpfoten aber auch noch Fressen....
   Well, good and good, these food types seem to be quite balanced, but healthy food is [PRT] a science for itself. You can offer the healthiest food, it is necessary that your velvet paws will eat it.

In (8) A asks if certain kinds of animal food stuffs are “good” (for cats?). B answers using an x-und-x construction preceded by the discourse marker naja in order to show that the expression good has to be elaborated. Even if this kind of animal food is “good” (in the sense of healthy), there are still other factors, such as the fact that the pets might not like this food, which have to be considered. Thus, B expresses that he wouldn’t classify the food mentioned by A as “good” without making any restrictions (Finkbeiner 2012: 12). As already mentioned, x-und-x is often used with a preceding naja in German. On the one hand, the discourse marker naja in the pre-front field reflects a negative stance towards the prior speaker’s utterance (one may compare the ambivalent ja jo preceding the x-och-x segment in line 3 of (6)). On the other hand, it usually projects more to come, in this case an explanation why the speaker reacts towards the prior utterance. If naja is used in front of an x-und-x construction the projection is expanded by the x-und-x segment which itself projects an elaboration.

5.2 DIA in Swedish and German

Turning to DIA, it appears to be the only reactive that is limited to auxiliaries. In Swedish, the most common verb involved is kunna ‘to be able to’, usually in the present tense (kan ‘can’). We have seen it in (3), and (9) is another example:

(9) A and B are looking at the sea and a rather rough coast-line:

1 A: kan man bade här?
   can you swim here?

2 B: kan kan man väl men vill vill man väl inte
   you can (lit.: can you) probably but you probably don’t want to (lit.: want want you not)

With regard to Du Bois’s (2009) dialogical notion of affinity between adjacent utterances (see above, section 4), we sometimes have, as in (9), both affinity across turns (both A and B use the modal kan) and within-turn affinity (two parallel double-auxiliary segments, the latter (with vill) mirroring the first one; both in boldface above). Such structures occur in a minority of DIA cases in both Swedish and German. One might suggest that the propensity for such mirroring is an attractive feature for some speakers who might perceive this as an opportunity for playing with words.9

Like the x-och/und-x-construction, DIA contains an initial segment (here: two tokens of the same auxiliary) which projects the problematising aspect of the utterance at an early stage (early identifiability, Linell 2013). The fact that the utterance type can be identified by this core segment at an early stage supports our argumentation that DIA can be classified as a construction (see above, section 3).

Sometimes, the second part of the full DIA construction can be expanded after the men-clause:

(10) (Recorded from Swedish Radio (SR 1: Nya Vägen 13.11.12)).
   The radio program takes up a recent cinema film (“Call Girl”) with a background in a political scandal in Sweden involving prostitution in the 1970’s. This discussion takes place soon after the first night performance of the film (in 2012), when the public debate revolved around the allusion to a theory that the then prime minister, here called Lars Almfelt, would have been a prostitution customer. P = program leader. D = one out of several invited discussants. Boldface

   is used to mark the core segment of the DIA construction, and its source in the prior utterance.

1 P: kan man göra <Någon annan> tolkning än att
2 statsministern i filmen e ett porträtt av Lars
3 Almfelt?

9 See Breyer et al. (2011) on improvisation in talk and its relation to emergent constructions.
Can one make any other interpretation than that (of) the prime minister in the film being portrait of Lars Almfelt?

D: kan kan man säkert om man verkliga vill de men de
4 e ganska svår.- allså affären (...) hände under en viss
dtid då Almfelt satt vid makten och man använder en
del citat som jag tycker är direkta Almfelt-citat [...] 
One can (lit.: can can one) certainly if one really wants to but it’s rather difficult, that is, the affair took place during a certain period when Almfelt was in power
and one uses a number of quotations that I think are direct Almfelt quotations [...]

The reactive response starts in line 4 with a double repeat of the modal auxiliary kan ‘can’. After the initial concession (‘One certainly can if one really wants to’), the ‘but’-clause with the counter-argument comes (‘but it’s rather difficult’). This is then expanded, starting in line 5 with allså ‘well, that is’, a discourse marker that regularly prefigures a lengthy answer (which is produced here only in part).

