119. A repertoire of German recurrent gestures with pragmatic functions

Abstract

The chapter presents a repertoire of recurrent gestures of German. It shortly discusses the data basis on which the repertoire is based and the steps in identifying and analyzing members of the repertoire before presenting the gestures in detail. Particular focus is put on the semantic themes of the gestures as well as possible semantic relations between members of the repertoire. Moreover, the chapter discusses the illocutionary acts and pragmatic functions identified for the gestures. It is shown that the same gesture can have several different illocutionary values simultaneously and that the respective gestures highlight the impact and consequences of the illocutionary acts in different ways. Concluding, the chapter presents structural relations between members of the repertoire.

1. Introduction

Emblems or *quotable gestures* (Kendon 1983, 1992) are conventional gestures that have a stable form-meaning relationship and can be translated into spoken words, phrases, or full sentences (mostly constituting a full speech-act on their own, Müller 2010). They can be used as a substitute for speech and are easily understood by speakers of particular cultural or social groups. Over the past years, a range of repertoires of emblems in various languages has been published. With a focus on Europe and few studies on Asia and America, mono-cultural and cross-cultural repertoires were set up providing fundamental insights into the range, use, and distribution of emblems (for an overview of existing studies, see Brookes 2004; Kendon 1992; Payrató 1993, this volume; Payrató and Teßendorf this volume; Teßendorf volume 1). A classical reference work on the cross-cultural comparison of emblems remains the work of Desmond Morris and his colleagues (Morris 1977; Morris et al. 1979).

   Cross-cultural studies indicate that emblems appear to center on particular semantic domains and that they tend to cluster around specific contexts-of-use. Kendon thus points out that emblems are used for

> interpersonal control (gestures with meanings such as "stop!", "be quiet!", "I'm warning you!"), announcement of one's current state or condition ("I'm amazed!", "I'm broke!", "I'm hungry"), and evaluative descriptions of the actions or appearances of another ("He's crazy", "pretty girl!", "He's dangerous")." (Kendon 2004b: 339)

Furthermore, emblems show different degrees of conventionalization (see, e.g., Brookes 2004; Payrató 1993; Poggi 2002), indicating that "emblems are a category of gestures

with fuzzy edges and conventionality is a not an exclusive characteristic of them" (Teßendorf volume 1: 93).

Recent investigations have shown that a type of conventional co-speech gesture can be identified, which shows structural and functional similarities with emblems. We have characterized this type of gesture as "recurrent, since it is used repeatedly in different contexts and its formational and semantic core remains stable across different contexts and speakers" (Ladewig 2011; see also Müller 2010). Depending on their context-of-use, recurrent gestures show differences in form, which correlate with variants of meaning and function (Ladewig 2010, 2011, this volume a, b; Müller 2004, 2010; Müller and Speckmann 2002; Neumann 2004; Seyfeddinipur 2004; Teßendorf this volume). (For further work along similar lines, see Bavelas et al. 1992; Brookes 2004, 2005; Calbris 1990, 2003; Fricke 2010, this volume; Harrison 2009; Kendon 1995, 2004b). By clustering around a shared and "distinct set of kinesic features" that goes along with a "common semantic theme", recurrent gestures may build so called *gesture families*. Gesture families are "groupings of gestural expressions that have in common one or more kinesic or formational characteristics" and "share in a common semantic theme" (Kendon 2004b: 227) (see also Bressem and Müller this volume; Fricke, Bressem, and Müller this volume).

Recurrent gestures often take over pragmatic functions, perform communicative actions, and fulfill meta-communicative functions. While recurrent gestures may also take over referential functions (see Ladewig this volume b), the repertoire to be discussed in the present paper consists of recurrent gestures with pragmatic functions. As such they either "display the communicative act of the speaker and act upon speech as 'speech-performatives'" or "aim at a regulation of the behavior of others" and thus act as 'performatives' (Teßendorf this volume). (See Ladewig this volume b for a detailed discussion of recurrent gestures.) In any case, recurrent gestures either operate upon or are part of the verbal utterance. While emblems are apt at replacing speech completely, recurrent gestures form part of a multimodal utterance meaning. They are conventionalized co-speech gestures. Obviously boundaries between the two categories are fluent (the ring gesture is an example for an emblem and a recurrent gesture, depending on its contexts-of-use and on its specific formational characteristics).

The fixed form-meaning relation that holds stable across a wide range of communicative contexts along with their primarily pragmatic function makes it likely to assume that recurrent gestures undergo processes of conventionalization. They appear to form a relatively closed group of gestures (Müller 2010), and thus form repertoires characteristic of a particular socio-cultural community. As Kendon has pointed out, it seems likely that pragmatic gestures appear in a limited set, mirroring a limited number of pragmatic functions (Kendon 1995).

This chapter presents a data-driven account of such a repertoire of recurrent gestures with pragmatic functions for speakers of German. The repertoire has been identified by applying a form-based perspective, which regards gestures as motivated signs and considers a close analysis of their form as the point of departure for reconstructing their meaning (for more detail, see Müller, Bressem, and Ladewig volume 1). The chapter presents the individual gestures included therein, it describes their forms, their semantic themes and functions, as well as structural and functional overlaps between gestures of the repertoire. In doing so, recurrent gestures are not treated as part of a repertoire of emblematic gestures (see, e.g., Brookes 2004), but are made the sole topic of a repertoire of conventionalized co-speech gestures.

