12. On some gestures' relation to talk

EMANUEL A. SCHEGLOFF
University of California,
Los Angeles

1

A common understanding of talking holds that at some point a conception or intent is formed in the mind of a speaker or potential speaker to say something or to use some word or construction, and that the talk that is eventually produced is an expression or realization of that intent, with something having occurred between conception and birth (I suppose we might call it "gestation") that converts the intent or conception into the form in which it emerges from the mouth.

This notion of talking has informed the professional literature as well. William James, for example, writes:

> And has the reader never asked himself what kind of a mental fact is his *intention of saying a thing* before he has said it? It is an entirely definite intention, distinct from all other intentions, an absolutely distinct state of consciousness, therefore; and yet how much of it consists of definite sensorial images, either of words or of things? Hardly anything! Linger, and the words and things come into the mind; the anticipatory intention, the divination is there no more. But as the words that replace it arrive, it welcomes them successively and calls them right if they agree with it, it rejects them and calls them wrong if they do not. It has therefore a nature of its own of the most positive sort, and yet what can we say about it without using words that belong to the later mental facts that replace it? The intention *to-say-so-and-so* is the only name it can

266

receive. One may admit that a good third of our psychic life consists in these rapid premonitory perspective views of schemes of thought not yet articulate. (Vol. 1, 1950:253, emphasis in original)
Or, later, Heinz Werner's "microgenesis of meaning," although somewhat more concerned with reactive situations, speaks to a similar notion in referring to "inner experiences of the semantic sphere of the linguistic forms, that were apparently prior to any specific articulation of the words" (1956:348).

More recently, efforts at constructing "performance models" of speech production follow similar lines. For example, Fromkin (1971:49, 51) proposes a model of speech performance that would be consistent with her findings about "speech errors." The model begins with "Stage 1. A 'meaning' to be conveyed is generated," and ends with a stage "where automatic phonetic and phonological rules take over, converting the sequences of segments into actual neuro-motor commands to the muscles in the articulation of the utterance." In between, "generators" of syntactic structure, semantic features, intonation contours, the lexicon, and so on operate.

Although there are models available of the speech production process, empirical work in this area has proven more difficult than work on speech perception. In particular, attention to "naturalistic" materials as input to, or as constraints on, models of speech production has largely focused on speech error data (Fromkin, 1973, 1980), often with the errors detached from the surrounding talk of which they were a part.

In the sort of work I do (on the sequential organization of commonplace interaction and conversation), a topic of interest that has a bearing on these issues is what I will call "projection." That term collects a variety of interests in how and when earlier parts of turns, turn-constructional units like sentences, sequences, whole conversations, and the like adumbrate, foreshadow, or project aspects of possible later productions (sometimes with the consequent intervention of others to circumvent the projected possibility). For turn-constructional units in particular, the notion of a "projection space" is concerned with both the span in which some element of talk is "in play" before being produced, and with the evidence of that which a speaker's turn may make available to its recipient. For example, it appears central to the organization of tightly coordinated turn-transfer from one speaker to a next that aspects of some current turn are projected, and are available to analysis by a recipient/potential-next-speaker before their actual occurrence; for example, the type of turn (question, quotation, disagreement, etc.), and roughly where the turn might come to completion (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson 1974). Another

#1   (PB 3-4:6)

Robin: → She hadda wait up the:re fo:r u-she:s been there
           since eight uh'clock this morning'n at six thirty
           she called me.

#2   (Clacia: 17)

Clacia: B't, a-another one theh wentuh school with me
         → wa:s a girl na:med uh, (0.7) w't th' hell wz er
           name. Karen. Right. Karen.

In (3), the trouble which is involved at "theyd- they *do* b- . . ." and in
what follows is preceded by sound stretches at "i:n::" and yet further
back at "fie:ld."

#3   (TG:219-232, simplified)

Bee: Yihknow she really eh-so she said you know,
            theh-ih-she's had experience. 'hh with
            handicap' people she said but 'hh ih-yihknow
          → ih-theh- in the fie:ld.
            (0.2)
Ava: (Mm:.)
Bee: → -thet they're i:n::.yihknow theyd- they do b-
            (0.2) t!'hhhh they try even harduh then
            uhr-yihknow a regular instructor.
Ava: Right.
Bee: 'hhhh to uh instr- yihknow do the class'n
            evr//thing.
Ava: Uh huh.

However, as the last instance suggests, the further back before a cutoff
repair initiator a sound stretch occurs, the more problematic it becomes
whether or not it is a harbinger of the later occurring repair.

   There are specific sources of this "problematicalness." First, sound
stretches themselves are employed as repair initiators (Schegloff, Jeffer-
son, and Sacks, 1977:367). Second, we know that sometimes repair is
initiated by a repair initiator and is then "canceled," that is, the repair
initiator occurs, but no other part of a repair segment follows; rather, the
turn at talk as projected before the repair initiator continues. We may
term these "nonethelesses," to catch the flavor of spotting trouble, stop-
ping the turn-in-progress to address it, but then continuing the turn
"nonetheless." Thus:

#4   (MO: Chicken Dinner)

F: So the park is trucked at thee:: beginning 'a
            the pier, right?

The stretch of "the" could be the initiation of repair, especially in view of
the "error" just made ("park is trucked" instead of "truck is parked");
however, no further repair segment is forthcoming, and the turn's con-
tinuation is produced compatible with its projected shape. These two
points – that sound stretches can be repair initiators, and that sometimes
only the repair initiator occurs in a repair segment – make it unclear
whether a sound stretch that occurs well before a later initiated repair is a
pre-indication of that later repair, or whether it is an *independent instance of a
repair-related event*, initiated by a stretch and then canceled. (Of course,
not all sound stretches are repair-related, and this fact further complicates
making a judgment as to whether some particular sound stretch is a pre-
indication of a later repair.

The possibility that a sound stretch or other hitch well before a later
repair is a pre-indication of that later repair suggests a further pos-
sibility. As some item enters the "projection space," as it "comes into
play," as it first becomes a specifically planned-for item, if it is sensed or
recognized by speaker as a possible trouble-source (e.g., the exact word
is not available, a difficult sound pattern is involved, how to say it is
unclear, etc.), then a hitch appears in whatever is being produced –
whatever is in the process of being said – *at the moment*. (By momentarily
delaying the point at which the possible trouble-source is to be said, the
possibility is enhanced that the trouble will be solved before that point
arrives. Also, notice is given interactionally of possible trouble ahead.)
Then some hitches would mark the early ("left") boundary of the projec-
tion space, which would thereby become "visible." To establish, or
begin to work toward, such an investigation requires, however, some
anterior sense of which "early" hitches are candidates for "early repair
indication" status, and that sense requires some independent estimate
of how far back before the actual appearance of an element of the talk it
can be shown to have been "in play." That is, an independent estimate
of the size of projection space is needed in order to work toward estab-
lishing early repair harbingers as another type of evidence on this issue.
In the next section, I will try to show how one sort of independent
estimate can be derived from the organization of gesture.