Although kan is by far the most frequent modal verb in DIA, there are others as well, such as vill ‘want to’ and måste ‘must’ (11, 12):

A and B are talking about a female friend who used to work with amateur theatre in her young age but is now very much engaged in a demanding academic job:

1 A: hon skulle nog villa hålla på me teater nu me
she would probably (PRT) want to engage in theatre work now as well
2 B: ja vill vill hon nog men frågan e om hinner
well she does probably but the question is if she has got the time

In (11), the typical DIA construction occurs in line 2, with initial double modal verbs (auxiliaries) in the first clause, followed by a complex men-clause with a pseudo-auxiliary (hinner ‘has got the time’), but without the doubling of auxiliaries mirroring that of the first clause, as in (9). (An alternative men-clause, including mirroring, could have been: men hinner hinner hon (nog) inte.) Now the implicit negation of the second (complex) clause in (11) is instead expressed periphrastically with frågan e om ‘the question is if’. Example (12) is similar in some respects, but here the men-clause is simpler and not negated.

Evidence for a Dialogical Grammar

(12) (Internet)
A: måste man ha sex pâ bröllaps natten?
Does one need to have sex on the wedding night?
B: Svår fråga... Måste, måste man ju inte men det hör ju till [...]
Difficult question... must must one PRT not (i.e. one doesn’t have to) but it’s PRT part of it [...]

DIA is often used in expert-novice constellations where the novice asks a question (requests information) and the expert gives the answer (conveys information). Thus, the settings are characterized by speakers who differ in their epistemic status (Heritage 2012a, 2012b), i.e. “persons recognize one another to be more or less knowledgeable concerning some domain of knowledge as more or less settled matter of fact” (Heritage 2012b:32).

As shown in Linell & Norén (2012), DIA occurs in Swedish also with so-called pseudo-auxiliaries: våga ‘dare (to)’, bruka ‘use (to)’, orka ‘have the strength (to)’, hinner ‘have time (to)’, behöva ‘need (to)’, slippa ‘be spared (from)’, not need (to), försöka ‘try (to)’, råka ‘happen to’, klara ‘manage (to)’ (cf. 13, 14, 15), and a few other verbs (16):

(13) (Conversational example noted down)
A and B have had a water-pipe accident, with a general flooding, in their flat which they rent temporarily. They have installed radiators to dry out the moisture. Now they are going for a day excursion with C, who is the daughter of the landlord and knows about the conditions.

1 A: vågar vi lämna elementen på när vi åker bort?
Dare we (i.e. do we dare) leave the radiators on when we go away?
B: ja vågar vi nå väl men de behövs inte
Dare you (i.e. you do dare) PRT but it’s not necessary

10 Pseudo-auxiliaries in Swedish share some but not all morphosyntactic and semantic properties with modal verbs and other auxiliaries. However, they also have some things in common with main verbs (SAG, II: 536–543). It is possible that the class of pseudo-auxiliaries that can occur in the DIA construction is potentially larger than we have so far been able to attest (Linell, 2011). Bylin (2013) describes a number of (originally) main verbs in Swedish which have been partially 'auxiliarised': börja ‘start (to)’, sluta ‘stop (to)’, fortsätta ‘continue (to)’, tendera ‘tend (to)’, hotta ‘threaten (to)’ and bruka ‘use (to)’. Of these, we have so far only found DIA with bruka (see (15)).
Evidence for a Dialogical Grammar

(14) (Internet)
A: hade bestämt att jag skulle himna cykla och göra rent akvariet oxå... men de
  hann jag inte...eller hann hann jag väl men jag orkade inte
  Had decided that I would have time to bike and clean the aquarium too... but I didn’t have
  the time... or had time had I PRT but I didn’t have the strength

(15) (Internet)
A: Vilket sminkmärke är ert favoritmärke?
  Which make-up brand is your favourite trade-mark?
B: Om jag inte handlar där så brukar jag handla från i.d.
  Eller brukar brukar jag väl inte, men jag har en
  foundation from dem och den är såh bra!
  If I don’t shop there then I use to (i.e. usually) buy from i.d.
  Or I don’t use to (lit.: use use I PRT not), but I have a foundation from them and it is so: good!

Another auxiliary-like verb that frequently occurs in DIA is gå ‘go, be possible, function’:

(16) (Internet)
A: Går det att jämna ett land med marken?
  Is it possible to level down a country with the ground?
B: Alltså går går det ju så klart, men det krävs oerhört mycket jobb och just
  detta känns inte så realistiskt.
  Well goes goes it (i.e. it does work ‘go’), it is possible of course, but it takes an enormous
  amount of work and precisely this does not seem to be that realistic.

