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Abstract
This paper seeks to integrate research from both cognitive science as well as phenomenology to explore the ways in which gesture and language interact in intentional action. My aim in this research is directed towards actor training and the use of gesture in naturalism. By sharing research from developmental psycholinguists the role of gestures in the training of actors can be examined more closely and it may be possible to elucidate modes within actor-training that enhance subtle and in-depth performed communication.
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This paper seeks to integrate research from both cognitive science as well as phenomenology to explore the ways in which gesture and language interact in intentional action. My aim in this research is directed towards actor training and the use of gesture in naturalism. By sharing research from developmental psycholinguists the role of gestures in the training of actors can be examined more closely and it may be possible to elucidate modes within actor-training that enhance subtle and in-depth performed communication.

In *Lie To Me* (2009), the American television series, Dr Cal Lightman played by Tim Roth reads the micro expressions of those under investigation by his clients in order to ascertain innocence or guilt. Through reading body language and facial expressions Dr Lightman and his team of ‘deception experts’ have managed to provide the Fox network with a highly popular production. Since 2009 *Lie To Me* has aired here in Australia extending to three series. Lightman’s remarkable perceptions have pushed the theories of body language and Facial Action Coding into the public arena. Dr Cal Lightman’s character and work is loosely based on Dr Paul Ekman’s research (1973; 1985; 2003; 2008). Ekman retired as Professor of Psychology in the Department of Psychiatry at the University of California, San Francisco (UCSF) in 2004 after working there for 32 years. He has publishing extensive research on the biological origins of facial expressions associated with a set of emotions, which he codified into his now famous Facial Action Coding System. For those interested in television trivia both Ekman, in his book *Telling Lies* (1985), and Lightman, in the television series, attribute their initial concern with facial expressions and veracity to the guilt they experienced after their mother’s suicide, when she convinced orderlies at her psychiatric institution that she was stable enough to be allowed on a weekend pass.

**A Phenomenological Perspective**

In my doctoral research, which concentrates on actor training (Hayes 2010), I refer to gesture using a phenomenological framework. I examine the perceptions of actors in training as they come to comprehend themselves as bodies under observation (by the audience). In the specific training that I both teach and research – The Malmgren Acting Technique – actors become conscious of their body’s movements in space. Part of this consciousness pertains to non-verbal communication between bodies. Bodily stances, angles of parts of the body in relation to the body’s axis, movement of arms,
legs, feet, fingers, the head, hands, fleeting facial movements, all are able to convey what I term as pre-linguistic reflective communication (Hayes 2010, 248). I use the term pre-linguistic because these performed communications operate outside of symbolically structured dimensions solely defined by language. Malmgren’s acting technique, basing itself on many of Rudolf Laban’s terminologies for specific human movements, labels these kinds of movements as ‘incomplete actions’ (Hayes 2010, 51; Laban 1971, 86–87) indicating they are not functional actions. The developmental psychologist Spencer D. Kelly (Kelly et al 1999, 588) states that the unconscious moves performed whilst speaking ‘co-determine the meaning of any utterance’, where the person making the sound, whether words or exclamations, may be partially unaware of the totality of the meaning conveyed. Moreover, in present gestural research it is not clear whether any listener can fully comprehend the information encoded in these spontaneous gestures (Beattie; Shovelton 2007). I use the term ‘reflective’ to situate these non-functional communications within Jacques Lacan’s (1999, 216) concept of mimesis, where an ego or identity is established through differentiation between itself and otherness through a mirroring process. Bruce Wilshire (1999, 167) suggests that in terms of theatre, mimesis operates as an unconscious means taking on the ‘expressivity of others in the group’.

