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In this article a conversation analytic approach is used to investigate the form and use of enactment by speakers with agrammatic aphasia in talk-in-interaction. Enactment here refers to the employment by participants of direct reported speech and/or other behavior such as the use of gesture/body movement and/or prosody to iconically depict some aspects of reported scenes or events. The enactment of these speakers is notable in terms of the distinctive grammatical practices within which it is regularly produced (e.g., without any reporting verb such as say) and a reliance on kinesic enactment and simple lexical forms produced as seconds, i.e., reactions or second pair-part responses such as oh, no, and oh no. It is argued that enactment and other instances of iconicity within interaction as produced by these aphasic speakers are examples of interactional methods adopted by them in order to formulate actions and events in talk using the limited lexical and grammatical resources at their disposal, and some similarities to other types of language use such as child language and pidgins are noted.

This research was funded by an award from the Economic and Social Research Council (Award R000222754). Earlier versions of the article were presented at the International Pragmatics Association Conference, Budapest (2000); the Euresco Conference on the Linguistic Organisation of Conversational Activities, Helsinki (2002); the University of Reading seminar series (2003), and the British Aphasiology Conference, Newcastle University (2003). We are grateful to all who have given feedback on the work presented here.

Correspondence should be sent to Ray Wilkinson, Neuroscience and Aphasia Research Unit (NARU), School of Psychological Sciences, University of Manchester, Zochonis Building, Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9PL, UK. E-mail: ray.wilkinson@manchester.ac.uk
This article uses a conversation analytic (CA) approach to investigate the interactive talk of people with aphasia, a language disorder acquired following brain damage, who display a particular pattern of aphasic utterance production termed agrammatism. Speakers with agrammatism can present with a number of features, including the omission of function words and grammatical affixes (Howard, 1985) and reduction in aspects of syntactic complexity such as embedding (Saffran, Berndt, & Schwartz, 1989). Speech also regularly displays a paucity of verbs (Edwards, 2000; Menn, O’Connor, Obler, & Holland, 1995). These speakers’ talk therefore regularly consists of utterances that are relatively simple syntactically, are often verbless, and are composed of a series of words, particularly nouns, with little or no grammatical indication of the relations between them (Goodglass, Kaplan, & Barresi, 2001). The following is a sample of agrammatic speech (from Goodglass, 1976) where the speaker is explaining about coming to the hospital to have work done on his gums:

Ah . . . Monday . . . ah, dad and Paul Haney [referring to himself by his full name] and dad . . . hospital. Two . . . ah, doctors . . . , and ah . . . thirty minutes . . . and yes . . . ah . . . hospital. And, er Wednesday . . . nine o’clock. And er Thursday, ten o’clock . . . doctors. Two doctors . . . and ah . . . teeth. Yeah. . . fine.

In particular here we will be discussing the use of enactment by agrammatic speakers within talk-in-interaction. The term enactment (M. H. Goodwin, 1990; Streeck & Knapp, 1992) as it is used here refers to the employment by participants of direct reported speech and/or other behavior such as the use of gesture/body movement and/or prosody to depict to recipients some aspect(s) of a reported scene or event. While the use of enactment by agrammatic speakers in talk-in-interaction has not previously been investigated in detail, there are a small number of studies in the aphasiological literature that analyze aspects of the phenomena focused on in this article. For example, in a study of agrammatic speakers’ performance on a picture-sequence narrative task, Menn et al. (1995) reported that the speakers often made use of direct reported speech, as well as sound effects and exclamations, in telling the story. It has also been noted that certain agrammatic speakers regularly display little or no use of indirect reported speech, presumably because of their difficulty with the subordinate construction involved (e.g., “X said that . . .”), and instead rely on direct reported speech (Goodglass, 1976; Hand, Tonkovich, & Aitchison, 1979). In a single case study of a Norwegian man with agrammatism, Lind (2002) observes that this speaker regularly makes use of direct reported speech in talk but does not use indirect reported speech. She discusses a number of ways in which the speaker contextualizes an utterance as direct reported speech, including the use of verbal and/or nonverbal expressions referring to a person or a place and the use of gaze and pauses, as well as the use of specific vocabulary, of prosody, and of gesture.