Let us summarise some of the properties of DIA. The construction starts with the
reduplication of a modal auxiliary or pseudo-auxiliary copying an identical
item in a prior utterance. Then there is a men (‘but’)-clause with either another
auxiliary or pseudo-auxiliary (duplicated (9) or not (11, 14)) or another expression
formulating the other (more) relevant condition (10, 12, 15, 16).

DIA can be either other-reactive (9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16) or self-reactive (14, 15).
Repeats in reactive constructions are morphologically identical or at least
lexically identical with the source (some exceptions with close synonyms have been
attested at least in x-och-x). Prosodically, there is usually some modification; repeats
tend to be stressed, sometimes with emotive superimpositions.

As regards DIA in German, we have already mentioned that the first occurrence
of the modal verb in the reactive utterance cannot be finite, despite the
fact that the source is usually finite. It always appears in the infinitive, as we
saw in (4). Here are a couple of additional examples from the Internet:

(17) (Internet)
A: muss ich meine katzen chipen lassen?
  Do I have to chip my cat?
B: Müssten musst Du gar nicht. Wenn Du sie mit ins
  Ausland nehmen willst brauchen sie einen Chip, derzeit gilt auch noch eine gut
  lesbare Tätowierung im Ohr. Chip geht schneller und einfacher, ohne
  Betäubung mit der Spritze unter die Haut. Zum Tätowieren muss die Katze in
  Narkose.
  Must must you nothing at all (i.e. you don’t need to). But if you want to take her abroad she
  needs a chip, at the moment a good clearly readable tattoo even counts. Chipping goes faster
  and easier, without anaesthesia with a syringe under the skin. For tattooing the cat needs
  anaesthesia.

B reacts to A’s question whether he has to chip his cat by using the DIA-
construction Müssten musst Du gar nicht. The following counter-argument,
expressed in the subsequent clause (if you want to travel abroad your cat has to
be chipped or at least tattooed, but the latter is not so comfortable for the cat),
clarifies that the negation of the modality expressed in the DIA-construction
actually can be partly irrelevant, if a special condition (travelling abroad with
the cat) holds.

(18) (Internet)
A and B discuss about changing the monitor resolution when playing computer
games:
A: Was hast du für einen Monitor ? Ich kann meinen 19er TFT problemlos in
  800x600 betreiben. [...]
  What kind of monitor do you have? I can operate my 19” TFT at 800x600 without problems.
B: Können kann ich, wollen will ich nicht. Weil die schlechte Optik den Spaß
  verdirbt.
  Can I (i.e. I can), but I want want not (i.e. I don’t want). Because the bad resolution will
  ruin the fun.

In (18) we have two parallel double-auxiliary segments (compare the Swedish
example in (9)). The first one, können kann, is a reactive response to the adja-
cent implicit question (can one use a 19” TFT monitor with a 800x600 resolution?).
The modality actualised in the source utterance (‘can’) turns out to be
less relevant in favour of another modality (‘want to’) which is expressed in the
second double-auxiliary segment. This concession is then expanded with a
‘because’-clause which elaborates the reason why B doesn’t want to use a moni-
tor with a certain technical standard (the reason is that the bad resolution will ruin the fun).

German does not have many pseudo-auxiliaries of the type exemplified in Swedish. In fact, the only German verb that we have attested with DIA is *brauchen*:

(19) (Internet)
A: *Für zum armburstschiessen braucht man doch so eine Lederjacke, damit man nicht so zittert.*
   For crossbow shooting you need nevertheless such a leather jacket, so that you don't tremble that much.
B: *Brauchen braucht man diese nicht.* *Wem's aber gefällt: Schiessjacke, z.B.*
   Need you not (i.e. you don't need it). Those who like it: shooting jacket, e.g.

The modality that is denied in the DIA segment of (19) is necessity. Instead another modality (optionality based on preference) is stated as the relevant one.

5.3 Some variations

A few remarks will be added here (as regards Swedish, see also Linell 2011). First, both languages have a related periphrastic construction with *göra* and *tun*, both meaning ‘do’. *Göra* periphrasis is not possible with true modal verbs in Swedish (they have Pro-forms that are identical with the modal auxiliary, which explains their occurrence in DIA (examples 3, 9, etc.)). Only pseudo-auxiliaries can take *göra*, after the first repeat which is then either in the infinitive or a finite form. Here is an example with the finite pseudo-auxiliary (*hinner* ‘have the time to’) and the pro-form *gör* (present tense):

(20) (Internet)
*en kort kavaj som inte såddär proper o prydig ska jag köpa snart, men just nu hinner jag inte leta. (hinner gör jag nog, men gör gör jag inte. medvetet.*

A short jacket that is not that neat an’ tidy I will soon buy, but just now I don’t have the time to search. (have time I do probably, but I don’t do it, consciously.)