Gestures (‘gestes’) for Merleau-Ponty in his *Phenomenology of Perception* (2002) are the means through which any animate body explores her world and enacts intentions. He emphasised the vital role that the body plays in constituting any perception of reality. In Merleau-Ponty’s (1968, 152–153) model of the *chiasmatic* connection between any body/subject and firstly their own body and secondly the bodies of other body/subjects, Merleau-Ponty describes a process through which ‘a consciousness [is] caught up in the ambiguity of corporeality’ (Garner 1993, 448). The embodied subject is at one and the same time grounded in and of the world and is able to reflect on that very condition. For Merleau-Ponty our realities are already established through our bodily intentions, which are always in part intertwined with others’ embodied intentions. Merleau-Ponty established the body/subject as embedded and interactive with every other body/subject, creating ‘phenomenal fields’ of experience (Merleau-Ponty 1968). Gestures for Merleau-Ponty, through this intertwinement, are the accumulation or acquisition of communal habits or skills. Any body’s movements in Merleau-Ponty’s phenomenology of embodiment are the intermediary position between culture and a given biological world (Merleau-Ponty 2002, 98; Casey 1998, 213), since every action is performed within an intersubjective space. The movements that I have termed pre-linguistic reflective communication emanate from what Merleau-Ponty terms the ‘autonomous’ or ‘prepersonal’ body (2002, 97) that ‘cleaves to’ the world even before the body/subject has assumed any perception of it. A wonderful and famous example of this is outlined by Iris Marion Young (2005) in her seminal article ‘Throwing like a girl’. It was 1977 when Young first presented her examination of young women’s motility and spatiality of throwing and in which, using Merleau-Ponty’s theories, she clarifies how the intentionality and motility of young women’s throwing abilities are unconsciously restricted through the girls’ bodily intersubjective experiences within a male-dominated environment. The results are the socially constructed habits of visible body comportments.
Theatre and Gesture

Theatre since its emergence has understandably been concerned with gesture as a meaning-making system. From the formal gestures of masked characters in Greek drama to the later emergence of specifically designated moves for each of the masked characters in the Commedia dell’ Arte, gestures have enabled the development of character (Walton 1984; Daniel 1965). Likewise in Asian theatre, for instance in the Vietnamese classical theatrical form of Tuông, gesture is specific and handed down through tradition to denote character, and expressive states.

It was François Delsarte who created the systematised set of gestures, used by actors and dancers, which influenced Rudolf Laban’s movement theories (The Delsarte Project 2011). Delsarte, who lived from 1811 until 1871, wrote nothing of his work and it was not until 1885 when Genevieve Stebbins wrote, *The Delsarte System of Expression* that Delsarte’s theories were fully articulated. Delsarte formulated nine principles of gestures, stressing connections between experience or mental attitudes and their physical manifestations in gesture. Nancy Lee Chalfer Ruyter (1996, 64) writing in *Dance Research: Journal of the Society for Dance Research* notes about Delsarte and quotes him in stating that,

> Of the three agents of expression that he designated as primary – voice, gesture and speech – he considered gesture to be ‘the direct agent of the heart… the fit manifestation of feeling… the revealer of thought and the commentator upon speech.’

Rudolf Laban (1879–1958) extended the interlinking of gesture with mental attitudes in his later years of movement research for actors and dancers when settled in the United Kingdom after fleeing Germany’s Nazi regime. By 1947 he had published *Effort* with F.C. Lawrence, one of the first British management consultants, indicating the connection of gestural rhythms with psychological states. Later in Laban’s text, *The Mastery of Movement* (1960), published posthumously by his wife Lisa Ullmann, Laban names a set of ‘Inner Attitudes’ linking C.G. Jung’s personality types of Sensing, Thinking, Intuiting and Feeling with motion factors.


The study of ‘Inner Attitudes’ became the principal means of Malmgren’s actor training at Drama Centre London and through which Malmgren trained such actors as Sean Connery, Anthony Hopkins, Collin Firth, Anne-Marie Duff, and Pierce Brosnan. ‘Inner Attitudes’ can be understood as differing perceptual modes of dealing with the environment and others. Marion North (1975) furthered Laban’s techniques for investigating movement for performers and the links between movement and personality, creating her own system of movement awareness looking at patterns and rhythms of movement.
I offer these insights in indication of the fact that systematising gestures within performance styles has often been used as a means of reflecting affective predispositions and thought processes of characters as well as reflecting character motivations. At times this process has captured the public imagination and been used beyond the boundaries of performance. For instance in the late 1970s Warren Lamb wrote *Body Code: The Meaning in Movement* which was a popular book and instigated a system called MPA (Movement Pattern Analysis) for assessing peoples’ motivations. Perhaps more popularly Alan Pease in 1987 wrote the best seller, *Body Language: How to Read Other’s Thoughts by their Gestures*. Paul Ekman’s Facial Action Coding System relies on the recognition of the movements of the 43 facial muscles to discern emotional expression. Clearly, Dr Lightman from *Lie To Me* and his insightful skills have been preceded by others.