The particular concerns described above do not exhaust the possible
interest of the projection space. It is, after all, one main arena in which
the machinery of speech production works. It is worth noting that two

different aspects of projection are potentially relevant: (1) when some later produced element of the talk comes into play, and (2) the evidences given and available to recipients, before their actual occurrence, of aspects of some elements of the talk. The two are linked here, by the use of the latter to gain leverage on the former.

2

In the remainder of the chapter I shall be drawing on aspects of the organization of gesture, and hand gestures in particular. It will be useful to mention some general points about hand gesturing as a point of departure.[2]

Hand gesturing is largely, if not entirely, a speaker's phenomenon. With few exceptions, which are themselves orderly and in keeping with this general proposition, hand movements by current nonspeakers are not, and are not seen to be, gestures. They may be/be-seen-to-be what ethologists call "self-grooms," self-manipulations, what Goffman calls "auto-involvements," fidgeting, and the like. I know of three main types of exception: (1) Current nonspeakers who initiate a hand gesture may show themselves thereby to be intending, and incipient, speakers, and the gestures may thus be used as a way of making a move for a turn at talk next (cf. also Duncan 1972), and "now"; this exception does not bear adversely on the larger claim. (2) Gestures may be used "in lieu of" talk, as when others are talking and a current nonspeaker tries to communicate without interrupting. In such cases it appears that the gesturing "nonspeaker" is a sort of covert speaker nonetheless; a simple case is the following, in which new guests are arriving to Pam's back yard while she is facing the opposite direction, and Carney calls attention to them by pointing:[3]

```
#5          (Pre–Auto: 2)
                     o................a
Pam:        John'n Ca:rm'n A:bbey c'd all ge//t–
Carney:     ((points to direction behind Pam))
Pam:        ((looks over shoulder in direction of
            point))
```

(3) A third type of exception occurs when a current speaker is interrupted, and yields to the interrupter. Such at-that-moment nonspeakers may hold a gesture that was in progress at the point of interruption to show that they consider their turn still in progress and intend to resume after the interruption. In the following fragment, the guest is in the

midst of a hand gesture when she withdraws from an overlap with "mother" at line 6:

```
#6              (MO: Chicken Dinner)  Gesture: guest has hands in
                front of her on table with palms facing each
                other but slightly facing up and "baton"ing
                together at the marked points of stress in the
                talk

Guest:          I've never thought about how it's done.=          1

                o............................
                =I thought they just set the cameras=I            2

                 ┌mean-┐                                          3
                [                                                  4
Father:            In   credible                                  4

                (.)                                               5
                                              h.........
                        ´         ´
Guest:            I have never (thou::ght)                        6
                 [[
Mother:           (           ) all that- all   that cable        7

                ..l....................................
                'n what if you got the wrong end when             8

                ........................
                you get where yer going.                          9

                h.......................
Guest:          It never entered my mind.                        10

                (0.3)                                             11

                o................
Guest:          'hhh I mean I never- when I watch (.)            12

                any kind of thing on television ...              13
```

l= Guest moves frozen gesture to slightly more "palms up" position, as if responding "I don't know" to prior talk unit by mother (ending with "all that cable"), and then holds that position until next marked onset.

The hand gesture the guest is in as she "drops out" of the overlap with "mother" is frozen throughout the mother's talk, and through her response to the mother at line 10, and is remobilized only when the guest resumes (line 12) the turn ("l mean I never") which was implicated in the interruption. For much of this duration, she is not talking, but the import of her holding the gesture is that she retains a claim to "speakership."

   None of these three classes of exception requires substantial revision

of the general rule that gesturing is a speaker's activity. Indeed, pictorial artists have long known that, in depicting a group of persons, they could indicate that, and which, one was talking by showing one person in mid-gesture. This close relationship between speakership and gesturing with the hands does not extend in quite the same way to other gesturing body parts, like the head.

The connection between speakership and hand gesture recommends the possibility that hand gestures are organized, at least in part, by reference to the talk in the course of which they are produced. Examination of video materials of everyday, naturally occurring interaction shows this organization to be the case. Various aspects of the talk appear to be "sources" for gestures affiliated to them. For example, hand gestures may be orderly and organized relative to the "stress" or "beat" organization of the talk, relative to lexical components of the talk, relative to the type of turn they occur in or some type of action done by the talk in a turn, relative to repair operations in the talk, and so on. Here, I will discuss only the first two aspects, with the focus on the second.

One class of gestures has as its primary organization the co-incidence of its "thrust" (its major energy pulse) or "acme" (its point of maximum extension) with a, or the, major stress or beat of the turn-constructional-unit (e.g., sentence) in which it occurs. The recurrence of this co-incidence is available to relatively casual inspection of video materials, and it has motivated the use of on-stress occurrence as a typological criterion in the professional literature (e.g., in Ekman and Friesen 1972). That this co-incidence is an organized achievement and not "mere coincidence," that it is a product of an organized effort and not a byproduct of some otherwise-focused organization, is most readily evident in two sorts of cases. One is when a series of stresses occur in close succession and have a series of gestures successively co-incident with them, as in fragments (7)–(10) (in which "ˊ" marks the thrust of a gesture, and underlining marks stress in the talk):

#7   (Three Sisters)

S: I mean it's like E̱ddie says, (1.0) as tíme
                goes on it gets wórse 'n wórse 'n wórse 'n
                wórse

#8   (Salv. Army)

C: ... We had s̱ix f̱oot ẖigh: s̱nowdrifts.

```
#9          (MO:  Chicken Dinner)
                           ´                ´
F:          ... hhh an' they ca:rry o(h)ne b(h)oth
            ways.


#10         (MO:Chicken Dinner)
                          c........... ´
F:          ... What I'm saying is then the peacock
            feáthers chá:nge cólor because we put eh-
            different colors ...
```

The other occurs when the gesture is released from a held or prepared position. For example, the gesturing limb is moved to a "cocked" position (this movement not being seen as a gesture but as a preparation for one) and is held there; such a holding can be sustained or broken at various points. A release of the gesture from the cocked position so that its thrust or acme comes "on the beat" displays a designed and organized effort to achieve that co-incidence.

```
#11         (Auto Disc: 03:05)
                        o.........................
Mike:       ... settin there en 'e takes iz helmet
            c......t....
            off 'n clunk it goes on top a' the car ...


#12         (MO:Chicken Dinner)
            c................................t
Guest:      Okay you have the male end for the trucks,


#13         (MO:  Chicken Dinner)
                           h.............t
Guest:      ... or:: (0.7) does he:: (0.8) particularly
            c.........t
            like the Washington tee shirt.
```

(Also, cf. [10].) This is especially striking when a momentary failure of coordination occurs and the co-incidence threatens to be missed. Then, an imminent gesture may be stopped and recoordinated with the talk so as to be delivered on the stress, as in the following fragment:

#14   (Auto Disc: 03:05) Gesture involves hand
              mimicking grasping substantial object, forearm
              raised in backswing prior to hitting down.

```
                                    o..
Mike:         ... was up on the back of his pickup

              ...........c    1   t.......a
              truck with a,  (0.4) with a ja:ck
```

1 = starts thrust, stops short and re-cocks.