Our analysis of the use of enactment by agrammatic speakers in talk-in-interaction is part of a growing body of work in which aspects of aphasic language such as grammar and lexis are explored from a conversation analytic perspective using naturally occurring interactive talk as the main form of data (e.g., Auer & Ronfeldt, 2004; Beeke, Wilkinson, & Maxim, 2003; C. Goodwin, 1995; Heeschen & Schegloff, 1999, 2003; Wilkinson, Beeke, & Maxim, 2003; Wilkinson, Gower, Beeke, & Maxim, 2007). A common characteristic of these analyses of aphasic language is an interest in investigating how features of the talk in these interactions may be “adapted to context” (Heeschen & Schegloff, 1999, p. 377), and in particular how certain aphasic grammatical and lexical practices may be understood in terms of their production and placement at that point within the turn constructional unit (TCU) (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974) within which they occur as well as within the ongoing turn, sequence, and wider activity within which that TCU is
being produced. Such studies present a different perspective to traditional approaches within aphasiology that have typically accounted for patterns of aphasic language (such as those seen in speakers with agrammatism) in terms of damage to the particular brain regions and/or neuropsychological processes believed to underlie those patterns (see e.g., Caplan, 1987; Ellis & Young, 1996), and that have based their accounts primarily on language elicited through the use of experimental methods such as object naming, picture description, and monologue elicitation. In this article we discuss the use of enactment by these speakers to formulate actions and events within talk-in-interaction and suggest some ways it can be seen to be a useful resource for them. We will be observing that enactment is one of a number of ways in talk in which these speakers make use of iconic language forms, and at the end of the article we will note some connections between such features of agrammatic talk and other types of language use, such as child language and pidgins, in which the speakers do not have brain damage.

DIRECT REPORTED SPEECH/ENACTMENT AND ICONICITY

While directly quoting someone, a speaker may also depict other aspects of the reported participant’s conduct by using kinesic behaviors such as facial expression, gaze, gesture, and body movement/posture (M. H. Goodwin, 1990; Sidnell, 2006; Streeck & Knapp, 1992) and prosodic and paralinguistic behaviors such as pitch, loudness, tempo, and tone of voice (Couper-Kuhlen, 1998; Klewitz & Couper-Kuhlen, 1999) to present to recipients a verbal and visual enactment not only of the words the reported speaker used but also how s/he sounded and acted as s/he said them. As well as occurring together as an overall gestalt, these different elements of an enactment may occur separately; a speaker, for example, may at some point kinesically enact aspects of a reported speaker’s physical behavior, such as gesture and facial expression, by miming it without simultaneously using direct reported speech or other propositional language (Streeck & Knapp, 1992). Most work on direct reported speech has focused on vocal elements of the quotation (i.e., the words used as well as, in some cases, the prosodic and paralinguistic behaviors), with relatively little analysis of any kinesic elements involved (exceptions being M. H. Goodwin, 1990; Streeck & Knapp, 1992; and Sidnell, 2006). In this article, while drawing on work on direct reported speech (sometimes also referred to as “quotation” or “direct quotation”), we will be focusing in our analysis on both the vocal and kinesic aspects of the speakers’ conduct, and it is for this reason that in our analysis we will favor the term enactment (M. H. Goodwin, 1990; Streeck & Knapp, 1992).

Schegloff (2000a) has noted that direct reported speech is one of the practices used by speakers to tell about an event. In the same way that they have practices for formulating or referring to persons (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979; Schegloff, 1996) or place (Schegloff, 1972), speakers have particular practices they use to formulate actions and events in the world. In purporting to present to a recipient the actual words used by the reported speaker(s), direct reported speech differs from other practices for formulating reported talk and actions. One other practice is indirect reported speech, which provides a paraphrase of the content of a speaker’s talk rather than the actual words used. Another practice mentioned by Schegloff (2000a) is that of the reporting speaker providing a more general formulation of perhaps several utterances/actions in the reported scene through, for example, the use of a reporting verb. In the relevant extract in Schegloff’s (2000a) article this is the verb “admiring” (in the utterance “we were kind’v admiring th’ car”), which “glosses the contributions of several participants over a stretch of talking” (p. 717).
Drawing on the distinction made by Peirce (Buchler, 1940) between icons, indices, and symbols as kinds of sign, a number of researchers (Clark, 1996; Clark & Gerrig, 1990; De Brabanter, 2005; Recanati, 2001) have suggested that an important feature of direct reported speech is that it is iconic in that it allows speakers to communicate by demonstrating (or depicting) aspects of a particular scene of event and thus “enable addressees to experience selective parts of what it would be like to perceive the thing directly” (Clark, 1996, p. 174). In the case of direct reported speech the speaker can demonstrate to a recipient the actual words the reported speaker is purported to have said as well as aspects of how s/he sounded and/or acted while producing the words (i.e., the prosodic/paralinguistic and kinesic behaviors of the reported speaker). As well as occurring with reported words, these prosodic/paralinguistic and/or kinesic behaviors can also be used without words to demonstrate an aspect of a scene or event, including as part of what Clark and Gerrig (1990, p. 781) call “nonlinguistic quotations” where speakers can enact noises and/or produce kinesic depictions both typically introduced by “go” (for example, “the car engine went [brmbrm], and we were off!” [Hudson, 1985, p. 235]).