Here, the writer puts her pseudo-aux+*gör* construction within parentheses, as a kind of modifying afterthought to herself (self-responsively). Note also the DIA-like segment in the following *men-clause* (compare example (9)). The pattern is used here with *göra*, in spite of the fact that this is not a modal auxiliary.

The German *tun* periphrasis, which is comparable to DIA, is often used in order to introduce an opposed, contradictory opinion (Schwitalla 2006). The following example from our own data illustrates this:

(21) (Internet)
A: *Hallo zusammen, habe hier mehrfach gelesen, dass Mütter zu o.g. Kursen gehen. Muss man das denn? Fühle mich langsam schlecht, weil ich das nicht mache.[...]*
   Hi there, I’ve read here several times that mothers do attend the kind of courses listed above. Does one really have to? Starting to feel bad myself because I don’t do so.
B: *Hallo! Also müssen tut man nichts und wenn bei dir ja ein regelmäßiger Kontakt zu anderen Mamas mit Kindern stattfindet ist das ok.*
   Hi! Now there’s nothing one does have to do and if you have regular contact with other mummies having kids than it’s ok.

The aux+tun construction at the beginning of B’s contribution is characterised by a repetition of the modal verb *müssen* which appears in A’s prior contribution in finite form (muss). Thus, the formal anatomy of aux+tun and that of DIA are almost identical. With regard to the function too, there are similarities between the two constructions. In (21) B uses the aux+tun construction in order to express that the modality (*müssen*) is principally irrelevant (you don’t have to do anything), after which she delivers a concrete answer to A’s question in the following conditional-clause (if you have regular contact with mummies you don’t need to go to such courses).

As we can see in the following example, the tun-periphrasis can even consist of a main verb+tun.

(22) Example from the reality tv-show “Die Fußbodenräuber” which is about a working-class family in Cologne. Frank (the son) is discussing with his mother (Annemie) because she wants him to stop weight training.

1  Frank: *ich bin siebenundzwanzig*
   I am twenty seven years old
2  wat willst mir denn *verboten*
   what do you want to forbid me
3  Annemie: *nee verzieht [ten] tu ich se dir ja nisch
   no I don’t forbid you that
4  Frank: *na also*
   [na also-
5  und wenn de jetz jeden tach mir hier
   and if you bother me the whole day
6  in den ohren liegst*
Finally, we should mention that a peculiar construction with double initial main verbs occurs in some German dialects (Fleischer 2008), but not in Swedish. This construction is similar to DIA. Here is an example from Fleischer:

(24) Trinken trinkt er nicht, aber rauchen raucht er.
He does not drink (lit.: drink drinks he not), but he does smoke (lit.: smoke smokes he") (i.e. he is not a drinker but he is a smoker)

Most German speakers would undoubtedly find this construction very strange, but it appears that it nevertheless occurs in some dialects, and in many other languages (Fleischer, op.cit.).\footnote{The actual example (24) is used by Fleischer (2008) in the title of his article. It appears to be a bit simplified, but Fleischer adds many authentic examples, some of which from historical dialect descriptions, from various German dialects. We have had the occurrences of similar constructions in other languages confirmed by language experts. See also Mertzlfucht & Linell (forthc.)}

We are faced with a DIA-like construction (note the parallel double-verb segment in the ‘but’-clause) that occurs with main verbs rather than auxiliaries. Something similar is completely impossible in Swedish and standard German. It seems doubtful to us that this construction, occurring in many (Romance, Slavonic, Fenno-Ugric etc.; Fleischer, op.cit.) languages, has a common historical origin with DIA.

6 X-och/und-x and DIA in a cross-linguistic comparison

Both constructions, in both languages, are similar in one formal aspect; they both display two repeats of an expression x from a prior utterance, the repeats placed utterance-initially in one case (DIA) juxtaposed without any conjunction, and in the other (x-och-x) conjoined by ‘and’. Although there are examples of both constructions appearing one (x-och-x) before the other (DIA) in one and the same turn (and thus in the same situation; example (23)), the two are pragmatically different. X-och/und-x negotiates the situated meaning and appropriateness of x, in relation to its meaning potential and conceptual situated context (Norén & Linell 2007; Finkbeiner 2012). The speaker concedes that there are things speaking in favour of its situated use, but there are also things speaking against it. DIA, by contrast, suggests that the pre-condition or deontic circumstance associated with the auxiliary or pseudo-auxiliary x is less relevant, in...
comparison with another condition y mentioned in the second clause. Thus, the two constructions have different functional potentials.