2. Setting up a repertoire

2.1. Data basis

The repertoire of recurrent gestures of German is based on the analysis of a set of 24 hours of video data including a variety of discourse types and different conversational settings. The corpus consists of face-to-face interactions (Müller 1998), discussions about political as well as non-political topics, academic lectures, parliamentary debates, data from a German TV game show ("Genial Daneben"), as well as some experimental data (Müller et al. 2009). The corpus was deliberately designed to include a wide spectrum of different discourse types in order to identify recurrent gestures in various contexts-of-use. We wanted to prevent possible misrepresentations of recurrent gestures caused by a narrow set of data.

2.2. Identifying recurrent gestures with pragmatic functions

In order to identify possible candidates for a repertoire of recurrent gestures with pragmatic functions, the video data set was approached with a bottom up and inductive perspective. Recurrent gestures were identified based on a twofold selection process. First, a trained gesture researcher sifted through half of the video data. Based on the researcher's own communicative competence of German, all recurring gestural forms were noted, and first hypotheses concerning the meaning of the forms (the motivation of the form), their contexts-of-use, and their possible functions were formulated. Since we concentrated on a repertoire of gestures with pragmatic functions, gestural forms with deictic function as well as gestural forms with concrete referential function were excluded. This first step in the identification of recurrent gestures was used to gain a rather general impression of the types of recurrent gestures used and their frequency and distribution. Based on this pre-identification, a list of recurrent gestures was put together, setting up the grounds for the second step in the selection. In this second step, a second gesture researcher annotated all tokens of recurrent gestures based on the list of recurrent gestures derived at in the first step. The pre-defined list was not exclusive. It could be expanded by the second gesture researcher, in order to include further frequent gestural forms that had been overlooked in the first round of analysis. At the end of the second step, all recurring gestural forms were identified in the whole data set. The final list comprised 16 recurring gestural forms, which were assumed to be candidates for recurrent gestures (see Tab. 119.1), and which were analyzed in detail in a third step of the analysis (see section 2.3).

2.3. Methods of gesture analysis

The detailed analysis of the recurring gestural forms was approached from a linguistic perspective, in which gestural forms are regarded as motivated meaningful wholes, in which every aspect of a gesture's form is treated as potentially meaningful and, accordingly, in which changes in form features are regarded as potentially meaningful as well. In recurrent gestures gestural form features are not random, by definition, but recur across speakers and contexts whilst sharing stable meanings. A gesture is "termed recurrent, since it is used repeatedly in different contexts and its formational and semantic core remains stable across different contexts and speakers" (Ladewig 2011; see also Bressem and Müller this volume; Müller 2004, 2010).

Methodologically, the analysis of the recurrent gestures was based on the Methods of Gesture Analysis, a form-based method to systematically reconstruct the meaning of gestures (Bressem, Ladewig, and Müller volume 1; Müller 2010; Müller, Bressem, and Ladewig volume 1; Müller, Ladewig, and Bressem volume 1). The method addresses fundamental properties of gestural meaning creation and basic principles of gestural meaning construction, by distinguishing four main building blocks: *form*, *sequential structure* of gestures in relation to speech and other gestures, *local context-of-use*, i.e., gestures' relation to syntactic, semantic, and pragmatics aspects of speech, and *distribution* of gestures over different contexts use. By assuming that the meaning of a gesture emerges out of a fine-grained interaction of a gesture's form, its sequential position, and its embedding within a context-of-use (local and distributed), a gesture's meaning is determined in a (widely) context-free analysis of its form, which grounds the later context-sensitive analysis of gestures.

Based on the Methods of Gesture Analysis and the Linguistic Annotation System for Gestures (see Bressem, Ladewig, and Müller volume 1), first a detailed description and motivation of the recurrent gestural forms (modes of representation, image schemas, motor patterns, and actions) was carried out. Afterwards, the gestures were analyzed in relation to speech on a range of levels of linguistic description (prosody, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics). As a final step, the detailed analysis of the gestural forms was brought together with the analysis of the contexts-of-use in order to analyze the distribution of the recurrent gestural forms across various contexts and to account for possible characteristic form aspects in particular contexts. In doing so, the semantic core of recurrent gestural forms was distinguished from the local meanings of the recurrent form and the meaning of its context-variants (Bressem and Müller this volume; Ladewig 2010, this volume a, b).

3. The repertoire: Sixteen recurrent gestures with pragmatic functions

In the corpus of 24 hours of video data, we found a set of 16 gestures with a recurring form and meaning and a pragmatic function (see Tab. 119.1) produced by 60 speakers (both females and males). The repertoire does not claim to be complete, however we do assume that the gestures included in the repertoire represent the most frequent and common recurrent gestures used among speakers of German. Tab. 119.1 presents a short description of the repertoire which is structured as follows:

 (i) name of the gesture (based on its kinesic form),
 (ii) description of its prototypical form (formational features, form Gestalt),
(iii) three short example utterances,
 (iv) semantic core,
 (v) illocutionary force (and pragmatic function).

A more detailed discussion of the members of the repertoire, which is not possible within the present chapter, would have to include also the following aspects:

 (i) form variants (including further articulators, e.g., body shifts, facial expressions, gaze),

 (ii) a detailed account of the range of pragmatic functions,
(iii) the number of occurrences in the data,
(iv) distribution across discourse types.