A central feature of iconicity is that there is a resemblance between form and meaning (Lyons, 1977). Other examples of iconicity include prosodic/paralinguistic “symptomatic signals” (Lyons, 1977) such as the correlation between loudness of voice and pitch rises and increased anger or excitement, and onomatopoeia, including “onomatopoeic interjections” (Dressler, 1995), for example the production of animal sounds such as “grrrr.” Another example is “diagrammatic iconicity” where the relation between the verbal elements iconically reflects the relation between the referents. One form of diagrammatic iconicity, for instance, is “temporal iconicity,” where “the string of elements on the form-level simply mimes the temporal order of activities in the real world” (Fischer & Nanny, 2001, pp. 7–8).

Some of the interactional properties of direct reported speech that have been noted in the literature would appear to be linked to its iconic properties. Holt (1996, 2000), for example, notes that in talk-in-interaction direct reported speech (DRS) can function not just to report a previous interaction but to provide evidence of what was actually said, and she observes that “DRS is often used to provide evidence by depicting the reported utterance” (1996, p. 226). This allows the recipient to assess the utterance him/herself, although the teller may also implicitly display his/her evaluation of, and stance towards, the reported utterance through, for example, the use of prosodic/paralinguistic features or laugh tokens while producing that reported utterance (Clift & Holt, 2007; C. Goodwin, 2007).

It has also been noted (Holt, 1996) that direct reported speech is an economical device in interaction. This is because by presenting the reported speaker’s prosodic/paralinguistic behaviors and/or kinesic behaviors at the same time as producing the direct reported speech, the current speaker can include a depiction of aspects of the reported speaker such as his/her appearance, emotional state, and linguistic register at the time of speaking. Thus speakers can demonstrate many aspects of a reported scene or event that would be more cumbersome or difficult to put into words and describe.

A further important property of direct reported speech that has been discussed in the literature and that we will be drawing on in our analysis is that by its design, as for example a response or reaction, direct reported speech can invoke an aspect of the reported event, such as a prior turn, which might not itself be reported. For example, Holt (1996) notes that discourse particles such as well and oh commonly occur at the start of the reported utterance and can function to “anchor the utterance to the ‘original’ situation, conveying information about the reported utterance and
context” (p. 237). In direct reported speech the form of the original utterance is produced, including its deictic features such as pronouns, place, and time deixis and verb tense (Li, 1986; Mayes, 1990). Similarly, nonvocal behaviors such as pointing may be produced as if they were those of the reported speaker in the reported scene or event (Streeck & Knapp, 1992).

A final notable property of direct reported speech is its relatively loose syntactic relation to the rest of the utterance in which it is embedded. It has been observed (e.g., Mayes, 1990) that direct reported speech functions like a main clause in that, unlike indirect reported speech, it can take the form of, for example, a question or command. It also can contain “main clause phenomena” (Mayes, 1990), which typically cannot occur in indirect reported speech. Main clause phenomena include discourse particles such as oh (see also Holt, 1996) and exclamations such as oh my gosh (Mayes, 1990). Compared to indirect reported speech, which, as a paraphrase of the original quote, contains only propositional content, direct reported speech allows for the displaying of affective aspects of the reported speaker’s meaning. This is achieved through aspects of the form of the utterance such as the use of discourse particles and exclamations as noted previously, and the prosodic/paralinguistic features of the reported utterance (Mayes, 1990). Kinesic enactment also appears to be able to be produced within an utterance with few syntactic restrictions (Clark & Gerrig, 1990).

