

Elisabeth Wehling  
Linguistics Department  
University of California Berkeley

### **When interlocutors get *pushy*: Space management gestures and communicative force**

Research shows that pragmatic gestures often rely on the same embodied concepts that structure thought and language (McNeil 1992; Müller 2004; Sweetser 1998). Pragmatic gestures that serve to control discourse events have been noted (Kendon 1995, 2004; Calbris 1990), and the majority of pragmatic gesture research emphasizes communicative cooperation and inclusion (Bavelas et al. 1992, 1995; Kendon 1995, 2004; Müller 2004). This study proposes a differentiation between pragmatic gestures that are grounded in spatial and force-dynamic reasoning (Talmy 1981, 1988, 2000), and gestures that do not directly relate to embodied notions of force and space, such as manual citing gestures (*inclusive-cooperative*) and facial disapproval gestures (*controlling*).

Based on an analysis of 30 minutes audiovisual recordings of political debate, it is shown that gestures that are based on embodied notions of force and space are used more frequently to control a discourse event than those who are not (such as a disapproving facial gesture) as well as non-embodied ones (conventionalized gestures).

Control gestures that are based on embodied notions of space and force are used in both argumentative and conversational discourse. However, the handling of space and force displays clear differences between argument and conversation. The analysis of the data shows that amicable conversational control gestures that have been reported (Müller 2004; Bavelas et al. 1992, 1995; Özyürek 2002; Sweetser & Sizemore 2008; Ladewig 2011) make, depending on communicative context, between 14% and 20% of the control gestures used in argumentative discourse.

Therefore, a scalar typology of pragmatic gestures that organize speaker interaction on the basis of force dynamics and spatial reasoning is proposed.

- Bavelas, Janet Beavin, Nicole Chovil, Douglas A. Lavrie and Allan Wade. 1992. Interactive Gestures. *Discourse Processes*, 15/4: 469-489.
- Bavelas, Janet Beavin, Nicole Chovil, L. Coates, L. Roe. 1995. Gestures specialized for dialogue. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 394-405.
- Calbris, G. 1990. *The semiotics of French gesture*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Kendon, Adam. 1995. Gestures as illocutionary and discourse markers in Sothern Italian conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 23: 247-279.
- Kendon, Adam. 2004. *Gesture. Visible Action as Utterance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Silva Ladewig. 2011. Putting the cyclic gesture on a cognitive basis. *CogniTextes*, 6, <http://cognitextes.revues.org/406>.
- McNeill, David. 1992. *Hand and Mind. What Gestures reveal about Thought*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Müller, Cornelia. 2004. The palm-up-open-hand. A case of a gesture family? In C. Müller & R. Posner (eds.), *The semantics and pragmatics of everyday gestures: 233-256*. Berlin: Weidler Verlag.
- Özyürek, Asli. 2002. Do speakers design their co-speech gestures for addressees: The effects of addressee location on representational gestures. *Journal of memory and language*, 46, 688-704.
- Sweetser, Eve. 1998. Regular Metaphoricity in Gesture: Bodily-based Models of Speech Interaction. In: *Actes du 16 Congres International des Linguistes*, Elsevier.
- Sweetser, Eve, Marisa Sizemore. 2008. Personal and interpersonal gesture spaces: Functional contrasts in language and gesture. In A. Tyler, Y. Kim, and M. Takada (Eds.), *Language in the Context of Use: Cognitive and Discourse Approaches to Language and Language Learning*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Talmy, Leonard. 1988. Force Dynamics in Language and Cognition. *Cognitive Science*, 12: 49-100.
- Talmy, Leonard. 1981. Force Dynamics. Paper presented at conference on Language and Mental Imagery. May 1981, University of California, Berkeley.
- Talmy, Leonard. 2000. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics Volume I: Concept Structuring Systems*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.