The arrangement of the gestures in the table reflects their degree of conventionalization. The respective degrees of conventionalization are determined based on their relation with speech (can they substitute for speech or not) and on the nature of their form variants (does a variant show a limited set of forms, functions, and contexts-of-use or not). The basic rationale followed is: The more a gesture can substitute for speech and the less it varies in form-function and in contexts-of-use, the more it is considered conventionalized (see Ladewig this volume b for further discussion).

Section A of the table (Tab. 119.1) presents recurrent gestures, which are primarily used in conjunction with speech and for which we found several form variants. Section B contains all recurrent gestures, which were predominantly used in conjunction with speech but for which also a speech-replacing use was documented. Furthermore, members of section B also showed several form variants. Gestures from section A and B build so called gesture families, that is, grouping of gestures with shared sets of kinesic features and a common semantic theme (see Bressem and Müller this volume; Fricke, Bressem, and Müller this volume; Kendon 2004b). Section C entails all those recurrent gestures which appear to have undergone a process of "emblematization" (Payrató 1993: 206). These gestures were used in conjunction with speech or in the absence of speech. Yet, in contrast to the gestures in section B, hardly any form variants were found and if so, they were restricted to the handedness and the concomitant use of other articulators (facial expression, gaze, body shifts).

Note, that for the analyses summarized in the table, we also drew upon existing research on particular gestural forms. Thus, for the *Palm Up Open Hand* (PUOH) or *Open Hand Supine, Palm Presentation* (OHS, PP) we build upon Kendon's and Müller's research (Kendon 2004b: 264−281; Müller 2004; for more detail, see Bressem and Müller this volume). For the *cyclic gesture* we rely on Ladewig (2010, 2011, this volume a), for the *ring gesture* we refer to Morris and Kendon and others (Kendon 2004b: 238−247; Morris 1977; Neumann 2004; Weinrich 1992; for a historical and cross-cultural survey of the Ring, see Müller 1998: 36−42, this volume a). Concerning the *shaking off gesture* we build upon Posner's semiotic analysis (Posner 2003). Regarding the gestures which share a movement away from the body and which are associated with the notion of exclusion, we rely on a detailed discussion of them in the context of the *Away family* of gestures (Bressem and Müller this volume).

Analyses on members of the repertoire in other languages can be found in the work of Calbris on French gestures (Calbris 1990, 2003, 2008, 2011), Harrison has worked on British gesturing (Harrison 2009), Kendon on the gesticulation of Italian and British speakers (Kendon 2004a, b), Payrató and Teßendorf on Catalan and Spanish gestures (Payrató and Teßendorf this volume; Teßendorf this volume), Streeck has conducted research on gestures of German, Japanese, Illokano, and American-Arabic speakers (Streeck 2009), and Webb has researched recurrent gestures of American speakers (Webb 1996). Our repertoire of recurrent gestures with pragmatic functions thus not only documents gestures that are frequent for German speakers but also hints at possible cross-cultural gesture forms and thus at potential overlaps of the German repertoire with those identified for other cultural and linguistic communities.

Tab. 119.1: Repertoire of German recurrent gestures

Recurrent gesture		Description of prototypical form	Example utterance	Semantic core	Illocutionary force and pragmatic function
A Back and forth, loose hands		Loose hands alternate away and towards the speaker's body.	(1) that we **always fall back** on the youth a little (2) **well there were so many** lucky moments that went along with the team	Change Uncertainty Ambivalence	Assertive Used to mark several arguments and points of view on the same topic, in particular, when referring to changing situations and events. (meta-communicative function)
Back and forth, index-thumb from wrist		Index finger and thumb are bent, palm is held laterally, tensed index and thumb – as if measuring something – are turned back and forth from the wrist.	(1) different pattern, **but still** (2) did you **win**, did you **lose**, how do you feel	Change Process Opposition Contrast	Assertive Used to exemplify changing events and processes, to mark oppositions of arguments, events, etc. (meta-communicative function)
Cyclic gesture		Continuous rotational movement, performed away from the body – as if hand was a turning crank.	(1) started at a time at which you **can take this step** (2) I realized (-) **how tough I was**	Cylic continuity Process Duration	Assertive, directive Used in the context of: word/concept searches and requests. Marks in general processes, duration, continuity, and the procedural structure of conversations. (meta- and communicative function)
PDOH with clockwise rotation		Lax open hand, palm downwards, repeatedly moved left and right by a clockwise rotation of the wrist.	(1) well I think it **was 10 years ago** (2) **were you feeling a but uneasy** (3) rather like **popular classic**	Vague Uncertain	Assertive Used to mark events, states, as well as ideas as uncertain and indeterminate. (meta- and communicative function)

(Continued)

