

Søren Sandager Sørensen

## Semantic maps and action formation

### The case of response tokens

**Keywords:** Interjections; response tokens; semantic maps; interactional linguistics; action formation; pragmatic typology; Danish

In Conversation Analysis and Interactional Linguistics, a lot of knowledge about social actions and their formation across a variety of languages has accumulated. The structure and status of action in relation to e.g. linguistic form is a current topic of interest (Deppermann/Haugh 2022), while another growing concern is the comparability of interactional descriptions based on different languages, discussed within and relevant for Pragmatic Typology (Rossi/Floyd/Enfield 2020).

This paper considers the question whether semantic maps may be useful for action description, and how it can inform interactional and contrastive linguistics. A semantic map (Haspelmath 2003) is a way to visualize or formulate relations between functions or meanings, and can be used to convey implicational hierarchies and relations between functions of certain forms, such as how they overlap or are distinctive. Given the amount of interactional descriptions of different actions, it may be possible to structure this knowledge through semantic maps to gain systematic overview.

The paper will for Danish use a combination of descriptions from existing literature (e.g. Sørensen 2020) and conversational collections from corpora, of response tokens. This will be contrasted with relevant descriptions of response tokens in English (on the basis of e.g. Stivers 2022 and Couper-Kuhlen & Selting 2018). Response tokens are particular words whose primary function is to perform responsive actions, such as confirmation, compliance, continuation and receipt. They are well-studied as examples of responsive action (Stivers 2022). The main basis for the paper are cases from everyday conversations and comparisons between specific words such as *ja* 'yes', *nej* 'no', *nå*, approx. 'oh', and *okay* and potentially more. Each word will be given its own semantic map, and the semantic maps will be 'classic'. The resulting description shows that these words vary a lot, but that some of the variation can be conveyed through a semantic map of action. The paper will discuss this as a proof-of-concept while also considering interactional research into comparable words and phenomena in other languages.

By combining the conversation analytic focus on detailed description of the understanding of linguistic elements with contrastive description, the method may be able to empirically ground functional concepts in participants' understanding and offer perspectives on unifying action terminology for contrastive purposes. These observations can also inform linguistic and typological description and future interactional studies.

The potential of this method must also be understood in relation to its limits. Creating a semantic map of action builds on conversation analytic description, but also involves a fair amount of interpretation and calibration of studies of varied material, where some precision

may be lost. The results also open the question of granularity, how distinctive contrasts in a map may be to participants under which circumstances, and how to account for the role of context when comparing. The discrete nodes on a map may not always be realized as categorical units in interaction (also see Zinken/Küttner 2022). It may also be discussed whether such maps are still “semantic” rather than pragmatic, which plays into discussions of the relation between semantics and pragmatics and the status of such notions.

## References

- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth/Selting, Margret (2018): *Interactional Linguistics. Studying Language in Social Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Deppermann, Arnulf/Haugh, Michael (eds.) (2022): *Action Ascription in Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics).
- Haspelmath, Martin (2003): The geometry of grammatical meaning: Semantic maps and cross-linguistic comparison. In: Tomasello, Michael (ed.): *The New Psychology of Language: Cognitive and Functional Approaches to Language Structure*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 211–242.
- Rossi, Giovanni/Floyd, Simeon/Enfield, Nick J. (2020): Recruitments and pragmatic typology. In: Floyd, Simeon/Rossi, Giovanni/Enfield, Nick J. (eds.): *Getting others to do things: a pragmatic typology of recruitments*. Berlin: Language Science Press, pp. 1–23. <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4018370>.
- Stivers, Tanya (2022): *The Book of Answers: Alignment, Autonomy, and Affiliation in Social Interaction*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press (Foundations of Human Interaction).
- Sørensen, Søren Sandager (2020): *The Prosody of Response Tokens in Danish*. PhD Thesis. Aarhus University.
- Zinken, Jörg/Küttner, Uwe-A. (2022): Offering an Interpretation of Prior Talk in Everyday Interaction: A Semantic Map Approach. In: *Discourse Processes*, 59(4), pp. 298–325. <http://doi.org/10.1080/0163853X.2022.2028088>.

## Contact information

### **Søren Sandager Sørensen**

Aarhus University

[mails@sorensandagersorensen.dk](mailto:mails@sorensandagersorensen.dk)