"On-stress" organization can be the primary or sole organization for a
gesture which is thereby "affiliated" to the talk component on which the
stress fails. As we shall see, on-stress organization can also operate as a
secondary ordering principle for gestures otherwise organized in the
first place. On-stress organization aims at a version of simultaneity;
there are relevant temporal relationships, and relevant relationships be-
tween talk and gesture other than the temporal.

Another class of gestures I will term "iconic." These are gestures
whose shape links them to lexical components of the talk either seman-
tically (i.e., the shape that the gesture describes depicts a/the "mean-
ing" or referent of a word)[4] or by word class (e.g., "locatives"). I will
work only with the most transparent iconic gestures, ones that, to my
eye and mind, require no text or explanation to link them to some
component of the talk.

Two occurrences are necessary for the composition of an iconic ges-
ture: a bit of movement and a lexical component relative to which this
movement is depictive. Although iconic gestures are sometimes co-inci-
dent with their affiliated word(s) (as in fragment [9], which is iconic in
"both ways"),[5] for the most part the two occur in a regular order. The
gesture – both its onset and its acme or thrust – precedes the lexical
component it depicts, sometimes being released from a cocked or held
position to do so.

#15   (Staff Meeting) Gesture is circular motion of
              hand articulated around wrist; "hold" is
              midway between highest and lowest points of
              circle. Lexical Affiliate is "rotating."

```
                 o................................
Brown:        ... y'know we were rotating people in the

              ......................h...
              office so th't it was open
```

#16   (Staff Meeting, directly following #15) Gesture
             is resumption (from #15) of circular motion
             until hand is at highest point of circle, where
             it is held with fingers pointing up. Lexical
             Affiliate is "up."

```
             .h..o.....h......r...
Brown:       ˙hhh b't nobody came u:p
```

#17   (MO: Chicken Dinner) Gesture is motion up and
             down of right hand with forefinger extended for
             two full cycles. Lexical Affiliate is
             "vertically."

```
                                        o.....
F:           ... it u:setuh look like a sto:plight.

             ...................................
             B'cuz we usetuh use it vertically a lot.
```

#18   (Auto Disc: 13:30) Gesture is extension of
             forefinger. Lexical affiliate is "first."

```
                                  o........a.....r.....hm
Gary:        ... he took t'the-(0.4) he gotta first down
             et uh ...
```

#19   (Salv. Army) Gesture involves right arm with
             hand open being extended straight up over
             head and held, then retracted by closing hand
             in "grasp" and lowering arm. Lexical affiliate
             is "reach" or "reach God."

```
W:           ... If I go tuh church mosta the ti:me, en

             ˙hh if I do all these goo:d things, (.)

             o......a....r........hm
             ˙hh maybe I'll rea:ch God,
```

The critical property of iconic gestures for the purposes of this chapter is
that they are pre-positioned relative to their lexical affiliates, achieving
their affiliation by means other than co-occurrence with them.

  The organizational design of this pre-positioning is further displayed
in another property of many iconic gestures. They are over before their
lexical affiliate is produced. In most cases, the gesture at least begins its
breakup or decay or retraction before production of the lexical affiliate,
as in the following (and cf. also fragments [16] and [19]):

#20   (MO: Chicken Dinner) Gesture is screwing
             motion; after end of that gesture, hands go

```
                    outward with thumbs pointing outward.
                    Lexical affiliate is "screw"; second gesture
                    may have "adapt" as lexical affiliate.

                        o.................................
F:                  =y'(h)kno(h)w th(h)et th(h)ey haveta

                    o.......
                    screw on, ·HHH to adapt
```

Note that the iconic gesture here is a repeating screwing motion, one
that could be ended earlier or extended further with no change in its
"shape." It is stopped just before its lexical affiliate. (On its lexical affili-
ate, a further gesture is enacted that may well be designed to depict
"adapt" in the electronic sense.) Similarly, in fragment [16], the gesture
involves a held limb, a hold that could as well be broken earlier or later;
it begins its decay before its lexical affiliate.

Furthermore, some iconic gestures not only begin their decay before
their lexical components, they end before them. One way gestures can
have their endings marked is by the return of the gesturing limb to the
position from which it departed at the onset of the gesture – to "home
position" (cf. Schegloff, Sacks, and Roberts 1975). A great many iconic
gestures end with a return to home, some before production of their
lexical affiliate, and in spite of immediate redeparture into another ges-
ture, as in fragment (21).

```
#21            (Auto Disc: 03:15)  Gesture as follows: with
               right elbow planted on table and forearm
               extending upward, hand describes circular
               motion articulated at wrist as preparatory
               phase or "windup," and forceful downward thrust
               of hand as gesture.  Lexical affiliate is
               "down."  All markings refer to Mike.

Mike:          So they all // go dow//n

Gary:          A:11

Gary:          All show

               (0.2)

               o.................
Carney:         Yeah, th//ey all,=

               ......t..
Mike:          They all-

               c.......
Gary:          =hn-//-hn:

               .....t       hm          o.........
```

```
Mike:       They all go down th//ere,= No, some-
            somebody
```

The pre-positioned placement of iconic gestures may, thus, be found in the pre-affiliate occurrence of the gesture's onset, thrust or acme, decay onset, or termination at "home," although not all of these features are present in every iconic gesture.

It is the property of pre-positioning that raises the possibility that iconic gestures (and other pre-positioned gestures that are otherwise linked to affiliates in the talk) might shed light on the extent of the projection space. If the gesture is depictive of a particular element of the talk, it is selected or constructed by reference to the particulars of that element.[6] If it occurs before the element is said, then it can be proposed that the element (e.g., lexical item) involved is "in play" – is in the "projection space" – at least as early as the thrust/acme or perhaps even the onset of the gesture selected or constructed by reference to it. Pre-positioned gestures, therefore, potentially offer a minimum estimate of the size of the projection space. The projection space extends back from the production of the lexical affiliate "at least" to the acme, thrust, or onset of its depicting gesture.