DATA

The data analyzed here comes from videotaped recordings of four people with nonfluent aphasia each talking in two-party interactions either with a spouse/family member at home or with a speech and language therapist either in a hospital clinic or the home of the person with aphasia. In the case of one aphasic speaker (Roy), data is available of his interactions both with his daughter (Di) and, on a separate occasion around the same time, with a speech and language therapist/researcher (Sally). In the case of another (Connie), the aphasic speaker has been recorded talking on separate occasions to two different significant others, her husband (Sam) and a female friend (Jane). For reasons of confidentiality all names of aphasic and nonaphasic speakers have been changed, as have any person or place names in the transcripts that may potentially allow the participants to be identified. Details about the speakers’ aphasia are presented in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker with Aphasia</th>
<th>Neurological Cause of Aphasia</th>
<th>Time Postonset of Aphasia at Time of Conversation(s) Analyzed in This Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Connie               | Left hemisphere cerebrovascular accident (CVA) | Conversation with Sam: 2 years  
                        |                                                                           | Conversation with Jane: 3 years, 11 months  |
| Roy                  | Left hemisphere cerebrovascular accident (CVA) | Conversation with Di: 7 years  
                        |                                                                           | Conversation with Sally: 7 years  |
| Donald               | Left hemisphere cerebrovascular accident (CVA) | 2 years 6 months  |
| Roger                | Left hemisphere cerebrovascular accident (CVA) | 4 years 1 month  |
The data is transcribed using normal CA transcription conventions (see, e.g., Atkinson & Heritage, 1984; Ochs, Schegloff, & Thompson, 1996) with the addition of phonetic symbols (International Phonetic Association [IPA], 1999) where necessary to capture more exact phonetic features of an aphasic speaker’s output. Kinesic behavior, such as gestures, facial expression, and body movement, are glossed in italics within double parentheses, for example ((gestures)). Where the kinesic behavior occurs at the same time as talk, the temporal relationship between them is marked with overlap brackets.

ANALYSIS

In our data a regularly observable feature in the talk of speakers with agrammatism is that the use of enactment allows them to use relatively simple linguistic resources for formulating actions and events. These linguistic resources are typically relatively simple both syntactically and lexically. Syntactically, as was noted previously, in normal (nonaphasic) talk the embedding of the direct reported speech after a reporting verb such as say is relatively simple since it has a loose syntactic relation to the rest of the utterance in which it is embedded. In agrammatic talk, as will be seen, it is regularly simpler still since typically the reporting verb is omitted and the enactment is, to a greater or lesser extent, produced in a freestanding form.

An example of this can be seen in Extract 1. Here Connie, the speaker with aphasia, and her friend Jane have been talking about looking in the local newspaper to find the price of a neighboring house that is up for sale. After talk about Connie not receiving the paper (lines 01–03), there is a discussion about which paper each gets before Connie in line 16 returns to the topic of not receiving the paper:

Extract 1 (Connie and Jane):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Connie</td>
<td>eh I didn’t get one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>what the paper?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Connie</td>
<td>yeah ((several lines omitted in which the participants discuss which papers they get))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Connie</td>
<td>I ph[one up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>((points to self; small nod))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>((nods))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Connie</td>
<td>[ (0.3) where’s the paper?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>((hand open; facial expression looking indignant))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>oh you phoned th- the the paper people?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Connie</td>
<td>hyheah!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>you have done?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Connie</td>
<td>[nhah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>((head shake))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>oh you’re gonna=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Connie</td>
<td>= ( hh) yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>yeah you should do=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Connie</td>
<td>=yeah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In line 16 Connie says “I phone up” and as she says it points to herself and produces a small nod (line 17). Jane nods in response (line 17). This nod appears to function as a continuer (Schegloff, 1982) since “I phone up” is hearable as pragmatically projecting more to come, such as Connie saying something about the content of the phone call. This is indeed what comes next, and it is produced in the form of an enactment. Connie here acts as if she is talking to the paper supplier by producing the question “where’s the paper?” (line 19). The question functions as a complaint, and while producing it she kinesically accompanies this with a facial expression of indignation/annoyance and an open hand gesture (line 20).