**Gesture and Language: A Cognitive Perspective**

Turning to science throws a more discriminating light on the subject of gesture. Susan Goldin-Meadow (1999), one of a number of developmental cognitive psychologists researching the role of gesture in communication and its relation to language, divides gestures into two types: the gestures that substitute for speech and clearly serve a communicative function and the gestures that I have referred to in the earlier part of this paper, those performed unknowingly. The former gestures Goldin-Meadow (1999, 419–420) reveals as taking language-like forms; they are codified and structured. A particular sign such as joining the thumb and forefinger to create the sign of ‘OK’ or such as lifting a thumb to another to sign ‘Thumbs Up’ cannot be substituted by altering the fingering. Change the fingers and the communication is not the same. More complex systems of language type gestures such as various sign languages fit into this category. Goldin-Meadow (1999, 419) has called the spontaneous gestures that accompany language ‘imagistic and analog’. These gestures, despite being spontaneously and unconsciously made, have been shown to have meaning for both the listener (Kendon 1994) and for the speaker (Goldin-Meadow 1999). All speakers gesture, even blind speakers and even when they are speaking to others who they know to be blind (Goldin-Meadow 1999, 427). Psycholinguists (Özyürek and Kelly 2007, 181) have shown that these gestures are linked to language through timing and meaning to the ‘ongoing speech stream’. Gestures operate in relation to language according to Spencer D Kelly (Kelly et al 1999, 588), another developmental cognitive psychologist, to ‘disambiguate the meaning of speech’ and that likewise ‘speech disambiguates the meaning of gesture’. Kelly (p. 588) writes that ‘eyes, hands, or tone of voice… actively codetermine the meaning’ of anything that is spoken.

In the You Tube clip, ‘Talking Twins Pt 2.’ (Talking Twins Part 2, 2011) two twins in nappies, who may be under a year old, stand in front of a fridge animatedly ‘speaking’ to one another in gobbledygook. The twins gesture dynamically to each other; they raise their arms, they wave their hands at each other and one of them raises a leg, all the while clearly having an animated ‘dialogue’ with each other. They demand and answer each other, despite the fact that as yet they have not developed verbal skills. They are in intentional action where their bodies are the principal means of communicating. The twins’ gestures, their tone of voice and their laughter are the techniques or embodied habits through which they are interacting. Their interaction is specific and through it they establish a jointly understood contention. The primacy of the
embodied nature of speech is highlighted through this video clip. As Cornelia Müller (2007, 110), a dedicated gestural theorist has indicated language needs to be considered as ‘multimodal… an integration of speech and gesture’ and ‘its natural home [is] – face-to-face situations’.

David McNeill (2005), the renown American psycholinguist takes the claims of the relationship between gesture and language further claiming that gestures are actually necessary to thinking and speaking; ‘Gestures fuel thought and speech’ (p. 3). There is a dynamic interaction which is performative in its spatial enactment between speech and gesture.

As children acquire their language they are also constructing a speech-gesture system. Gesture and speech grow up together. We should speak not of language acquisition, but of language-gesture acquisition. (McNeill 1992, 295)

Gesturing enables the speaker to clarify his or her thinking. Susan Goldin-Meadow (1999, 427) asserts that this occurs by ‘shifting the [cognitive] burden from verbal to spatial memory’. In other words there is a downloading of articulation abilities by placing part of that articulation into spatially and physically expressed gestures. Gestures also assist in the access to new thoughts, enabling ‘for the first time notions that are not fully developed’ (Goldin-Meadow 1999, 427). Gesturing has also been shown to have a causal relationship in learning (Cook et al 2008), so that by gesturing we can retain an embodied way of meeting and representing new thoughts.