Tab. 119.1: *Continued*

Recurrent gesture		Description of prototypical form	Example utterance	Semantic core	Illocutionary force and pragmatic function
Swaying		The (lax) flat hands, palm facing towards the center, are alternated by rotations of the wrist.	(1) well a **half standardized** guide line (2) she started to **sway** (3) because ehm **this is not easy constructionally**	More or less Roughly Approximation	Assertive Used to mark events, states, as well as ideas as uncertain and indeterminate. (meta- and communicative function)
B Brushing away		Loose hand, palm oriented towards body, is moved away from body with a (rapid) twist of the wrist – as if brushing away annoying crumbs.	(1) you worked for it a **long time** (2) because what you say is **not** the truth (3) the gulf war, **although** it was over quite quickly	Excluding Negative assessment	Assertive, directive, expressive Getting rid of, removing, and dismissing annoying topics of talk by rapidly brushing them away from the speaker's body. Clearing off body space goes along with a qualification of the rejected objects as annoying, e.g., a topic of talk is being negatively assessed. (meta- and communicative function)
Throwing away		Cupped hand oriented vertically, palm facing away from the speaker's body, hand flaps downward from the wrist – as if throwing an annoying object away.	(1) **well** (2) it was interesting because they were gone for **1 or 2 years** (3) **alright, leave it**	Excluding Negative assessment	Assertive, directive, expressive Getting rid of, removing, and dismissing annoying topic of talk by throwing it away from the speaker's body. Clearing off body space goes along with a qualification of the rejected objects as annoying, e.g., a topic of talk is being negatively assessed. (meta- and communicative function)

(Continued)

Tab. 119.1: *Continued*

Recurrent gesture		Description of prototypical form	Example utterance	Semantic core	Illocutionary force and pragmatic function
Holding away		Flat open hand(s), palm vertically, away from speaker's body, moved or held outwards – as if holding or pushing away an object, or stopping an object from falling over.	(1) **there are things I don't want to hear** (2) **but hold on** (3) ——	Excluding Refusing Stopping Rejecting	Assertive, directive, commissive, expressive Refusal, stopping something from intrusion, stopping from continuation, rejecting a speaker's or hearer's topic of talk, and a qualification of the rejected topic as an unwanted one. (meta- and communicative function)
Sweeping away		Flat open hand(s), palm facing downward, move laterally and horizontally outwards – as if sweeping away something from a flat surface (a liquid or bread crumbs) so that absolutely nothing is left.	(1) there were **no problems** (2) **solely** (3) alright, lets leave **the topic aside**	Excluding Negating	Assertive, directive Negation, e.g., completely rejecting topics of talk by (energetically) sweeping them away from the center to the periphery, so that they are excluded from the conversation and negated. (meta- and communicative function)
Palm Up Open Hand (PUOH)		Palm open, turned upwards, often with a downward movement or turn of the wrist and a hold in the end – as if showing, offering, presenting, or receiving an object.	(1) **if this isn't second class, what else?** (2) **right?** (3) because I am a philosopher **originally**	Presenting, Giving, Offering, Showing	Assertive, directive Presenting an abstract discursive object as a manipulable and visible one, inviting participants to take on a shared perspective on this object. (meta- and communicative function)

(Continued)

Tab. 119.1: *Continued*

	Recurrent gesture		Description of prototypical form	Example utterance	Semantic core	Illocutionary force and pragmatic function
	Ring		Index finger(s) and thumb(s) form a circle. Index and thumb touch each other – as if grasping a small object. The hand(s) are held or moved up and down repeatedly.	(1) in particular the **little pensioner** (2) in a **great condition,** after he did a **wonderful job**	Precision	Assertive Used for marking the precision of arguments. The precision grip is used for specification, clarification, and emphasis of the speaker's utterance. (meta-communicative function)
C	Stretched index finger – held		Stretched index finger is raised and held.	(1) the so called (-) **attention** Mario (2) **on the one hand** (-) will give two examples (3) **but** it is like this	Attention	Assertive, directive Used with cataphoric function by drawing the attention of other participants to new and particular important topics of talk as well as to signaling thematic shifts, such as when dismissing the statement of others. (meta- and communicative function)
	Stretched index finger – moved horizontally		Stretched index finger, palm facing away from the speaker, is moved upwards and rapidly moved horizontally by turning the wrist.	(1) this is **not true** (2) who you do **not obey** (3) **headshake –––**	Denial	Assertive, directive The gesture is used to negate and express denial often going along with verbal negation. (meta- and communicative function)

(Continued)

Tab. 119.1: *Continued*

Recurrent gesture		Description of prototypical form	Example utterance	Semantic core	Illocutionary force and pragmatic function
Dropping of hand		Lax flat hand moves upwards, then drops on the lap or the table etc. Dropping usually results in an acoustic signal of the hand.	(1) **oh well** you can forget about it (2) I absolutely don't know, **I have no clue** (3) well the team did not exist yet (-) **well** (-) i would say	Dismissing	Assertive, expressive Used to dismiss topics of talk by marking parts of the utterance as less important and interesting. (meta- and communicative function)
Fist		Clenched fist moves (rapidly) downwards – as if hitting hard.	(1) **everybody** ran (2) that rather relies on totalitarian mechanism like **pressure and control**	Strength Force Power	Assertive, expressive Used to put emphasis on the parts of the utterance by directing the listener's attention, expresses emotional involvement and insistence. (meta-communicative function
Shaking off		Rapidly shaking lax open hand, oriented towards body – as if shaking off hot water to avoid boiling the hand. Often comes with a recurrent facial expression.	(1) billarziose for instance (-) a **terrible** disease (2) **puh:::**	Dangerous Delicate Appalling	Assertive, expressive Used to mark an object or situation as potentially dangerous, delicate, or appalling. (meta- and communicative function)