Comparing the Swedish and German constructions, each seems pragmatically equivalent to its counterpart in the other language, but the ranges of x’s to which they can be applied are different in the two languages. In the next and final section, we will discuss the structural background to the differences briefly.  

First, we note a similarity between Swedish and German:

(a) Swedish allows for a great variety of clause-initial constituents, including finite verbs, in declarative utterances (free “fundaments”). In this respect, Swedish is comparable to German, and more liberal than Danish and English (Sigurðsson 2005).

But there are also numerous structural differences between the two languages:

(b) The absence of person agreement in Swedish verb inflection: A direct repeat (kan) of the source form (kan) is the most direct reactive, with many related cases, including, for example, a free-standing fronted x in the pre-front field: kan, de kan man... (see (5) above). After the initial auxiliary, DIA follows up with a second copy occurring in the normal V2-position (which requires a finite verb); modal auxiliaries having identical modal copies rather than the Pro-verb gör in Swedish. The absence of person agreement in Swedish finite verb forms greatly facilitates reactivies with verbs, including auxiliaries, since the source can be copied without modification; for example, a prior question with du as subject (kan du...?) can be followed by a reaction with jag as subject (kan jag...), while this is not possible in languages such as e.g. German which has a highly differentiated verbal paradigm, e.g. ich kann/du kannst/wir können, 'I/you/we can'. Thus, German, with equal diversity of constituent types in the front position (cf. (a) above) as Swedish, will choose the infinitive. However, in other reactive constructions, there is a competition between present tense (finite) and infinitive (infinite) in the initial position. In reactive constructions, especially x-och-x, the following asymmetrical tendencies in Swedish (→ here means ‘is substituted by’):

Source: usually PRES → repeat: PRES, but occasionally PRES → INF

Source: INF → repeat: INF (never the reverse: *INF → PRES)

Source: Ptcp/sup, pret → repeat: INF (‘PRES)

Hence, there is a certain asymmetry in favor of the infinitive. This is more pronounced in German. In languages in general, there appears to be a competition between finite verb forms in (1. or 3. p. sg.) present tense and the infinitive as the unmarked verb form. According to Finkbeiner (2012), this can be observed for German x-und-x, and it also explains why German only allows for XauterKauten.

(c) Swedish has a general predilection for two adjacent (sometimes och/å- conjoined) finite verb forms (marked in boldface), e.g. x-och-x: kan å kan,... “pseudo-coordination”: han står å röker ‘he is standing smoking’ (lit.: ‘stands and smokes’), sitter å sover ‘sits and sleeps’, jag går ut och går ‘goes out and walks’, double imperatives: våga våg dig! ‘dare weigh yourself’, försök lyft stenen! ‘try lift the stone’ (SAG IV: 709, 907), also with “pseudo-coordination” of imperatives: Sitt inte här å sovi! ‘Sit (comp.) not here and sleep’. Börja å läs där nere! ‘Start (comp.) read (comp.) down there’, Låt bli å nyp mej! ‘Let (comp.) go and pinch (comp.) me!’ and “double supine”: kunnat gjort ‘been able done (i.e. could do)’, constructions with a finite verb (of presence, e.g. ‘stand’, or motion, e.g. ‘run’) linked to the grammatical object of ha (Nordberg 1977): han har hästen står i stallen ‘he has his horse stands in the stable’. In several of these construction types, German will have the infinitive instead of a finite verb form (infinitives are marked in boldface), e.g. Versuch den Stein anzugehen! ‘Try to move the stone’. Moreover, infinitives are often preferred to morphological imperatives (Hier Parkschein lösen! ‘Pay for parking ticket here’, Nicht rauchen! ‘Don’t smoke’ etc.). These free infinitives always appear without the infinitive particle zu. As Deppermann (2006) points out, they are not solely used as equivalents for imperatives and (polite) instructions, but also to express a deontic proposition. Thus, deontic infinitive constructions serve as normative position statements for future actions (Deppermann 2006: 243).

