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
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.