3.1. Semantic cores

Based on the local meaning of the recurrent form and the meaning of its context-variants, the semantic core of the recurrent gestures was identified. The meaning was reconstructed based on the assumption that image-schematic structures and everyday actions constitute the derivational basis for the gesture's form, meaning, and function. For the group of recurrent gestures with the semantic core of "excluding" (see Bressem and Müller this volume), for instance, two shared image-schematic structures underlying all Away gestures are assumed: CENTER-PERIPHERY and SOURCE-PATH-GOAL. For the holding away member of the away group we suggested a further image-schematic structure as motivation: BLOCKAGE. For all members of the family we found that different mundane actions work as derivational bases for those gestures. Thus, everyday actions of sweeping, brushing, holding, and throwing away (annoying and unpleasant) things in the surroundings of the speakers body, all result in a common effect: clearing the space surrounding the body of something by moving or keeping things away. This effect of action is semanticized in the gesture family "away" leading to a) shared structural and functional characteristics but also to b) particular kinesic qualities as well as to differences in the recurrent gestures. On the basis of these commonalities and differences, the semantic core "excluding" was identified for the recurrent gestures (see Bressem and Müller this volume for a detailed discussion of the "away" gestures; Ladewig 2010; Müller 2004; Teßendorf 2009 for a discussion of the methodological and analytical procedure in analyzing the image-schematic and action base of recurrent gestures).

3.2. Illocutionary acts and pragmatic functions

Based on Searle's classification (1979), the recurrent gestures included in the repertoire were assigned to the five categories of illocutionary acts: 1) *Assertives*, by which the sender specifies the truth of the proposition by expressing acts about the sender, the receiver, or the state of things, 2) *directives*, by which the sender expresses how the receiver should act, 3) *commissives*, by which the sender commits him- or herself to do something, 4) *expressives*, by which the sender expresses aspects about his state of mind, and 5) *declaratives*, by which the sender alters the state of things in the real world.

Depending on the context-of-use, the recurrent gestures included in the repertoire carry different illocutionary values. All of the gestures can be said to carry assertive value, as they constitute acts about the state of things. Very frequent are furthermore directives as well as expressive acts by which either acts for the receiver are signaled or the state of mind of the sender is expressed. Rather uncommon for the recurrent gestures included in the repertoire are commissives, acts by which the sender commits him- or herself to do something. This can only be assumed to play a role in the gesture "holding away": When executed with both hands and an averted gaze or body, the sender commits himself to no further statements on the topic being talked about that is held away by the gesture.

Apart from expressing different illocutionary values, the gestures included in the repertoire highlight the impact and consequences of the illocutionary acts expressed. With their performative or pragmatic function, recurrent gestures "rather than contributing to the propositional content of the utterance, […] embody the illocutionary force or the communicative action which often remains verbally implicit" (Müller 2008: 225). In so doing, the gestures either fulfill meta-communicative function and "display the com-

municative act of the speaker by acting upon speech as 'speech-performatives'" or they fulfill communicative actions and "aim at a regulation of the behavior of others as 'performatives'" (Teßendorf this volume: 1544) (see also Brookes 2004; Kendon 1995, 2004b; Payrató and Teßendorf this volume; Streeck 2006).

For the gestures included in the repertoire, members can be identified, which solely seem to embody the illocutionary force of the proposition ("back and forth", "back and forth, index-thumb from wrist", "ring"). By highlighting and marking various aspects of the discourse and the discourse structure, these gestures specify a piece of discourse to have particular relevance and status in respect to other pieces or distinguish topic from comment (Kendon 1995: 164, 2004b: 225−247). In so doing, they act upon speech and take over meta-communicative function. Most members of the repertoire however cannot be said to have *either* meta-communicative *or* communicative function. Rather, the majority of gestures carries more than one pragmatic function and may do so even simultaneously. Depending on the context-of-use, the gestures show different dominance effects of these functions.

A range of gestures primarily embodies the illocutionary force of the speaker's own utterance. Examples are the gestures "PDOH with clockwise rotation" and "swaying", which are used to mark events, states, as well as ideas as uncertain and indeterminate, the gesture "shaking off", used to mark an object or situation as potentially dangerous, delicate, or appalling, as well as the family of the "away" gestures, by which topics of talk are rejected by holding or moving them away. All of these gestures may primarily act upon the speaker's own utterance and, in these cases, can be understood to function as modal particles (Müller and Speckmann 2002). Yet, apart from signaling the uncertainty or denial of the speaker, the gestures also provide instructions for the hearer on how to act, namely to take into account the uncertainty and denial in following communicative actions. By implying instructions on the following communicative actions, the gestures act upon the behavior of the other. For the family of the "away" gestures, for instance, it is implied that the hearer should not bring forward counterarguments, which might relativize the speaker's own position.

Sometimes, however, the gestures may express the perlocutionary value of an utterance. This is particularly prominent in speech-replacing uses, as documented for the gestures "throwing away", "holding away", and the "Palm Up Open Hand" for instance. In all of these cases, the gestures act upon the behavior of the other by expressing instructions on how to act. In the case of "throwing away", the speaker gesturally utters the instruction to forget about what has been uttered. In the "holding away" gesture, executed with both hands and with an averted gaze or body, the gesturer requests the speaker to stop addressing him- or herself on that topic any longer. Similarly, a both handed "Palm Up Open Hand", often executed with raised shoulders, signals ignorance and, by doing so, requests the other to stop any further inquiries (cf. Kendon 2004b: 275−281 on the Open Hand Supine PL gestures).

Apart from the fact that the individual members of the repertoire carry different illocutionary values, our results underline existing observations made for emblematic gestures: "The same body action can (occasionally) have several different illocutionary values." (Payrató 1993: 202) Moreover, German recurrent gestures highlight the impact and consequences of the illocutionary acts in different and quite specific ways, thus showing a spectrum of pragmatic functions.