How far back, then, does the projection space extend? I would like to begin to address that question on another body of materials. Before turning to them, however, I want to note that the projection space may not be "linear" with respect to the actually produced talk, and that for that reason the appropriate way of talking about it may not be in measurement units that assume linearity, such as milliseconds. Rather, organizational units indigenous to the production of talk may be involved – versions of what we have elsewhere termed "turn-constructional units" (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson 1974). Consider the following fragment, in which the gesture involves both forefingers pointing to the speaker's temples:

```
#22          (MO: Chicken Dinner)  Gesture has both
             forefingers pointing to speaker's temples.
             Lexical affiliate is "thinks."


                              o..........
F:           Jus' like a cl(h)a:ssic story,='HHH An'

             a.............................r
             now when I go out to a job, yihknow an'
```

```
              o....a........
'HHH before we run the cable ev'rybody

..............................
thinks, 'hh "fuck the tru:ck."
```

The beginning of the gesture is around the boundary of a constructional unit; its shape – pointing both forefingers to the temples – to me clearly projects think(ing). But "thinks" does not arrive for quite a while, and between the onset of the gesture and the production of its affiliate, the gesture is dropped and then resumed. The dropping and resumption of the gesture occur around the boundaries of an insertion ("yihknow an" to "cable") into the initially projected shape of the turn unit/sentence; an insertion in which the "subject" of the talk gets shifted from "I" to "we" such that the final portion – "fuck the truck" – is attributed to "ev'rybody." Much is going on here, and the gesture is deployed, undeployed, and redeployed in a manner well fitted to the talk and the exigencies of its production. Units of talk construction of some sort, rather than physically standardized time units, would appear to be involved.

3

When references to space, place, or direction occur in conversation, they frequently are accompanied by gestures. Some of these gestures are depictive of the spatial element and are a type of iconic gesture (some were examined in the previous discussion). These are mostly direction terms such as "up," "down," "out," "in," "off," and the like. Others are not depictive in the same way, but are "points"[7] of varying degrees of clarity that occur in turns that contain place and space references of various sorts. Though the relationship is not iconic, these gestures seem affiliated to the place/space talk elements as the iconic gestures are affiliated to their lexical sources. Aspects of the construction of the gesture and its relationship to the talk element follow.

If the place referred to is visually accessible, then the point is in the direction of the referent, as in the following:

```
#23        (Auto Disc: 01:35)  Gesture is a point by Gary,
           who is sitting in the yard, to the house.
           Lexical affiliate is "iz room."

Gary:      Whynche go put that up so thet it don't
```

```
                 g//et broke any worse,

                 .


                 .


                 .

Gary:            Go put it u//:p.
Curt:            Go on.

                       o...
Ryan:            Uh-WHE-E:RE?

                 .....a  .a  r.......hm
Gary:            Put-nah- In iz roo:m.


#24              (MO: Chicken Dinner)  Gesture is point by F to
                 the end of the dining table.  Lexical
                 affiliate is "the end uh the table there."

                       o....a..r......hm
F:               Why:nchu put that 't the end uh the

                 ta:ble there.
```

If the place referred to is not visually accessible, then it appears that the point is not necessarily in a direction selected to be the "actual direction" of the referent relative to the scene of the talk. For example, in segments that I will not display here, different "places" (which happen actually to be in different directions from the talk scene) are accompanied by points in the same direction, and two persons referring to the same place while talking together point in different directions. The behavior of recipients is compatible with this disengagement of gestures from "actual direction"; recipients of the talk rarely look in the direction to which the point is pointing in place-reference–related gestures.

Instead, sectors of local space relative to the speaker (or the gathering) may be identified with some place referred to.[8] Then:

(1) References to different places employ different local space sectors for their associated gestures, as in the following, in which "beginning" and "end" of a pier are marked:

```
#25              (MO: Chicken Dinner)  Gesture marked at the
                 beginning of the excerpt is a point to the
                 right; the lexical affiliate is "the
                 beginning of the pier."  Gesture marked toward
                 the end of the excerpt is a point to the left;
                 the lexical affiliate is "end of the (pier)."
```

```
       o..c...........t...............
F:     So the park is trucked at thee::

       h...........r........
       beginning uh the pier, right? So

       they can't run the cable on top a'

       the pier, they haveta run the cable

       undernea:th  the pier. Right?
G:     Oh G(h)od
F:     So now yihknow they're (.) they're

       climbing on rafters and jumping

       from rafters, carrying this ca:ble

       that's about the size of a half dollar

       that stretches for maybe a thousand feet.

       'hhh An' they're running out an' running
                          p...........
       out, 'hhh 'course when they get tuh thee

       .................................
       end uh the (0.2) end uh the (0.2) instead of ...
```

(2) Subsequent references to a "same" place employ the same sector as previously used. (Fragment [26] immediately precedes [25].) Note that left points are used to refer to "on" or "end of" the "pier."[9]

```
#26        (MO:Chicken Dinner) Gesture has several parts:
           first right hand is cocked to the right, but is
           not released; then right hand moves to the left;
           then left hand points to the left.  Lexical
           affiliate is "on the pier."

F:         He ran, they went down to the ocean,
           y'know P.O.P., the park,  t//o
                                       o..
           do a commercial, or do a scene.  So

           ....................c...............
           they had a video truck, 'course parked
                 r.......             l......
           (0.3) ih can't park on the- on.the-
                         p....
           on the- on the pie:r
```

G: Yeah


```
1 = right hand moves to left
```

(3) An apparent extension of this practice (on which I have only slight evidence) is the identification of a referred-to object or person with some referred-to place to which a point to some space sector is affiliated. Subsequent reference to that person or object is accompanied by a point to the same sector, even if no place reference is included in the subsequent mention; for example:

```
#27        (MO: Chicken Dinner)  Gesture is a point.
           Lexical affiliate is "the truck"

F:         You gotta have the female end for

           the cam'ra,

G:         Oh no::://:

                 o...t...h.....r...
F:         And the ma:le end for the truck
```

Here, "truck" is accompanied by a point to the space sector previously employed for "beginning of the pier" (cf. fragment [25]) with which the parking of the truck was associated.[10]

Place/space related gestures (henceforth "locationals"), therefore, are either iconic (as in the case of the "directionals") or they are shaped in other ways that display their organized affiliation to an element of the talk around them. Such connections allow independent exploration of the relative positioning of gesture and talk affiliate.