Depicting her question/complaint rather than describing it provides Connie with an economical method of producing her utterance. However, one effect of this economical formulation appears to be a difficulty for Jane in understanding Connie’s utterance. Jane’s candidate understanding (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977) in line 22 formulates the event that Connie has just enacted as being a past event in which she has phoned the paper people. After Connie at first apparently agrees with this formulation, further questioning by Jane however reveals Connie to have been talking about something she planned to do or felt she should do, in the future.

The omission of the reporting verb before the enactment and the enactment’s relatively freestanding form as seen in Extract 1 are both very common in the talk of the agrammatic speakers in our data and will be seen in all of the other extracts in this article. In other ways, however, this extract is unusual in our data both in that the enactment here is in the form of a sentence and in that it contains a verb. Much more typical is the pattern that will be the focus of the rest of this article; this is where the enactment is in a nonsentential form, contains no verb, and regularly consists of either very few lexical items (most commonly one) or what Clark and Gerrig (1990) term “nonlinguistic quotations” where the aphasic speaker produces a gestural enactment either with a nonlexical vocalization or with no accompanying vocalization. As such, these enactments tend to be extremely economical and linguistically simple both syntactically and lexically. Another feature of these enactments (and again this differs from the enactment in Extract 1) is that they are regularly indexical (see Heritage, 1984a) in the sense of being “seconds” (Schegloff, 2003) to something, i.e., either reactions in forms such as oh or second pair-part responses (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973) such as declinations that here regularly take the form of no.

We will discuss these forms of enactment in terms of four patterns in the data: the use of kinesic enactments with or without vocalization, the use of oh and assessments, the use of no, and the use of oh no.

---

1The economical nature of the formulation here can be seen if other possible methods of constructing the utterance are envisaged. An indirect reported speech version, for example, might take the form “I’m going to phone up that paper supplier and ask where my paper’s got to.” Notable advantages for agrammatic speakers such as Connie of the direct enacted version in Extract 1 over the possible alternative indirect one are that as well as being shorter, lexically simpler, and allowing the aphasic speaker to use his/her relatively intact kinesic and prosodic/paralinguistic resources, the formulation in Extract 1 avoids the need for the production of a reporting verb (ask) and the subordination construction that follows it.

2The source of this problem for Jane in understanding whether Connie is enacting a past or future event appears to lie in the fact that Connie uses the present tense both in the enactment (the contracted form of is) and in the preceding “I phone up.” Another example from the same conversation of Jane misinterpreting something Connie says as a past event when it is a future event is discussed in Beeke et al. (2003). Patterns of such examples point to one way in which specific aphasic impairments, such as difficulties with morphology, can lead to real interactional problems for aphasic speakers and their conversation partners.
KINESIC ENACTMENT WITH OR WITHOUT VOCALIZATION

All of the examples of enactment by agrammatic participants in our database contain kinesic enactment as at least a part of the overall enactment gestalt. By means such as facial expression, gaze, gesture, and body movement/posture participants can iconically demonstrate how a speaker purportedly looked as s/he produced the reported action or activity. In some of our examples agrammatic speakers use kinesic enactment without any accompanying lexical content, i.e., either on its own or with accompanying nonlexical vocalization. Such forms of enactment thus provide an economical and linguistically simple means to communicate a reported speaker’s action (see also Beeke, 2005; Beeke, Wilkinson, & Maxim, 2007).

An example of an agrammatic speaker using kinesic enactment on its own is seen in Extract 2, which comes from a conversation between Roy, a man with aphasia, and his daughter Di. Immediately prior to this extract and in lines 01 to 05, Roy and Di’s discussion is focused on Di’s upcoming birthday party and how, although her boyfriend had organized it and kept its existence a secret from her, Roy had had an inkling that something was being arranged. In line 07 Roy then produces a new person reference (“Linda”) while pointing to a spot in front of himself (line 08). He continues by saying “and” while starting to point to a different spot in front of himself and gazing at his finger (lines 09 and 10). This second point appears to be a method used by Roy here to display another person in the event by means of indicating (Clark, 1996) rather than referring verbally to the person. Having communicated the existence of more than one person in the event, Roy now displays their action by means of kinesic enactment; in line 12 while gazing ahead he mimes the speakers’ excited talking by opening and closing his mouth and moving his head from side to side. The mime appears to be an exaggerated and humorous enactment by Roy of two or more women (perhaps including Di) gossiping and reacting excitedly to discussion of the possibility of a party.

