

In Fiala, J., & Chvatík, I. (Eds.) Transcdisciplinární Gratulovník k.60 narozeninám Ivana M. Havla. Praha: Oikoymenh, pp. 7–9.

DIALOG ON DIALOG

- AN APPETIZER TO THE STUDY OF DIALOG

-

Jens Allwood

This dialog was inspired by at least two considerations. The first one was an ambition to continue the ancient tradition of using dialog as a medium of scientific and philosophical discourse. This practice was kept alive by Ivan and his friends during the 1970:s and 80:s and deserves to be continued.

The second consideration is a story Ivan once told me. Ivan had a conversation with John Searle, where John Searle repeatedly replied *m* to what Ivan was saying. Ivan was encouraged by this and so asked Searle if he agreed with what Ivan proposed, whereupon Searle said *no*. His uttering of *m* only really meant *I hear you, I understand you*, but not *I accept what you are saying*.

Incidents of this type show that the nature of dialog still contains many features which are worth while exploring further. I have attempted to create an appetizer to such an exploration by creating a “dialog on dialog”, i.e. a dialog where the topic of the conversation is the organizing features of dialog.

Personae:

D = Dialogicus

M = Metadialogicus

D: Eh

M: Yes

D: Is it my turn?

M: Well there is no one else who could speak

D: Eh

M: Hesitating, are you?

D: Yes, that is no

M: Changing your mind?

D: m

M: Is that a “yes”?

D: In this context, yes

M: I see

D: m

M: Or is it just that you hear me?

D: No I understand you as well

2

M: But you don't accept what I say?

D: No

M: Do you say you don't accept what I say because you don't understand me after all?

D: No

M: Is your "no" an answer?

D: Well, it's adjacent to your question

M: Is not something more than adjacency required to make it an answer?

D: You mean [like] providing the information you asked for

M: [yes]

D: Don't interrupt me!

M: I am not interrupting you, I am supporting you

D: You mean that if you start talking while I am talking and overlap with my talk you are not necessarily interrupting me?

M: Precisely

D: I see, by the way, what speech act is "precisely"?

M: Maybe an affirmation, acceptance or agreement

D: Is that the sort of speechacts which are preferred?

M: Well, if you are not argumentatively inclined, anyway

D: If you were, maybe "precisely" would mean precisely wrong.

M: So preference in dialog is organized according to inclination?

D: By whom?

M: And in whose interest?

D: Who knows?

M: Maybe Logos.