As in the case of iconic gestures, although they are sometimes coincident with their talk affiliates, locationals are most commonly prepositioned, and are methodically organized to be so.

(1) Some locational gestures are returned to home position before production of their affiliate, as in (24) above, or the following:

```
#28        (Auto Disc: 14:05)  Gesture is a point to the
           right with the left forefinger.  Lexical
           affiliate is "t' Florida."

Gary:      =of course he hast'take it down

           there (          //    )

Curt:      He can't sw//ap with someb'dy]
```

```
            o........a r.......hm
Gary:       But eez takin it] t'Florida so, ...
```

(2) A great many more begin their decay or retraction before production of their affiliate.

```
#29         (Auto Disc: 06:35)  Gesture is a point with
            whole of left forearm and hand to the left.
            Lexical affiliate is "over there."

                                         o....
Gary:       You always go o-over en ni-nice in

            ...................a.......r......
            the afternoon en (th'n) you go over

            .......hm
            there wi//th jus::t shirtsleeves on ...


#30         (MO: Chicken Dinner)  Gesture is a point and
            touch to own forehead above hairline with
            right forefinger.  Lexical affiliate is
            "on the front of your hair."

M:          (Ushh't) I got flou:r i(hh)n m(h)y nose.

            o..........a    a      r...
G:           W'll yih sure had it on the front of

            yer hai:r.
```

(3) Most commonly, even if the retraction or home position is not before the lexical affiliate, the acme or thrust, and consequently the onset of the gesture, precede the locational reference. They potentially offer, therefore, the same resource offered by iconic gestures for estimating how early a component of talk may be said to be "in play" before its actual production.

A consequence of this organization and a question it raises require comment before proceeding. Because the acme or thrust constitutes the core of the enactment of a gesture, and because the acme/thrust regularly occurs before its lexical affiliate, the possibility is afforded of a rupture between the gesture and its affiliate, such that the gesture is produced but its lexical affiliate is not. This possibility occurs when the speaker is in overlap and drops out of the competition after the gesture has been formed but before its lexical component has been produced, as in fragment (21) cited earlier, or the following:

#31   (Pre-Auto: 5) Gesture is point to left with
           left forefinger from extended arm.

Gary: Beer's in th'r'frig'rater,

Curt: hm-mghhm.

Mike: Yeah w'll leave it there.

Pam: Bring yer own co:ke.=

           =e⌐n here we sto:cked up on�
             [   ]
             [o.............a r....] hm
Gary: en⌊booze is settin on the ⌋

           (0.3)

Pam: o:n coke for yeh,

Or it may happen when the speaker cuts off the turn in progress in a
self-initiated repair, as in the following:

#32   (MO: Chicken Dinner) Gesture is repeated point
           at the table or something on it.

           o..a   a r...
G: Dih you: put- no you used a lot of

           flou:r

           (1.7)

G: Dih you pu:t- (0.2) 'n (1.0) spices?

In both cases, a full place reference seems to inform the turn, though
some or all of it is missing from the talk.

   Once these types of occurrences are noted, we can note that some talk
displays a gesture, apparently locational, with no lexical affiliate, but
seems to have been designed that way, and is not a conversational
casualty. For example:

#33   (Salv. Army) Gesture is a point with forefinger
           to each cheek -- first left cheek, then right
           cheek.

           o....a.......a....
L: En I'm getting a sun tan.

```
#34           (MO: Chicken Dinner)  Gesture is a point to
              S's chair by G.  All markings refer to "G".

G:            Don' sit the:re.

S:            Huh?
                            o.
G:            Don' sit there.

              .......
F:            C'mo:n
              a.......r.................ha
G:            C'mo:n.  Sit ┌back up an'  ta:lk to us
                          [
F:                         C'mon Stevie. Come sit down.
```

Here, I take it, "on my face" or "on my cheeks" and "here" or "there" respectively clearly inform the talk, although they are missing from it. Such occurrences, whose possibility is structurally provided for by the organization of gesture in which these gestures are pre-positioned, underscore again the importance of examining talk and body behavior together as complementary aspects of talk in interaction.

There does not appear to be, nor should one expect, an invariant span between the production of a bit of talk and the beginning of its projection space, invariant to the type of talk component, its placement in its sentence or other turn-constructional unit, and the placement of that unit relative to the turn it is in, in the sequence it is in. Nor should one expect such a finding when looking at data that happen to afford a resource for estimating a minimum value for that span. What can be reported is a weak ordering principle for acme/thrust, a limit on empirically based theoretical possibility, and an application of the resources that have been developed to a particular case.

(1) A general ordering principle for locational gestures has been noted: before the lexical component to which the gesture is affiliated. There is variation in *where* before its lexical affiliate a locational gesture is placed. A weak auxiliary principle that orders a cluster of cases is: the acme or thrust is positioned to be co-incident with a/the major stress most proximately *preceding* the gesture's lexical affiliate, as in the already cited fragments (21), (24), (27), (28), and the following:

```
#35           (Auto Disc: 02:55)  Gesture is point out to
              right with right thumb.  Lexical affiliate
              is "off."

Mike:         'n 'e tried it about four differn
```

```
                times finally Keegan rapped im a good
                          o....c......l      a...
                one in the a:ss'n then the-b- DeWald
                r......hm.
                wen o:ff.
```

l = starts thrust but cuts it off.

Note, furthermore, that in all these fragments the gesture's acme or thrust falls on a preceding stress even though the lexical affiliate of the gesture is itself stressed, and the gesture could have been placed there by reference to on-stress organization, further evidence that the pre-positioning of these gestures is organizationally designed.

(2) Although the acme or thrust is the core of a gesture, and is what we mainly refer to by "the gesture," it is not the earliest evidence of it, or productionally the first part of it. For estimating the earliest indication of the opening of the projection space for some component of the talk, the *onset* of a gesture is what is wanted, the first bit of movement that will become the gesture that is shaped by reference to that talk component. Here the question is, "How far back do such things go?" The answer will not hold for any case in particular, but can tell whether any entertained possibility in any particular case is within known-to-be-possible limits. In the materials I am dealing with, onsets of locational gestures can be found as far back as just before the beginning of the sentence or other turn-constructional unit in which the lexical affiliate occurs, even if the affiliate occurs at the end of that unit. Specifically:

(a) The gesture's onset may start at the end (in the last syllable or word) of the prior sentence or other turn unit in the same speaker's turn,[11] as in:

```
#36        (MO: Chicken Dinner)  Gesture is point with left
           forefinger.  Lexical affiliate is "over here."


           o....a....................r.....
G:          Wuh- (0.2) No:: sit over he:re and

           ta:lk  //  to us.

F:         C'mon


#37        (MO: Chicken Dinner)  Gesture is point to S's
           chair.  Lexical affiliate is "up there."


F:         Last time?
```

```
G:          Yea:h ˙hhh This time he ate so fast.
F:          Mmhmm.
            (0.4)
                                  o......
G:          an' got down from the table so fast.=
            .......a  r.....................hm
            Las' time he sat up there the whole ti:me.


#38         (Auto Disc: 09:55)  Gesture is sweep with right
            hand toward left and rear.  Lexical affiliate
            is "back."


Mike:       ... ˙hh the guy come all the way with

            fifteen thous'n dollars, he had it right

            there in iz hhh(h)ha:nd man ˙hh in iz

            trailer 'e sz I wantcher Cord, ˙hh yer
                          o....t............a
            not getting it. You might ez well turn
                  hm
            around'n go back.
```

(b) The gesture's onset may start in the bit of time between the start of a turn's talk and the end of a prior turn by another speaker, as in fragment (30) above, or the following, in which the gesture has nearly returned to home position before the talk begins, though the place reference occurs at the end of the sentence there begun:

```
#39         (Auto Disc: 15:00)  Gesture is a point forward
            with left forefinger by Gary.  Lexical
            affiliate is "out there."

Curt:       ='n then he, uh:: seh-uh sent a couple of'm
            t'California.
                                  o..a..r......hm
Gary:                     (-  -  -  -  -  -  -) Well he
            has a snowmobile out there'n, one guy ...
```

Note: each dash at the start of Gary's turn represents about one-tenth of a second of silence.

(c) The gesture's onset may start in the last word(s) of a prior turn by another speaker, as in the earlier cited segments (21), (23), and (34). This

is not to say that the projection space of any component of a turn can be asserted to extend back to before the beginning of the turn unit in which it occurs. It does propose that if some occurrence is a candidate precursor of a later occurrence in a turn, then if it comes no earlier than just before the start of that turn unit, it is compatible with being within the projection space of the later occurrence.[12] A brief application of this logic to a segment follows.

4

I began by developing the question of the extensiveness of the projection space preceding the actual production of a component of speech with regard to the pre-indication of repair. I suggested that, in order to decide whether early possible pre-indications of repair were indeed that, we would need an independent estimate of the possible size of the projection space. I then proposed that such an independent estimate might be derived from iconic gestures, because an element of the talk depicted by a gesture could be said to be "in play" at least as early as the onset of the gesture depicting it. Locational gestures, which share the relevant properties of iconic gestures, can potentially serve the same ends. But does an indication of the beginning of the projection space derived from iconic or locational gesture have any bearing on the status of a sound stretch as a pre-indication of repair? Does the source of the solution I have proposed actually contribute to the problem that motivated it? I will finish with a treatment of a stretch of talk in which the two phenomena – pre-positioned gesture and early possible pre-indication of repair – both occur, so as to see how the solution resource fits to the problem.

```
#40          (Auto Disc: 13:30)   Gestures are all points by
             thumb or forefinger of right hand, either to
             the right or over his left shoulder.  All
             gestures are Gary's and are described by
             reference to his position.


Curt:        I  heard Little wz makin um, was makin frames'n
             sendin 'm t'California.
Gary :       (mn he might be, //          )
Curt:        (Is he:: w-)
Gary:        He's got iz one furse:ll. (1.0) en iz new
```

```
            o..(a:)..1    2    3    r.hm  o........4
            one:  (uh),  he took t'the-  (- - - -) he gotta

            r....hm                     o...5  r.....
            first down et uh,  ( - - - - - - - - - -) Bowling

            Green last week er, oh a couple weeks ago I guess

                         o.....
            ih was, inna car show,

                   6....
Curt:       Hm.

                   .r....
Gary:       Enna, place from Nashville Tennessee offered him

                                     o.....7....
            a hunner do:llars a, da:y, (- - - - - - - -) to

            ......r....hm
            bring it down tuh Nashville tuh show it.
```

1,2 = acmes of two points to the right by thumb.

3   = acme of point over left shoulder by thumb or
        forefinger.

4   = acme of point over left shoulder by forefinger.

5   = acme of point over left shoulder by forefinger.

6   = acme of point to the right by thumb.

7   = acme of vestigial point to the right by thumb.

Note first that when Gary comes to refer to "Bowling Green," he does so only after a bit of repair – a search initiated by "uh" and followed by a 1.0-second pause before he "finds" the name. Note second that there is a sound stretch well preceding this search, at "en iz *new* one: uh,." We have here, then, an instance of a repair preceded by a sound stretch that could be a pre-indication of that "trouble." But the sound stretch is so much earlier than the search; could "Bowling Green" have entered into play that much earlier? Could its projection space go back as far as that?

Note third that in the 1.0-second pause that is part of the search for "Bowling Green" Gary does a "point"; he does it in sequential environ-ment at which a place reference is already projected as relevant, and he thus appears to be doing a pre-positioned locational gesture. (Indeed, such gestures are not unusual in the course of word search segments for place reference.) This point (identified in the transcript by the number "5") is "aimed" over his left shoulder.

Note further, that, during the production of the sound stretch, which we are treating as a candidate pre-indication of the later repair, Gary produces another gesture, indeed a series of gestures. These are points and are seeable as possible affiliates of an imminent locational reference. The third point in this set (the one identified by the "3" in the transcript) appears to be aimed over Gary's left shoulder – the same sector of local space to which he points when he "finds" the reference to "Bowling Green," and to which he points with the same finger at the position marked "4" in the transcript, which appears to be both an iconic gesture affiliated to "first," and a locational gesture affiliated to Bowling Green. The practice of pointing to a same sector of local space in connection with repeated reference to a same place has already been remarked on, and serves here to connect the repair preceding "Bowling Green" to the sound stretch well before it, at "new one."

Note finally that another set of gestures connects two parts of the talk substantially removed from one another, with repair of quite another sort being involved. Of the three points produced in the environment of "new one," only the third is a point over Gary's left shoulder. The first two (at the positions marked "1" and "2" in the transcript) are points to the right, and not with the forefinger but with the thumb. It is therefore notable that when Gary finishes the clause about "the first at Bowling Green," its very end is accompanied by the onset of a new gesture – a point apparently affiliated to the reference of a locational character to "place from Nashville Tennessee." This point, as well as the much reduced or vestigial point preceding the later reference to "Nashville" (at the number "7" in the transcript), are both to the right and both done by the thumb. We are thereby led to remark that these excerpts may be quite similar to (22) examined earlier, in which an iconic gesture was first deployed, then retracted, while a parenthetical remark was inserted before the gesture's lexical affiliate, reinitiated as the parenthetical remark was ended, and then redeployed in the usual manner – just before its lexical affiliate. Here, it appears that the utterance fragment beginning "en iz new one" is projected to incorporate a reference to Nashville, and a locational gesture – a thumb point to the right – was deployed in "anticipation" of it, marking its entry to the projection space. That utterance is then suspended for a bit in favor of a different one first, and with it, the locational gesture in progress is withdrawn, and another – fitted to the newly inserted talk – is deployed. As the inserted talk is brought to an end and the suspended talk is about to be resumed, the gesture that had been in progress before is resumed, now finding its proper place just before the locational reference to which it is affiliated.