**Gesture and Actor Training**

Phillip Zarrilli (1995a; 1995b; 1997; 2004) has written extensively about actor training and acting processes from a phenomenological perspective. Emphasising that there is no one Euro-American actor training and that any actor training system will impact on its embodied practices through discourses (1995a, 72), Zarrilli is still able to locate the principal ‘work’ of western actor trainings as being psychophysiological (p. 81). Through considering the experiential and lived dimensions of performing, Zarrilli (2004) directs fundamental concepts of acting away from objectifying and reifying actors’ processes, a particularly pertinent position at a time when semiotics has recast the experiencing agent, the performer, in terms of subject positions that have been discursively constituted. Through considering the embodiment of performance, Zarrilli (2004) offers four modes of actors’ bodily engagement in their ‘lived worlds’. These he terms, ‘The Ecstatic Surface Body’, ‘The Recessive Visceral Body’, ‘The Aesthetic Inner Bodymind’ and ‘The Aesthetic Outer Body’. It is from Zarrilli’s ‘Ecstatic Surface Body’ that imagistic and analog gestures emanate and through which, on a daily basis, an unawareness of these gestures remain, as the body constitutes ‘a null point in our perceptual field, we experience from the body, and the sensory world’ (Zarrilli, 2004, 658).
In other words, whilst the sensory perceptions of the body are directed outwards towards its environment there becomes little awareness of the perceiving body itself. Whilst ‘The Recessive Visceral Body’ constitutes the awareness of visceral sensations often vague and unspecific as it pertains to the inner workings of bodies, the two latter modes of ‘The Aesthetic Inner Bodymind’ and ‘The Aesthetic Outer Body’ are awareness developed through specific psychophysical practices. The former directs subtle attention to dialectical inter-linkages between mind and body whilst the latter constitutes the performer’s awareness of being under observation and thus awareness of being simultaneously both a personal as well as a representational entity.

It is through the development of these kinds of awareness in actor training, where trainee actors are led to an experience of the primacy and subtleties of the actors’ lived bodies that an in-depth understanding of gesturing can emerge. Through Zarrilli’s ‘Aesthetic Inner Bodymind’ actors can be engaged both in their intentional and imagistic directions and also aware of their emergent gestures, forming an integrated experience of ‘the gestalt body-as-a-whole’ (Zarrilli 2004, 664). Often little attention is given to performer’s bodily experiences in actor trainings or at times bodily experiences may be negated. Krause (2002, 270) bemoans the fact that whilst Brecht’s epic theatre searches for sophisticated expressions of gestus, modern ‘method’ acting ‘downplay[s the] complexities and contradictions’ of performed action, as if all that is needed is complete empathy with any character for gestures by seeming osmosis to emerge from the actor. Kathy Leahy (1996) indicates that even in the selection of actors for Australian acting schools gestures, vocal tones, appearance and demeanour are used to select a narrow cultural class, rather than being used to explore ‘emotional connectedness or imagination’.

For the student actor without grounding in an awareness of her or his unique lived bodily experience, performance can become an arena for constructed actions with little connection to the actor’s felt meaning. It is not uncommon to see in theatre and performance courses frozen bodies on stage, bodies with minimal movements, bodies locked in painful self-awareness of their lack of ‘naturalness’.

In The Knowing Body (Hayes 2010, 222), I examine the case of a student actor who abandons an authentic self-reflexive exploration of her actions and gestures in order to stay in competition with the rest of her cohort. The process of developing Zarrilli’s ‘Aesthetic Inner Bodymind’ and ‘Aesthetic Outer Body’ take time, with differing developmental times for differing students. For the trainee actor in question (Hayes 2010, 222), she felt so pressured to keep up with the demands of the course and with the output of her fellow trainee actors that it became simpler to imitate actions rather than explore the interconnection between her physical expressions and her own felt meanings. Consequently her processes of learning became stultified and as she states, imitating rather than investing herself in her actions ‘is not worth anything’. I believe this to be a not uncommon occurrence in tertiary performance courses
One simple gestural problem that occurs frequently for actors-in-training is the misinterpretation of the need for gesturing as a need for offering signed information. Trainee actors can be seen pointing to themselves, or to others or to parts of their bodies or particular directions. This type of gesturing, that is gesturing substituting for speech, is not what would be happening if the words were connected to thoughts that were occurring in that moment. What are needed are imagistic and analog gestures but frequently trainee actors are unable to discern or comprehend the embodied desires or intentions that are being enacted. Whilst it is readily apparent to audiences when actors’ gestures are a mismatch with the text that is being spoken, it is more difficult for the actor-in-training to grasp what is required.

Michael Chekhov’s (2002), *To The Actor: On The Technique of Acting*, promotes the stimulus of the ‘psychological gesture’ to liberate performative actions for actors. This rehearsal technique aims to expand the imaginary landscape of the characters played by actors, whilst the gestures used in exploration of the text are not necessarily incorporated into any actual performance. Chekhov’s ‘qualities’, such as molding, floating, flying and radiating, like Delsarte’s gestures or Laban’s movement scales are experiential patterns of movement effecting sensations and muscles.

