

1. All our panellists agree that **language IS NOT about sending and receiving encoded** messages, which is how it has traditionally been conceptualized. Rather, the view we share is that language is **an interaction system**, which arguably drastically changes how it should be studied.

My first question is therefore a broad one and a meta-theoretical one:

If you were to create **a list of the crucial aspects of language** that need to be included in an action-based model of language, ones that have been unduly **ignored** by the traditional approaches and/or by other panellists' proposals, what would they be and why?

2. Given that we consider language roughly as a tool or resource or system for interaction, the fundamental question is what **the object and subject** of interaction are here, as well as what the character or **nature of this interaction** is.
 - a. First, I'd like to ask **Mark** to recap his position here.
 - b. **Eleni and Ruth**, I believe you largely agree with Mark on this, but could you offer a characterization from your position - what are the object, subject and the relations involved in linguistic interaction, and where do we find "grammar" there?
 - c. **Joanna**, your model views utterances as constraints, which follows Terry Deacon's more general model of cognition. However, the issue of what they are constraints *of* seems not entirely clear; as Mark would put it, you need to have a topological space that is being constrained by utterances - could you clarify what that space is in your approach and the more specific nature of the constraining relationship? And then we can discuss the issue of constraints more generally.
 - d. **Bert**, your concept of "dialogical array" seems to be what the object of linguistic transformations operate on in your proposal - is that right? If so, could you elaborate on its similarity or differences with Mark's situation convention?
3. Next, I would like to bring up the issue of emergence of different levels of organization and their relationship to each other. Part of an action-based perspective is the recognition that social situations self-organize regardless of intentions of the interlocutors - they take a life of their own - and can be studied as such. At the same time, I don't believe we really want the individual, the person, to be completely lost in the study of such higher levels of organization.

So, my question is this: **how do you propose emergent nested systems do justice to both the dynamic self-organizing reality of socio-linguistic interactions as well as the autonomy of the persons involved in them?** Does the supra-individual constitution of grammar make it unviable to talk about the individual mind that co-constitutes it? What are the problems that need to be addressed here?

4. An action-based perspective on language clearly leads to a much wider conception of language, one that incorporates mental and social phenomena that traditionally fell within the ambit of other sciences. **Is this blurring of disciplinary boundaries welcome?** And if so, how do you think labour should be distributed across research fields and sub-fields?