3.3. Structural and functional relations between gestures

In discussing the semantic cores of the recurrent gestures, we have highlighted particular semantic relations between specific members of the repertoire (e.g., the "away" gestures) and argued that semantic differentiations and specifications of particular types of gestures need to be seen in relation to other members of the repertoire (see section 3.2). By discussing these semantic overlaps we have shown that our focus in analyzing the repertoire of recurrent gestures has not only been on a close description and discussion of single members but also on relations between the members of the repertoire. By pursuing this perspective, different relations between members of the repertoire were uncovered. Moreover, it became apparent that in addition to examining groupings of gestures from the perspective of gesture families also a perspective is needed which takes into account the possibility of so called gestural fields (Fricke, Bressem, and Müller this volume). In doing so, a complex network of relations between the members of the repertoire may be uncovered. We will illustrate this aspect by shortly discussing the "away" gestures and the gestures "back and forth, index-thumb from wrist", "swaying", and "PDOH with clockwise rotation" (see Tab. 119.2).

Tab. 119.2 Structural and functional relation between gestures

Recurrent gesture	Shared aspect of form	Shared aspect of meaning
sweeping away	horizontal and vertical movements	away
holding away		
throwing away	rapid (downwards) twists of the wrist	
brushing away		
vague	wrist movement (clockwise)	Uncertainty, vague, approximation
swaying		
change		Change, process, opposition, contrast

All "away" gestures share the semantic theme of excluding. This theme is motivated by actions that serve to remove or hold away things, resulting in a shared effect, namely the clearing of the body space by moving or keeping things away (Bressem and Müller this volume). This semantic core goes along with shared aspects of form as all gestures exhibit movements away from the center of the speaker. However, the "away" gestures can furthermore be split in two groups, based on differences in their movements: horizontal and vertical movements (sweeping and holding away) vs. movements of the wrist (brushing and throwing away). While sharing the semantic core "away", differences in form lead to further internal structuring and grouping of the "away" gestures.

   A similar pattern can be observed for the gestures "PDOH with clockwise rotation", "swaying", and "back and forth, index-thumb from wrist". For all gestures, the shared aspect of form lies in clockwise twists of the wrist. Despite form differences between the gestures (both handedness, lax flat hand, and bent fingers), a common formational core of all gestures can be found on the level of the movement type. This shared aspect of form however does not go along with a shared semantic core. Whereas the gestures

"PDOH with clockwise rotation" and "swaying" express the notion of uncertainty, vagueness, and approximation and are used to mark events, states, and ideas as uncertain and indeterminate, the gesture "back and forth, index-thumb from wrist" carries the notion of change, process, opposition, and contrast and is used to exemplify changing events and processes as well to mark the opposition of arguments, events, and the like. Here, a shared aspect of form results in the differentiation of two specific types of meaning and thus exhibits a different pattern than observed for the "away" gestures, which are primarily held together by a shared semantic theme.

These two groups of gestures thus illustrate that recurrent gestures as members of a repertoire may be investigated from two different perspectives: either from common formational features (e.g., effect of action, types of movement) or from a common meaning (e.g., away, uncertainty, vague, approximation, etc.).

> Semasiology starts from the form of individual signs and considers the way in which their meaning(s) are manifested, whereas onomasiology starts from the meaning or concept of a sign and investigates the different forms by which the concept or meaning can be designated or named (Baldinger 1980: 278; Geeraerts 2010: 23; Schmidt-Wiegand 2002: 738). The distinction between semasiology and onomasiology is equivalent to the distinction between family-oriented and field-oriented thinking. (Fricke, Bressem, and Müller this volume: 1632)

Accordingly, the recurrent gestures identified in the repertoire may be investigated by pursing a perspective on gesture families or that of gestural fields (for more details, see also Fricke 2012). Without going into further detail on the distinction between gesture families and gestural fields, it needs to be pointed out that by pursing a perspective on recurrent gestures which takes into account their relations with other gestures in the repertoire either sharing common formational aspects or common aspects of meaning, complex internal structuring of groupings of gestures may be identified. In so doing, a new perspective on the nature of recurrent gestures as well as their relations with other recurrent gestures is offered.

4. Discussion

The chapter has presented a first repertoire of recurrent gestures for speakers of German. By discussing the gestures' illocutionary values and pragmatic functions, the repertoire ties in with existing repertoires for emblematic gestures (e.g., Brookes 2004; Payrató 1993) and thus offers the grounds for comparative analyses. Other than existing accounts however, which include this type of gestures within a repertoire of emblematic gestures, the present repertoire has made recurrent gestures the sole focus and, in doing so, revealed characteristics of recurrent gestures so far not discussed. By arranging them based on the gestures' degree of conventionalization, by discussing the semantic themes expressed, as well as existing semantic and structural relations between the members of the repertoire, the chapter has furthered an understanding of the linguistic potential of gestures and shown that, in a similar way as for the examination of the spoken lexicon, relations between exemplars are also of utmost relevance for a repertoire or lexicon of conventionalized gestures. In drawing the focus away from discussing specific gestures of the repertoire as isolated types to a focus of the gestures as members exhibiting rela-

tions with each other, the chapter has shown that a repertoire-based perspective allows for the delineation of gestures from each other, for the identification of their singularity, and the explanation of specific gestures.