In a similar manner to Chekhov’s psychological gestures, Yat Malmgren (Hayes 2010) uses Rudolf Laban’s ‘basic actions’ of punching, slashing, pressing wringing, dabbing, flicking, gliding and floating (Newlove 1993, 78) to physically score an actor’s intentional actions in any performed scene. As with Chekhov’s ‘gestures’, these movements may not appear in the performed scene but, importantly, they add an internal spatial, rhythmic and intentional dimension to an actor’s embodied expression. The aim of this approach is to link actors’ vocal expressions with kinaesthetic imagery for as McNeill (2005, 4) states *language is inseparable from imagery...* The imagery in question is embodied in the gestures that universally and automatically occur with speech.

Malmgren’s actor training initially requires actors to present individually in order to emphasise the *chiasmatic junction* between each actor’s body as an observed material entity and at the same time as an expressive locus for the body/subject who is performing (Hayes 2010, 216–223). Through working first with self-devised and improvised scripts, actors become aware of their own language structures and how these are linked to the rhythms of the ‘eight basic actions’ (Hayes 2010, 29). Self-written scenarios performed by trainee actors allow for each actor’s ‘Ecstatic Surface Body’ to function with varying degrees of experiential awareness of their own kinaesthetic positions. As the training progresses specific language packages, relating to the eight basic actions are required for each presentation. Whilst the content of any scenario remains self-written and self-chosen, the rhythm patterns of the scenarios are specified. Consequently each actor begins to perceive the interconnections between their gestures and the structure of their verbalisations. So begins the possibility of the development of Zarrilli’s ‘Aesthetic Inner Bodymind’.
More Than Words

In relation to the dialectic interconnection between language and gesture Özyürek and Kita (2007, 71), both gestural theorists who have developed David McNeill’s theories, indicate that gesturing is altered by the manner in which information is packaged into specific units for speaking.

The content of gestures is shaped *simultaneously* by how speech organizes information about an event and by the spatial details of the event, which may or may not have been expressed in speech (Özyürek and Kita 2007, 70).

David McNeill (2005, 4) stresses that there is no universal body code and that it is erroneous to think of gesture as forming a ‘body language’. Instead culture, as expressed through the particularities of any language, is playing a significant part in gesturing through providing the syntactic packaging of information (Özyürek and Kita 2007, 70). The gestures created by any person in communication with another could not be understood outside of their specific interaction. The imagery-language dialectic that McNeill elucidates is of fundamental importance to performance theorists because it indicates the primacy of the performative nature of language. There is information in any encounter between two people that is only being expressed through gesture and at the same time the syntactic structures of the language being used are shaping the gestural component of the interaction.

This imagery-language dialectic (materialized in gesture and speech) is an interaction between unlike modes of thinking. The disparity of these modes is the ‘fuel’ that propels thought and language (McNeill 2005, 4).

Cornelia Müller (2007, 110) stresses the face-to-face location of language as the ‘natural home’ of language, which she views as ‘multimodal’. She reconfigures language as an integration of gesture and speech, taking into account gesture as a specific modality of the whole. With this in mind it is clear how vital the role of gesturing is within any language-based performance.

What then can we say to our students? Perhaps we can begin by stating, ‘Dr Lightman, there is no code!’ However within gesturing lies a meaning-making process that is a simultaneous and embodied expression of imagistic thought processes. Each attempt at the articulation of specific communication not only results in speech but also forms gestural moves, having spatial, temporal and intentional attitudes through which the whole body/subject is expressive towards its being-in-the-world. From twitches, to blinks, to the rolling of ankles, to nose-scratching and ear-pulling, all are parts of a dialectical process of communication with our abilities to speak of the things that matter to us.
Partial Narratives

As indicated earlier not only may a speaker be partially unaware of what is being transmitted through pre-linguistic reflective communication, but listeners may be also partially unaware. Susan Goldin-Meadow (1999) explores the concomitant possibility that of speakers mutually influencing each other’s communication through their gesturing. She indicates that when gestures and speech convey the same message gesturing facilitates communication. However gestures can impede communication when there is a mismatch between what is spoken and the accompanying gestures Goldin-Meadow 1999, 426). The gestures are supplying their own partial narrative to the communicated thought-stream. They have the potential to throw a light on the unspoken thoughts of the speaker, or to increase the complexity of the communication. As an actor trainer I regard this research as underscoring a vital component contributing to the liveness of any performance.