In sum, this segment provides not only a specimen of the connection between repair and pre-indication of it being displayed by the deployment of related gestures in those two environments, but of a more general connectedness between two parts of discourse by the deployment of related gestures in them.[13]

5

A great deal of the talk in interaction arrives on a prepared scene. By the time any particular bit of it is produced, many of its aspects have been prefigured, sometimes in quite distinct ways (as with the "thinks" in fragment [22]), often in ways much harder to pin down. Posture, gesture, facial expression, preceding talk, voice quality, and the like all till the soil into which the words are dropped.

Iconic and locational gestures have, as one of their attractions, the property of being often connectable in reasonably clear ways to specific components of the talk. One of the findings proposed above about these classes of gestures holds for some other talk-accompanying behavior as well. This behavior is not distributed randomly or symmetrically around the talk that it accompanies. Rather, its distribution is skewed, and occurs before the talk it is built for, and up to co-incidence with that talk, and rather less after the bit of talk has been produced. This is even more the case if the onsets of these behaviors are considered.[14] Of course, a great many of these behaviors taken one by one are indefinite in their meaning and import, however pregnant with projected sense. Examining a gesture or a facial expression does not ordinarily allow any definite assertion about the character of the talk then in progress, and its interactional import. Isolated units of this sort are like so many chips. We regularly get their sense and contextual fit only when the bit of talk they were built to accompany arrives. These bits of behavior render the scene in which the talk arrives a prepared scene; the talk, in turn and in retrospect, renders the bits of behavior their coherence as preparation.

Appendix A. "This," "That," and the Placement of Deictic Gestures

The temporal relationship between a gesture and its affiliate has a direct bearing on aspects of deixis. I shall give only a brief illustration here, one concerning the choice between the indexicals "this" and "that" and the sensitivity of that choice to proximity/remoteness, not in space, but in time.

We are dealing here with indexical uses of "this" and "that." An object is referred to in the talk but not by a reference term or a descriptor, but rather by the insertion of a dummy item that is paired with a gesture of some sort that

indicates the object the dummy "stands for." The gesture has its placement in the talk specified by the placement of the dummy – the indexical. It is crucial to note that it is the *gesture* that is thereby placed in the talk, not the object the gesture indicates. For what is brought into the talk by the dummy is not "the indicated object" but a "reading of" or an "analysis of" the gesture. The choice between "this" and "that" as alternative dummies can turn on the sort of analysis to be made of the gesture.

Consider the following three segments:

```
#41        (MO: Chicken Dinner)  Several gestures are
           involved.  F is holding a business card in his
           left hand and gesturing with right hand.  He
           first releases a prior gesture, then repositions
           the business card with his left hand.  He then
           points at (something on) the card and animates
           the point for a  few moments.  He then stops that
           gesture and points at a part of one of the
           listener's  garment at "this color."

                                 1.............2....
F:         ...y'know like three time lo:nger the bird. ˙HHH

           ......o........3.....................4  o......
           an' then: u-thi:s stripe is in a li:ght (.) w'll

           5.................
           it's in this color.
```

```
1  =  release of prior gesture toward business card

2  =  repositioning of business card

3  =  point reaches its acme and moves back and forth over
         business card

4  =  stop back and forth motion

5  =  arrival at target of next point
```

In the cases of both "this"s here, the state of the gesture at the time the "dummy" is "due" is the "reading" of the gesture to be brought into the talk (I omit consideration of Wittgenstein's problem here). In the first case, methodical preparation brings the acme of the gesture to its initiation simultaneous with the indexical (and with its stress), and the gesture is sustained over the ensuing words. In the second case, the target seems to be arrived at in advance of the indexical, but is apparently in position as the indexical is said ("apparently" because the gesturing limb is hidden from view in the video picture).

A second case:

```
#42        (Auto Disc: 08:30)  Gesture involves both hands
           describing roughly the shape of a large bell,
           starting at the bottom and with hands just
           meeting at the top.

Curt:      Hey, Where c'n I get a::, uh 'member the old

                                 o..........c  t..
           twenny three model T spring, (0.5) backspring,
```

```
                     ........................1
                     't came up like that, (0.2)
```

```
1  =  gesture describing bell ends with hand at high point
      of gesture, hands are held there before being
      released to next gesture, which redescribes the
      figure but from the top down.
```

Note here that what is to be brought into the talk is a *shape* described *over the course of the gesture*, not a state displayed at its end point, or at the point at which the indexical is produced. The appropriate analysis of the gesture to be brought into the turn is, therefore, the course of a gesture largely already past, relatively remote, and the dummy that can indicate that is "that." Use of "that" may, thus, serve to display completion, and readiness for recipient's response. It is not that "this" could not be used; it seems likely, however, that were it used it might be accompanied by a repeated enactment of the shape, and, accordingly, extension of the turn. All of this depends in part on the speaker's judgment of the eyes of his recipients. Here, he sees them (or at least the one he is directly looking at) to be seeing the gesture on its first presentation. "That" is usable, and sensitive to its placement relative to the gesture and the analysis of it wanted for the turn, that is, "prior states of the gesture."
    And a third case:

```
#43        (MO:Chicken Dinner)  Hands are held in front of
           body with palms facing each other about nine
           inches apart, and then are twice moved to be
           farther apart.  After final widening, hands are
           shaken up and down, animating the "measuring
           gesture."
```

```
                               1      2
F:         ... an' the female to a ma:le,='HHH So these

           3 c  t......................................r
           (0.3) ca:bles about th(hh)is l(h)o(heh heh)ng

           y'know ...
```

```
1  =  adopts first position of hands about nine inches apart.

2  =  increases distance between hands.

3  =  increases distance between hands again.
```

The "length of the cables" is to be brought into the talk. Elsewhere, just before the first data segment discussed in this section, the same speaker has described something as "incredibly long" with an accompanying gesture. There he chose a descriptor to do the work of "length," and perhaps here – in the (0.3)-second pause – a similar selection is at stake. Instead, a deictic function is employed. Whether or not such a selection in such terms is involved, note that a series of adjustments is made in the relative positioning of the hands which will be the analysis of "this long." Twice the hands are widened (the adjustments, quite apart from the finally achieved distance, helping to achieve a reading of "this long" as "very long") so that they are "current-state-of-the-gesture-readable" when the indexical that refers the recipient to them is produced. There is a

trajectory to the gesture here as there was in the prior segment considered, but in that one the whole trajectory preceding the deictic was brought into the turn by "that," and here the earlier parts of the trajectory are replaced by the later, and the final, stage alone invoked by "this" (though the history of this final stage may have consequences, as previously noted).