Acknowledgements

5. References

Bavelas, Janet Beavin, Nicole Chovil, Douglas A. Lawrie and Allan Wade 1992. Interactive Gestures. *Discourse Processes* 15: 469−489.

Bressem, Jana, Silva H. Ladewig and Cornelia Müller volume 1. Linguistic Annotation System for Gestures (LASG). In: Cornelia Müller, Alan Cienki, Ellen Fricke, Silva H. Ladewig, David McNeill and Sedinha Teßendorf (eds.), *Body − Language − Communication. An International Handbook on Multimodality in Human Interaction.* (Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science 38.1.), 1098−1125. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Bressem, Jana and Cornelia Müller this volume. The family of Away gestures: Negation, refusal, and negative assessment. In: Cornelia Müller, Alan Cienki, Ellen Fricke, Silva H. Ladewig, David McNeill and Jana Bressem (eds.), *Body − Language − Communication. An International Handbook on Multimodality in Human Interaction.* (Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science 38.2.), 1592−1604. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Brookes, Heather 2004. A repertoire of South African quotable gestures. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 14(2): 186−224.

Brookes, Heather 2005. What gestures do: Some communicative functions of quotable gestures in conversations among Black urban South Africans. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32: 2044−2085.

Calbris, Geneviève 1990. *The Semiotics of French Gestures*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Calbris, Geneviève 2003. From cutting an object to a clear cut analysis. Gesture as the representation of a preconceptual schema linking concrete actions to abstract notions. *Gesture* 3(1): 19−46.

Calbris, Geneviève 2008. From left to right…: Coverbal gestures and their symbolic use of space. In: Alan Cienki and Cornelia Müller (eds.), *Metaphor and Gesture*, 27−53. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Calbris, Geneviève 2011. *Elements of Meaning in Gesture*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Fricke, Ellen 2010. Phonaestheme, Kinaestheme und multimodale Grammatik: Wie Artikulationen zu Typen werden, die bedeuten können. *Sprache und Literatur* 41(1): 70−88.

Fricke, Ellen 2012. *Grammatik multimodal: Wie Wörter und Gesten zusammenwirken*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Fricke, Ellen this volume. Kinesthemes: Morphological complexity in co-speech gestures. In: Cornelia Müller, Alan Cienki, Ellen Fricke, Silva H. Ladewig, David McNeill and Jana Bressem (eds.), *Body − Language − Communication. An International Handbook on Multimodality in Human Interaction.* (Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science 38.2.), 1618−1630. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Fricke, Ellen, Jana Bressem and Cornelia Müller this volume. Gesture families and gestural fields. In: Cornelia Müller, Alan Cienki, Ellen Fricke, Silva H. Ladewig, David McNeill and Jana Bressem (eds.), *Body − Language − Communication. An International Handbook on Multimodality in Human Interaction.* (Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science 38.2.), 1630−1640. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Harrison, Simon 2009. Grammar, gesture, and cognition: The case of negation in English. PhD dissertation, Université Bourdeaux 3.

Kendon, Adam 1983. Gesture and speech: how they interact. In: John M. Wiemann (ed.), *Nonverbal Interaction*, 13−46. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications

Kendon, Adam 1992. Some recent work from Italy on quotable gestures (emblems). *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 2(1): 92−108.

Kendon, Adam 1995. Gestures as illocutionary and discourse structure markers in Southern Italian conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 23: 247−279.

Kendon, Adam 2004a. Contrasts in gesticulation. A British and a Neapolitan speaker compared. In: Cornelia Müller and Roland Posner (eds.), *The Semantics and Pragmatics of Everyday Gestures*, 173−193. Berlin: Weidler.

Kendon, Adam 2004b. *Gesture. Visible Action as Utterance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ladewig, Silva H. 2010. Beschreiben, suchen und auffordern − Varianten einer rekurrenten Geste. *Sprache und Literatur* 41(1): 89−111.

Ladewig, Silva H. 2011. Putting the cyclic gesture on a cognitive basis. *CogniTextes* 6.

Ladewig, Silva H. this volume a. The cyclic gesture. In: Cornelia Müller, Alan Cienki, Ellen Fricke, Silva H. Ladewig, David McNeill and Jana Bressem (eds.), *Body − Language − Communication. An International Handbook on Multimodality in Human Interaction.* (Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science 38.2.), 1605−1618. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Ladewig, Silva H. this volume b. Recurrent gestures. In: Cornelia Müller, Alan Cienki, Ellen Fricke, Silva H. Ladewig, David McNeill and Jana Bressem (eds.), *Body − Language − Communication. An International Handbook on Multimodality in Human Interaction.* (Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science 38.2.), 1558−1574. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Morris, Desmond 1977. *Manwatching. A Field Guide to Human Behavior*. London: Jonathan Cape; New York: Harry Abrams.

Morris, Desmond, Peter Collett, Peter Marsh and Marie O'Shaughnessy 1979. *Gestures: Their Origins and Distribution*. London: Jonathan Cape.

Müller, Cornelia 1998. *Redebegleitende Gesten: Kulturgeschichte − Theorie − Sprachvergleich*. Berlin: Berlin Verlag.

Müller, Cornelia 2004. Forms and uses of the Palm Up Open Hand. A case of a gesture family? In: Cornelia Müller and Roland Posner (eds.), *Semantics and Pragmatics of Everyday Gestures*, 233−256. Berlin: Weidler.