Pedagogically, through Malmgren’s acting technique trainee actors develop an awareness of the gestural transactions as well as the intentional and language-based transactions occurring in any face-to-face encounter. However the placement of character becomes a determinant in deciding how sensitive any text-based character is to the embodied gestural information that is flowing.

Specific characters may be resistant to responding to any communication apart from verbal information. Other characters may assist communication, intervening with smiles, nods, reflective gestures in harmony with the embodied gestural communication that they are receiving. Characters may be baffled by the discrepancies between what is being spoken and what they understand through gesture. Any on-stage character requires these kinds of considerations as to how gestural communication is dealt with. Gestural theorist Janet Bavelas (2007, 128) explores face-to-face dialogue, both the audible acts as well as the visible acts. She includes in her definition of gesturing facial displays and adds gazing as a gestural component. Bavelas (p. 128) shows how when high levels of reciprocity are occurring in a communicative act then gestures can momentarily replace words and still be understood and responded to by the listener. There can be simultaneous feedback where speaker and listener are interrupting or completing each other’s dialogue based on their gestural exchanges. In particular Bavelas mentions that facial displays can alter the direction of the communication. She terms these highly reciprocal gestural interactions where mutual influence is occurring as ‘micro-social interaction’ (Bavelas, 2007, 128).

A participant’s contribution does not originate autonomously in his or her mind (or from “language” as an abstraction) and does not evaporate into a social vacuum (Bavelas, 2007, 128).

Playscripts, especially contemporary texts can indicate where this form of dialogue is occurring, placing dashes where the interruption by the listener is to happen. However without an understanding of gesture and how it contributes to the dialogue these performed interruptions can remain as static and meaningless in the trainee actor’s performance. The trainee needs to consider how invested in ‘the other’, or how intertwined in ‘the other’ the speaker is in relation to the communication.
Trainee actors are often seen to speak in performance as if the listener can immediately comprehend what the speaker is saying. However the effort of the communication is embodied in the animation of the gestural patterns, especially when expressing new ideas or ideas that matter to the speaker. Again it is necessary for trainee actors to comprehend how each character imagines their reception by other characters.

Carrie Noland (2007, 8) in her examination of the new media art of Bill Viola calls the specific and often minute gestural movements that Viola captures on film when his performers are in action, ‘protentive’ movements. Noland (p. 2) is interested in the ways in which specific motor sequences convey unscripted yet social meanings for an audience. The movements that Viola captures in his slow motion films are not functionally performed by his actors, but rather emerge as small adjustments of each actor’s body in a larger context of functional action. The actors may be unaware of these muscular gesticulations, many of which are facial. Viola’s camera work brings these to life in profoundly moving ways. Noland’s research suggests that when actors are on the way towards new and meaningful actions these socially inscripted moves will emerge through the ‘prepersonal’ body (p. 8). However this can only come from actors allowing rather than censoring their own personal reactions to environments and others to exist as they move; the actors’ already established ‘I cans’ are set in neural pathways but need to be constantly adjusting to new contexts if the vitality of their gestures are to be witnessed. This ‘moving towards’ is the important thing; images propelling movement will then create a myriad of ‘protentive’ shapes along the way towards the next set of sedimented spoken words.

**Conclusion**

The exploration of gesture in naturalism can be vitally enhanced through an understanding of the research that psycholinguistics offers. A phenomenological approach in performance pedagogy considering each actor as a body/subject in constant interaction with her or his own ‘lifeworld’ offers a contextualised vision of how bodies interact on or off stage. Assisting in each actor’s developing awareness of the interconnections between their felt meanings and their physical and vocal expressions is a rich pedagogical investment in enabling ongoing learning processes for any student of performance. Whilst the concept of universal ‘body language’ is erroneous given the complex interventions of culture with any body/subject, the psycholinguistic research revealing the interconnections between imagery, language and gesture provide fields of possibilities for exploring subtle interactions in face-to-face spoken communication in performance. Through such means it is possible to gain an enlightened view of how through bodies and voices human beings bridge their separateness as they act, talk and listen.
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