Hodge, G. (2020). Book review for *Journal of Pragmatics.* https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2019.12.009

Gesture in Multiparty Interaction, Emily Shaw. Gallaudet University Press, Washington, DC (2019). 268 pp., ISBN 978-1- 944-83843-0, 80 USD.

It is a long-standing observation that humans communicate using a range of semiotic resources within situated interactions e hands, bodies, voices, physical objects and surfaces e and the communication habits which emerge (including what we call 'signed languages' and 'spoken languages') are inherently multimodal (e.g. Kendon, 2004; Enfield, 2009; Green, 2014; Perniss, 2018). Comparative investigations of the face-to-face interactions of signers and speakers therefore offer deeper understanding of the processes fundamental to language use and evolution (see e.g. Kendon, 2014; Perlman, 2017; Ferrara and Hodge, 2018). However, most comparisons to date have focused on controlled dyadic interactions and/or experimental data, with the aim of identifying which bits of signed languages are parallel to the co-speech gestures used by speakers of spoken languages (i.e. interrogating the "visual-gestural modality" versus the "aural-oral" or "verbal modality"), especially with respect to use of manual depicting actions, and potential boundaries between "gesture" and "sign" (see e.g. Perniss et al., 2015, inter alia). Less common are comparisons embracing a Peircean-inspired semiotic approach for analysing the full range of meaningful actions evidenced within face-to-face interactions, mainly using corpus data and with the intention of enabling more holistic assessments of similarities and differences, untethered from theoretical assumptions about language modality (e.g. Johnston, 2013; Fenlon et al., 2019; Puupponen, 2019). Even rarer are investigations that prioritise interactional perspectives and explicitly analyse turn-taking as jointly negotiated social acts (e.g. Manrique, 2016; Ferrara, 2019). Shaw's book bridges these latter two marginalised (yet highly complementary) paths and paves them further.

Drawing from a constellation of semiotic and interactional principles for analysing face-to-face communication, Shaw compares the multimodal communication practices observed within naturalistic deaf and hearing multiparty interactions. Specifically, interactions within one group of fluent deaf signers of American Sign Language (ASL) and another group of fluent hearing speakers of US English who do not know a signed language. Shaw chose a game night as the comparable communicative event because game nights are typical for both deaf and hearing social gatherings in the United States. Both groups were required to play a game Guesstures at one of their homes, during which players must communicate without using conventionalised codes (in this case, either ASL and/or English). In addition to promoting visible use of the body in communication, each group was therefore also implicitly tasked with self-determining what counted as "gesture" or not. This strategy allowed deaf signers to organically decide what is gesture and what is sign as the game unfolded, and enabled Shaw to offer observations on local ideologies of what it means to gesture. For example, the deaf signers' choice to exclude a mimetic action of milking a cow because it was too similar to the ASL sign MILK, but agreeing to include a finger-pointing action to one's wrist to denote the concept "time" because hearing people use this gesture too. The main result is to show that gesture is a vital part of spoken language, that spoken languages are best described as "verbal-visual-gestural" just as signed languages are described as "visual-gestural", and that more similarities than differences can be observed by directly comparing the two groups. This book constitutes a very welcome challenge to the traditional emphasis on the differences between signed and spoken language use (which has unfortunately obscured many similarities), and enables Shaw to address a wide range of topical questions of interest to scholars of linguistics, anthropology, and gesture studies.

After familiarising the reader with the signed language linguistics and gesture literature, and a review of the main problems in each field, Shaw identifies two questions that still need answers: (1) how deaf and hearing people use a range of gestures other than those functioning to depict imagery, i.e. how we use gestural actions in addition to the "iconic gestures" (McNeill,

1992) or "depicting signs" (Liddell, 2003) that have received most attention to date; and (2) how deaf signers manipulate iconicity at will, dynamically turning the depiction up or down as needed (Chapters 1 and 2). As Shaw argues, the prevailing dichotomy of signs as ranging from iconic to arbitrary is "too coarse to describe the forms people use in multi- dimensional and multimodal ways" within their interactions (p. 37). Rather than making use of pre-existing categories developed through signed language or co-speech gesture research, Shaw therefore uses the identification of interactionally- driven communicative moves to drive the investigation and the "composite utterance" (Enfield, 2009) as the central unit of analysis. Her aim is instead to describe the semiotic articulators in each move according to what each progressively con- tributes to the composite utterance (i.e. signalling sign, index and/or icon) and different layers of interactional meaning. This semiotic basis is further enriched by Goffman's (1981) participation framework, which considers how people take stances, establish footing, and signal affiliations or oppositions to each other.