Müller, Cornelia 2008. What gestures reveal about the nature of metaphor. In: Alan Cienki and Cornelia Müller (eds.), *Metaphor and Gesture*, 249−275. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Müller, Cornelia 2010. Wie Gesten bedeuten. Eine kognitiv-linguistische und sequenzanalytische Perspektive. *Sprache und Literatur* 41(1): 37−68.

Müller, Cornelia this volume. The Ring across space and time: Variation and stability of forms and meanings. In: Cornelia Müller, Alan Cienki, Ellen Fricke, Silva H. Ladewig, David McNeill and Jana Bressem (eds.), *Body − Language − Communication. An International Handbook on Multimodality in Human Interaction.* (Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science 38.2.), 1511−1522. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Müller, Cornelia, Jana Bressem and Silva H. Ladewig volume 1. Towards a grammar of gesture: A form-based view. In: Cornelia Müller, Alan Cienki, Ellen Fricke, Silva H. Ladewig, David McNeill and Sedinha Teßendorf (eds.), *Body − Language − Communication. An International Handbook on Multimodality in Human Interaction.* (Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science 38.1.), 707−733. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Müller, Cornelia, Jana Bressem, Silva H. Ladewig and Susanne Tag 2009. Introduction to special session "Towards a grammar of gesture". Paper presented at the *Conference Paper presented at the Gesture and Speech in Interaction (GESPIN) at the Adam Mickiwicz University Poznan, Poland*.

Müller, Cornelia, Silva H. Ladewig and Jana Bressem volume 1. Gesture and speech from a linguistic point of view. In: Cornelia Müller, Alan Cienki, Ellen Fricke, Silva H. Ladewig, David

McNeill and Sedinha Teßendorf (eds.), *Body − Language − Communication. An International Handbook on Multimodality in Human Interaction.* (Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science 38.1.), 55−81. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Müller, Cornelia and Gerald Speckmann 2002. Gestos con una valoración negativa en la conversación cubana. *DeSignis* 3: 91−103.

Neumann, Ranghild 2004. The conventionalization of the ring gesture in German discourse. In: Cornelia Müller and Roland Posner (eds.), *The Semantics and Pragmatics of Everyday Gestures*, 217−223. Berlin: Weidler.

Payrató, Lluís 1993. A pragmatic view on autonomous gestures: A first repertoire of Catalan emblems. *Journal of Pragmatics* 20: 193−216.

Payrató, Lluís this volume. Emblems or quotable gestures: Structures, categories, and functions. In: Cornelia Müller, Alan Cienki, Ellen Fricke, Silva H. Ladewig, David McNeill and Jana Bressem (eds.), *Body − Language − Communication. An International Handbook on Multimodality in Human Interaction.* (Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science 38.2.), 1474−1481. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Payrató, Lluís and Sedinha Teßendorf this volume. Pragmatic gestures. In: Cornelia Müller, Alan Cienki, Ellen Fricke, Silva H. Ladewig, David McNeill and Jana Bressem (eds.), *Body − Language − Communication. An International Handbook on Multimodality in Human Interaction.* (Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science 38.2.), 1531−1539. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Poggi, Isabella 2002. Symbolic gestures: The case of the Italian gestionary. *Gesture* 2(1): 71−98.

Posner, Roland 2003. Everyday gestures as a result of ritualization. In: Monica Rector, Isabella Poggi and Nadine Trigo (eds.), *Everyday Gestures: Meaning and Use*, 217−230. Porto: Fernando Pessoa.

Searle, John R. 1979. *Expression and Meaning. Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Streeck, Jürgen 2006. Gestures: pragmatic aspects. In: Keith Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 71−76. Oxford: Elsevier.

Streeck, Jürgen 2009. *Gesturecraft. The Manu-facture of Meaning*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Seyfeddinipur, Mandana 2004. Meta-discursive gestures from Iran: Some uses of the "Pistol Hand." In: Cornelia Müller and Roland Posner (eds.), *The Semantics and Pragmatics of Everyday Gestures*, 205−216. Berlin: Weidler.

Teßendorf, Sedinha 2009. From everyday action to gestural performance: Metonymic motivations of a pragmatic gesture. Paper presented at the *Conference Aflico, Lille, France.*.

Teßendorf, Sedinha volume 1. Emblems, quotable gestures, or conventionalized body movements. In: Cornelia Müller, Alan Cienki, Ellen Fricke, Silva H. Ladewig, David McNeill and Sedinha Teßendorf (eds.), *Body − Language − Communication. An International Handbook on Multimodality in Human Interaction.* (Handbook of Linguistics and Communication Science 38.1.), 82−100. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Teßendorf, Sedinha this volume. Pragmatic and metaphoric gestures− combining functional with cognitive approaches in the analysis of the "brushing aside gesture". In: Cornelia Müller, Alan Cienki, Ellen Fricke, Silva H. Ladewig, David McNeill and Jana Bressem (eds.), *Body − Language − Communication. An International Handbook on Multimodality in Human Interaction.* (Handbook of Linguistics and Communication Science 38.2.), 1540−1558. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Webb, Rebecca 1996. Linguistic features of metaphoric gestures. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Rochester, New York.

Weinrich, Lotte 1992. *Verbale und nonverbale Strategien in Fernsehgesprächen: Eine explorative Studie*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Jana Bressem, Chemnitz (Germany)
Cornelia Müller, Frankfurt (Oder) (Germany)