Extract 2 (Roy and Di):

01 Di: some’inks a bit fishy here=
02 Roy: =e- e- EXACTly. exactly.
03 (0.2)
04 Roy: [and]
05 Di: [you] were ri:ght!
06 Roy: uh- i- i- >exactly< °hh and=course=°hh eh- eh- eh- er

3 This extract thus provides an example of how, in light of limitations in the ability to use verbal symbols, aphasics may make increased and distinctive use of the other two types of sign described by Peirce, indexes (i.e., Roy indicating by pointing in line 10) and icons (i.e., Roy’s demonstrating an action by means of kinesic enactment in line 12). Another example of the combination of indicating and demonstrating is given in Clark and Gerrig (1990, example 3), although in Extract 2 here it is notable that Roy is not pointing to an actual person or object but rather manages to indicate a person through having set up this slot for a person reference by means of the prior person reference to Linda and the point that accompanied that reference. In part, therefore, the second point gets its ability to communicate a particular meaning by means of the semiotic space set up by the first point rather than by indicating a particular person or object in the physical environment. The regular use of verbal indexical resources in the construction of turns by fluent aphasis has been described by Wilkinson et al. (2003).

4 For evidence that this is the interpretation of the participants see lines 13 to 22. In particular, with her unpacking of Roy’s mime in line 13 (“we’re all going ooooh!”), Di can be seen to treat the mime as the reported speakers reacting to something.
As with kinesic enactment on its own, the use of kinesic enactment with accompanying vocalization allows an aphasic participant to communicate without using lexical items something about an action or event through the depiction of how a particular speaker purportedly both appeared and sounded. In Extract 3, for instance, Donald, the speaker with aphasia, is telling a visiting relative, Tim, about a fracas that has taken place in the neighborhood. In line 10 Donald produces the person reference “Gus” (after in line 08 self-correcting his earlier reference to him as “Larry” in line 03), and then (in lines 11 and 12) depicts what Gus did by kinesically and vocally enacting Gus’s threatening behavior:

Extract 3 (Donald and Tim):

01 Tim: uhm: (0.3) what’s the boy’s name that ( ) that plays
02 football
03 Donald: (1.4) eh (.) Larry Larry,
04 Tim: Larry right.
05 Donald: [eh, eh tall. ]
06 [(indicates “tall” with hand])
07 (2.5)
08 eh Gus (.) [( ) ]
09 Tim: oh Gus] Gus yeah
10 Donald: [ Gus, ]
11 → [wɔːː bəʊ eː/]
12 → [(head forward; stares ahead; mouth & face tense)]
13 Tim: yeah

The vocalization here is iconic in that, for example, it uses increased stress to depict how Gus sounded threatening and/or angry (see Lyons, 1977). At the same time, Donald kinesically enacts Gus’s threatening body behavior; he pushes his head forward and stares, as if at an opponent, while tensing his mouth and face as if in readiness to fight. Thus here Donald communicates what Gus did not by describing it (e.g., “Gus threatened to hit him”) but by demonstrating it using kinesic and prosodic/paralinguistic, but not lexical, means.
In both Extracts 2 and 3 it is notable that both enactments are affective. In Extract 2 the women’s excitement is humorously depicted by Roy through his exaggerated movement of his head from side to side while miming talking. In Extract 3 Gus’s anger/threatening behavior is depicted by Donald’s use of increased stress in his vocalization along with particular bodily behavior (pushing head forward and staring, tensing his mouth and his face). It would appear that kinesic enactments with or without accompanying vocalization are well suited to the display of affective states.

It is also notable that each enactment is produced as a reaction by the reported speaker to something in his/her environment that is not explicitly stated, either in the immediate or more distant sequential context, but can be inferred from the reaction (for example in Extract 2 another speaker mentioning the possibility of a party, in Extract 3 someone doing something that has made Gus react threateningly).