Note in all three segments that (1) the onset of the gesture always precedes its deictic affiliates; (2) the acme, or beginning of acme, is on or before the affiliate; (3) therefore, the deictic is built not to point to something ahead, but to something just happening or already over.

Appendix B

Unless otherwise noted, transcript excerpts in which body behavior is included employ the following symbols marked above the line of talk in which they occur:

o	=	onset of movement that ends up as gesture
a	=	acme of gesture, or point of maximum extension
c	=	body part "cocked" or "poised" for release of gesture
h	=	previously noted occurrence held
t.	=	thrust or peak of energy animating gesture
r	=	beginning or retraction of limb involved in gesture
hm	=	limb involved in gesture reaches "home position" or position from which it departed for gesture
p	=	point
. . . .	=	indicates extension in time of previously marked action
1, 2	=	numerals refer to legend describing special actions at end of data excerpt
(— —)	=	elapsed time of silence, each dash representing about one-tenth of a second; this representation of silence used only occasionally, to show placement of body behavior in it; otherwise silence is represented by numbers in parentheses, e.g., (0.2).

Notes

1. The word search that occurs in this utterance is analyzed in Goodwin and Goodwin (forthcoming). One finding of the analysis is that the gaze withdrawal and "thinking face" that accompany this word search begin at the word "wa:s," and make the "link between the stretch in 'wa:s' and the subsequent search . . . quite clear, and indeed literally visible to recipient." (Charles Goodwin., personal communication)

2. The chapter was prepared on the premise that a videotape of the relevant data would be available. The videotape was available at the conference but is not in this book. There is no satisfactory device for the presentation of the sort of material appropriate to the themes of this essay. Still pictures, tracings, stick figures, and the like all lose precisely what is at issue – the shape and pace of movement. Discursive description preempts the very analysis the material should bear on contingently; how to describe the body behavior is precisely the issue. Quasi-anatomical and topographical descriptions give a false sense of objectivity and precision, and are not the relevant terms of descriptions for the analysis; metaphorical and analogical descriptions "capture the flavor" but are not detailed accounts; in any case, the reader is

disallowed an independent judgment of the adequacy of the account to the
materials. Every effort I have made to revise the essay has foundered on the
issue of adequate representation of the data. Nor does coding the fragments
and reporting statistically solve the problem; it merely hides it under a table.
What is needed is a videodisc accompanying the text. For the present pub-
lication, I have fallen back on discursive description as an unavoidable
expedient.

I most regret being unable to present in publication at this time a rework-
ing of the essay to explicate the methodological import of some of the dis-
cussion now couched in substantive terms. Specifically, what is here, and
elsewhere in the literature, treated as findings about the relationship of com-
ponents of speech and their "affiliated" gestures, can be recast as a discus-
sion of how we (analysts and coparticipants) come to see some bit of talk and
some bit of body behavior as "affiliated." Rather than treating their affilia-
tion as a given, and using it as a license to explore what is treated as "further
findings" (such as their temporal relationship, their "semantic" rela-
tionship, etc.), the notion of "affiliated gesture" can itself be seen as prob-
lematic, and the "further findings" recast as those properties of talk-and-
body-behavior by which they are constituted as an affiliated "package."
When visual inspection of the behavior becomes possible, such a recasting
of the discussion may be more feasible.

The conference version of the paper, substantially reproduced here, omit-
ted adequate bibliographical references. Most glaring was omission of any
reference to the growing literature on so-called nonverbal behavior, and on
gesture, or as Kendon calls it "gesticulation," in particular. The most rele-
vant references are to Efron (1941), Condon and Ogston (1966, 1967), Ekman
and Friesen (1969, 1972), and Freedman (1972). Most directly pertinent is the
work of Kendon, who as long ago as 1972 reported in passing a finding like
those with which I am concerned. More recently, Kendon (1979b) takes up
materials and findings just like those with which I am concerned. Our
interpretation of these findings is different – Kendon finding in them
grounds for a claim of some sort of priority, precedence, anteriority, or more
fundamental status for body behavior as compared to speech. I treat the
production of the talk as organizationally more fundamental, the body be-
havior being generally temporally and sequentially organized with respect
to *it*, and not the other way around. Still, the convergence of findings is
notable; the results were arrived at independently, and from different sets of
(naturalistic) materials.

3. See Appendix B for explanation of symbols used in transcript.
4. The "meaning" depicted is not necessarily the one employed on that occa-
   sion of use; e.g., though "upness" is not involved in the "up" of "wake
   up," the gesture may depict "upness." Cf. (21).
5. The speaker's two hands move in parallel to the right, to the left, and to the
   right again.
6. Gestures may also be constructed as complements to the talk in describing
   something, and may then not be shaped by the particulars of talk elements;
   cf. examples (33) and (34) and related discussion.
7. As it happens, these are nongaze-directing points.
8. Richard Fauman first called my attention to some of these points.
9. Note in this fragment the similarity to fragment (22). In both, a gesture is
   under way, an insert is done in the talk that gets the gesture temporarily
   aborted, and when the originally projected talk resumes, the originally pro-
   jected/enacted gesture is resumed.

10. These points are especially relevant to place/space references in stories told in conversation from which many of the fragments displayed are taken, but they seem to obtain outside storytellings as well. On the association of persons or objects with places as a mnemonic device with broad implications, cf. Frances Yates (1966).
11. Instances such as (37) and (38) are ones in which various aspects of the talk display that another sentence or other talk unit is to come. In other cases (e.g., [6]), incipient gestures, or as yet uncompleted ones, may serve to claim, or display an intention, to produce further talk. Charles Goodwin called my attention to the relevance of this point here (also cf. Goodwin 1981:29).
12. All the "harbingers of repair" cited at the beginning of this paper are compatible with this constraint.
13. My understanding of this segment was substantially enhanced by Charles Goodwin's detailed remarks on an earlier version of it.
14. Note that even gestures designed for co-incidence (e.g., with stress) will regularly need pre-positioned onset to achieve it, yielding access to their projection space as well.