(d) The class of pseudo-auxiliaries is much larger in Swedish than in German (virtually only brauchen, plus the obsolete pflegen), which may have increased the propensity in Swedish for XpåmaxXpamax (see above the text before

12 For a detailed comparative-contrastive discussion of the constructions, see Mertzluft & Linell (forthc.).

13 The awkward English translations in this paragraph are designed to imitate the Swedish constructions.
example (13)). Other German verbs corresponding to Swedish pseudo-auxiliaries are constructed with the infinitive particle zu ‘to’. However, some of the Swedish pseudo-auxiliaries can also be constructed with its Swedish counterpart att.

(e) German has the construction of tum-peripherias (Schwitala 2006) in cases like ich tut kochen/essen (‘I do cooking/eating’)/etc., which has no exact counterpart in Swedish. However, both languages have the responsive, contrastive use of main verb + tum/göra ‘do’: kochen tue ich auch (‘I also do cooking’); Sw. sova (more often: sover) gör jag sällan ‘Sleep (lit.: sleeps) I seldom do’; schaffen tue ich es schon aber wollen will ich nicht (corresponding roughly to Sw. orkar gör jag men vill vill jag inte, ‘I can manage it but I don’t want to’).

In conclusion, we propose that there are a number of morpho-syntactic characteristics in Swedish vs. German that make the language in question prone to use different DIA variants. There does not seem to be one single decisive factor. Such a conclusion would seem natural if we look at languages more as “meshworks” than as maximally integrated systems (e.g. Linell 2009).

7 Concluding discussion: Reactive constructions as evidence for dialogicality

Let us now sum up some of the dialogical properties of reactive constructions discussed in this paper. The first point to notice is that these constructions can only be used as responses, “reactions”, to prior utterances. Of course, the mere fact that reactives repeat expressions (x) from prior utterances illustrate Du Bois’s (2009) notion of affinity in dialogical syntax. Here the whole constructions are responsive; they cannot be seen as decontextualised linguistic resources, as sentence types quotable as independent units (as sentences usually are in linguistic grammars). They must instead be explained in terms of their local (and other) context(s). This is, of course, a property of many constructions in languages, but reactives are especially clear cases.

Overwhelmingly, x-och-x and DIA are responses to questions (see examples, and some statistics in Linell 2011). However, x-och-x can also be used as a reaction to what appears to the speaker as a controversial statement. Both constructions appear when a participant cannot say a plain yes or no to a claim or a question, but feels obliged to indulge in an elaboration.

If we take these two reactive constructions in their whole utterance contexts, we can see that they contain at least two different segments, which do different jobs within the comprehensive project of the whole utterance. The initial segment containing the repeats of x takes an immediate stance to a prior utterance which has brought up a local topic that cannot be plainly confirmed or denied. At the same time, this first segment (x och/und x, aux aux) functions as a projector (Güntner 2011) of something more to come. The first segment is part of the utterance’s pre-front field in x-och/und-x, but becomes integrated in (the initial field of) the first finite clause in DIA. The upcoming “something more” consists of an elaboration with two clauses, a concession and a rebuttal, which together constitute a relativisation of the stance. The concession admits that there is some grounding for the stance expressed in the prior utterance, but the second but-clause develops a counter-argument which is more relevant in the specific situation at hand. Thus, the reacting speaker hosts two different perspectives (“voices”) that have to be balanced in the local contribution; x is regarded as relevant or even perhaps true in one respect, but not in another. The speaker conducts a kind of “internal dialogue”: “you are right in one respect, but not in another”.

The observations just made confirms a general view of on-line language, namely, that utterances are incrementally built (Linell 2013, and references there). In the case of x-och-x there are often pauses after the initial segment and also later in the evolving elaboration. At the same time, the initial segments (x och/und x, two tokens of the same auxiliary in DIA) uniquely identify the upcoming utterance as a problematising one, using a particular construction (x-och/und-x, DIA). This is in line with the principle of early identifiability, that is, that utterance types are often projectable at an early stage (Linell, op. cit.).

Our data show how reactive conversational (and, concerning electronic language, interactive) practices have become conventionalised as grammatical constructions, although they seldom appear in printed genres (apart from types appearing in dialogical exchanges included in novels, and the like). Moreover, they are always dependent on prior contexts, and therefore cannot be understood as decontextualised sentences. They are evidence for a dynamic conception of grammatical constructions.

In sum, our analyses show how a number of dialogical principles (see above, section 4) of sense-making have been confirmed.
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