Finally, it can be seen that in both extracts the enactment is produced as part of a particular grammatical practice where the enactment is preceded by a person reference but without a reporting verb. This construction can be seen as an example of topic-comment structure, with the person reference as the “topic” and the enactment as the “comment.” Topic-comment structure has been described as a feature of both fluent aphasic talk (Wilkinson et al., 2003) and, in particular, nonfluent aphasic talk such as that of speakers with agrammatism (Beeke et al., 2007; Bookless & Mortley, 1996; Safran, Berndt, & Schwartz, 1989) where, in the light of these speakers’ difficulties in displaying grammatical relations in the conventional ways, they display an increased reliance on pragmatic relations between items. In Extracts 2 and 3, the ordering principle of producing one or more person references at this point in the turn that are hearable as (in pragmatic terms) the “topic” or (in semantic terms) the “agent(s)” in the turn allows the recipient to hear what follows as being related in a specific way, for example as a comment related to the topic or an action carried out by the agent(s). Thus, despite the lack of a reporting verb, the enactment in these extracts is hearable as something that has been said and/or done by the persons identified.

This grammatical practice of person reference plus enactment with no reporting verb is common in the dataset and will be seen in other extracts following (Extracts 4 and 6a). It has also been noted in other agrammatic speakers; Goodglass (1976, p. 259), for example, notes “in some instances these patients will simply name the speaker and follow with a direct quote, as in the text of a play.”

**OH AND ASSESSMENTS**

A second form of enactment used by agrammatic speakers are those using *oh* and assessments. *Oh* is a change-of-state token that “is used to propose that its producer has undergone some kind of change in his or her locally current state of knowledge, information, orientation or awareness” (Heritage, 1984b, p. 299). It functions as a “response cry” (Goffman, 1981), i.e., an example of “presumed ‘natural expressions,’” namely, signs meant to be taken to index directly the state of the transmitter (Goffman, 1981, p. 116) and as such can be seen to have commonalities with other nonlexical expressions such as the vocal and/or kinesic affective productions seen in Extracts 2 and 3. One relevant feature of response cries such as *oh* is that they display “evidence of the alignment we take to events, the display taking the condensed, truncated form of a discretely articulated, nonlexicalised expression” (Goffman, 1981, p. 100). As such, it has been noted
(Mayes, 1990; Holt, 1996) that in normal talk the common occurrence of *oh* as part of an enacted utterance, particularly at its beginning, is one way in which the current speaker can display the reported speaker as reacting in some way to an aspect of, or an event within, his/her environment. This is thus one way in which information about the original environment can be implicitly invoked by the current speaker.

While *oh* also commonly occurs in the enactment of normal (non-communication-disordered) speakers, one notable difference is that here it regularly constitutes the whole of the enacted utterance rather than, for example, only being the first item. As such, producing an enactment using *oh* allows these aphasic speakers to formulate a speaker’s action in a very economical and linguistically simple way. An example of this can be seen in Extract 4. Connie here has been telling her husband, Sam, about the people in her aphasia group, which she attended earlier that day. Immediately prior to the extract she has been discussing one of the group attendees, Jim, and has mentioned Jim’s tablets and his doctor, who, she says, does not listen to him. As the extract starts, what Connie is trying to tell Sam about Jim, his tablets, and his doctor is not clear and indeed it becomes the source of a long repair sequence that subsequently lasts for several minutes beyond this extract.

In lines 01 to 05 Connie establishes that Jim has made a drawing, presumably done to show to his doctor in order to inform him of something that Jim is unable to tell him verbally because of his aphasia. Connie then demonstrates this drawing by talking through it while indicating three parts of her body (lines 06 to 11), and while she moves her finger in circles over her stomach she says “as-pir-ins.” In describing this event between Jim and his doctor, Connie now shifts attention to the doctor (line 13) and communicates the doctor’s reaction to Jim’s drawing by using the grammatical construction seen in Extracts 2 and 3, i.e., a person reference and then (after a go-ahead nod from Sam) an enactment (in this case “oh”) with no reporting verb. At the same time as she says “oh” she kinesically depicts the doctor becoming aware of something through nodding her head and rounding her mouth.  