The multiparty video data documented for the deaf and hearing groups was analysed using the Conversation Analysis framework, and by iterative descriptions of utterances in terms of broad categories of articulators, and development of unconventional glossing practices (Chapter 3). Shaw explains this was done to avoid enforcing any problematic "language versus gesture" distinctions on the data, which may have occurred if one was encouraged to decide what a particular gestural action is doing on the basis of pre-existing analytical categories. Although both novel and admirable (especially in the context of deep concerns about how written gloss practices have been applied to signed language data), it is not clear if this process unwittingly obscured comparison of some forms, and Shaw may have benefited more from the comparative semiotics approach advanced by Johnston (2013) and Kendon (2014). Regardless, it is the process of data collection and initial comparison during which the main differences between the two groups were identified.

Firstly, that deaf signers need to maintain maximal sight lines to communicate with each other, whereas hearing speakers typically do not e a necessity first noted as a factor potentially influencing the shape of signed languages by Johnston (1996). Shaw goes one step further, noting that "this physical arrangement for maximisation of sight lines is, in fact, a ritualised entry into multiparty interactions in ASL" (p. 48). In other words, it is a moral imperative within deaf multiparty interactions to make sure that everyone can see each other, one that shapes our interactions from the start. Secondly, the time pressures of the guessing game meant that eye contact between deaf guessers and performers was probably higher than other situated contexts, where signers are free to break gaze after turn initiation. A further difference was that the deaf signers delineated what they would include or exclude as "gesture" during the game as it was played, whereas the hearing speakers could rely on the pre-existing and prevalent ideology of gesture being anything meaningful done with the hands and/or body. Shaw also observed that the hearing gesturers tended to score lower than the deaf signers, even though they had easier clues. This tendency may reflect the fact that deaf signers are arguably more habituated to guessing the communicative intents of a wide range of people compared to hearing speakers, who have the lifelong luxury of drawing upon heavily conventionalised forms (e.g. spoken words) in many contexts.

This list of differences make good sense to strong signers familiar with both kinds of interactions e as Shaw is herself, being an experienced ASL/English interpreter e yet they are differences not often (or at all) put forward in the literature. It is also here that the differences between the deaf and hearing groups end. Shaw devotes the rest of the book to detailed analyses of moments from the data to demonstrate two important principles: (1) when people can see each other, they maximise the visible display of meaningful semiotic information insofar as it achieves mutual understanding; and (2) the cognitive accessibility of information e whether it

is new, given, or even misunderstood e is a hugely influential factor motivating what semiotic resources are used and how (thus offering answers to the two questions outlined in Chapters 1 and 2). When the deaf and hearing groups were compared side-by-side, their habits of interacting were more similar than not: both groups made use of eye gaze to co-regulate turns; both groups used manual forms to depict imagery and simultaneously achieve some interactional function; both groups used bodily enactment ("constructed action") to both depict imagery and keep their audience engrossed; both groups shifted their torsos to index performing and interacting modes; and both used manual emblematic forms to signal degree of accuracy to guessers.

The rest of the book outlines the discursive similarities resulting from these observations. One strand of analysis focusses on specific task-oriented interactions (e.g. taking pizza orders, setting up the game) to explore the notions of frame, footing, positioning and stance (Chapter 5). Another looks at how Open Hand Palm Up and other backchannelling (or "mirroring") actions work to further support these positions within composite utterances (Chapter 6). Signed language data has not often, if at all, been discussed from these perspectives, yet Shaw effectively shows how both deaf and hearing groups "signal engagement and create discourse coherence through their bodies in highly similar ways" (p. 126). This pluralistic approach is interesting and inspiring, while also outlining how signed language, spoken language and gesture researchers can find common ground moving forward. It is unfortunately the case that many gesture researchers neglect the signed language literature in their work, while many signed language researchers neglect the research on gesture e and are routinely criticised for this by gesture researchers called upon as reviewers. This stand-off between mutually beneficial fields and viewpoints needs to end, and Shaw's book provides an excellent resource for all kinds of researchers to broaden their horizon. Indeed, Shaw's demonstration of how we can compare deaf and hearing interactions is the greatest strength of the book, along with the extensive examples from a US context and detailed explanations of how the interactions unfolded.

One point overlooked, however, is whether the data suggest that defining human communication systems on language modality grounds (e.g. the "verbal-visual-gestural modality") is warranted at all, or whether such bounded categorisations are potentially misleading given the sheer diversity of interactions that are possible (and the multitude of languages, voices, codes and forms of communication that may be used within them, see Kusters et al., 2017). As we move further along the path of comparative semiotics, it may be useful to question whether the paradigm of language modalities continues to serve our understanding in a progressive way. Perhaps it is better characterised as an intellectual convenience e and historically, a political necessity e that we can gradually do without. Given the wonderfully rich data analysed, compared and presented in Shaw's book, it seems difficult to maintain the assumption that languages can be described and categorised according to a specific language modality with essential characteristics that potentially shape them in some way. It may be more accurate (and probably not controversial for more interactionally-oriented researchers) to suggest it is people and all their embodied constraints and potentialities who shape interactions, communication systems and languages e not language modalities. Indeed, there is continuity between Shaw's line of research and ideas put forward by Edward Tylor in 1865, when he suggested the word "utterance" simply means to "put outside" one's thoughts, and that we should encompass all the "principle means" by which our utterances are "put outside" and analyse them (Kendon, 2004: 51; see Tylor, 1865). Shaw's contribution demonstrates an effective way to do this.

Acknowledgements

The reviewer gratefully acknowledges support from the UK Arts and Humanities Research Council (AH/N00924X/1).

References

Enfield, N. (2009). The Anatomy of Meaning: Speech, Gesture, and Composite Utterances. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fenlon, J., Cooperrider, K., Keane, J., Brentari, D., Goldin-Meadow, S. (2019). Comparing sign language and gesture: insights from pointing. *Glossa J. Gen. Ling. 4*(1): 1-26. https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.499.

Ferrara, L. (2019). Regulating Turn-Taking with Pointing Actions in Norwegian Sign Language Conversation. Paper presented at the 13th Theoretical Issues in Sign Language Research conference. 26-28 September, Hamburg.

Ferrara, L. & Hodge, G. (2018). Language as description, indication, and depiction. *Front. Psychol. 9*: 716. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00716.

Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of Talk*. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

Green, J. (2014). *Drawn from the Ground: Sound, Sign and Inscription in Central Australian Sand Stories*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Johnston, T. (1996). Function and medium in the forms of linguistic expression found in a sign language. In Edmondson, W.H., Wilbur, R.B. (Eds.), *International Review of Sign Linguistics*, 1. Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ, pp. 57-94.

Johnston, T. (2013). Towards a comparative semiotics of pointing actions in signed and spoken languages. *Gesture, 13*(2): 109-142. https://doi.org/10.1075/gest.13.2.01joh.

Kendon, A. (2004). *Gesture: Visible Action as Utterance*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Kendon, A. (2014). Semiotic diversity in utterance production & the concept of 'language'. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B 369*, 20130293.

Kusters, A., Spotti, M., Swanwick, R., & Tapio, E. (2017). Beyond languages, beyond modalities: transforming the study of semiotic repertoires. *Int. J. Multiling. 14*(3): 219-232. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2017.1321651.

Liddell, S.K. (2003). *Grammar, Gesture, and Meaning in American Sign Language*. Cambridge University Press, New York.

Manrique, E. (2016). Other-initiated repair in Argentine Sign Language. *Open Linguist. 2*(1). https://doi.org/10.1515/opli-2016-0001.

McNeill, D. (1992). *Hand and Mind: what Gestures Reveal about Thought*. Chicago University Press, Chicago, Illinois.

Perlman, M. (2017). Debunking two myths against vocal origins of language: language is iconic and multimodal to the core. *Interact. Stud. 18*(3): 376-401. https://doi.org/10.1075/is.18.3.05per.

Perniss, P. (2018). Why the study of language should be multimodal. *Front. Psychol. 9*, 1109. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01109.

Perniss, P., Ozyürek, A., & Morgan, G. (2015). The influence of the visual modality on language structure and conventionalization: insights from Sign Language and gesture. *Top. Cogn. Sci. 7*(1): 2-11. https://doi.org/10.1111/topis.12127.

Puupponen, A. (2019). Towards understanding nonmanuality: a semiotic treatment of signers' head movements. *Glossa: J. Gen. Linguist. 4*(1): 39. https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.709, 1-39.

Tylor, E. (1865). *Researches into the Early History of Mankind and the Development of Civilization*. John Murray, London.

Dr. Gabrielle Hodge is a deaf researcher specialising in the linguistics of signed languages. She earned her PhD in Linguistics from Macquarie University in 2014, supervised by Professor Trevor Johnston. Her doctoral research used the Auslan Corpus to investigate how to identify and describe clause structure in signed languages. She is currently a post-doctoral researcher working with Dr. Kearsy Cormier on the BSL Corpus Project at the Deafness Cognition and Language Research Centre at University College London. Her research interests include corpus linguistics and the semiotics of multimodal signed and spoken language interaction.