Extract 4 (Connie and Sam):

```
01 Connie: e- eh (.) man, (. ) > Ji: m, < (. ) eh draw-ing.
02 (1.0)
03 Connie: drawing.
04 Sam: draw-ing.
05 Connie: [(yeah. ehm tch man ehm (. ) tch
06 [head,
07 [(indicates towards her head)]
08 [body, (. )]
09 [(points to her chest)]
10 [ehm (0.2) tch as-pir- ins.
11 [(points to her stomach and moves finger in circles)]
12 Sam: [(nods)]
13 Connie: eh doctor,
14 Sam: ((small nod))
```

Unlike in examples 1 to 3 Connie here maintains eye contact with her recipient while producing her enactment. The removal of eye contact during enactment is a common feature of these extracts (see also Lind [2002] and Sidnell [2006]).
While Sam’s delayed verbal response and subsequent other-initiation of repair (lines 18 and 19) display that he has had trouble understanding what Connie is trying to tell him about Jim, Jim’s tablets, and the doctor, the fact that the doctor was informed of something appears clear. Again the advantages for an agrammatic speaker such as Connie in using this economical and linguistically simple enactment are clear when this method is compared with other possible methods. For example if we compare a possible nonenacted version of the telling such as “the doctor then realized that . . . ,” it can be seen that an advantage of the enacted version is that the speaker is able to convey the action not only without the use of a subordinate clause but also without the use of a verb.

A further advantage of indexical forms such as oh for agrammatic speakers, as will be seen in the next example, is that by using them as a form of enactment to depict the reported speaker’s reaction to an event, the event itself can be invoked without having to be described or even mentioned. As will be seen, the same phenomenon is evident with the use of assessments (Ford, Fox, & Thompson, 2002; C. Goodwin & Goodwin, 1992; Pomerantz, 1984) as a form of enactment, where the assessing adjective can be used to index an assessable (such as an action) without that assessable itself being mentioned.

Extract 5 displays these properties of oh and assessments as forms of enactment. Here Roy is telling Sally, a speech and language therapist/researcher, about how his stroke happened. The telling is in response to a request from Sally who, picking up on what Roy has told her in a previous session about how his talking was in the earlier days after his stroke, has asked him, “Do you want to tell me a bit more about that, about how it happened or is that something that you don’t like to talk about?” Roy assures her he does not mind talking about it and produces the telling:

Extract 5 (Roy and Sally):

01 Roy:  ehm (0.2)  yeah (0.2)  okay, (.) eh:: (0.3)  basically, (0.3)
02 uhm (.)  tch (.)  summer, eh July::,
03 Sally:  mmhm,

((over 20 lines omitted in which Roy informs Sally that he was on holiday in July because work was “static” then, and that he was waterskiing on the south coast of England on a holiday with four friends))

:

27 Roy:  anyway:, (.)  sort of (1.5)
28 [ (0.3)  wak-ter-ski:ing,
29 [ (arm out; hand as if waterskiing))
30 Sally:  mmhm,
31 → Roy:  and  [ strange!,
32 → . . . . . . . . [(moves from side to side; hand as if waterskiing)]
33 Sally:  mm
Having first set out the time when the events in the telling happened (lines 01 and 02) Roy provides other background details of the event (not shown in the transcription for reasons of space) such as the fact he was waterskiing at the time while on holiday with four friends. With “anyway:” (line 27), Roy returns to the fact that he was waterskiing, moves on to the main part of the telling and begins to use enactments. Just before he attempts to say “waterskiing,” Roy kinesically enacts himself waterskiing by holding his left arm straight out horizontally in front of himself with his fist closed (line 29). He holds this pose over a number of turns (up to line 36) while verbally enacting his reactions to the onset of the stroke first by using the assessment “strange” (line 31) and then by the change-of-state token “oh” (line 35).6

As Roy says “strange!” and “oh!” he moves his body from side to side. The combined effect of the verbal and kinesic enactments is to depict Roy noticing and/or becoming aware of something odd happening to him while he is waterskiing (for the use of oh as a method of displaying a noticing see Heritage [1984b]). After these verbal enactments, he then produces another type of iconic language, onomatopoeia, in the form of “bang” (line 38) and as he does so he kinesically enacts himself falling over by moving his hand and body sideways towards the floor. He then (line 41) verbally enacts himself reacting to this situation using the assessment “funny!” (while moving his head again towards the floor, apparently to depict that he is saying this after having collapsed). Finally he completes the telling by again using the onomatopoeic form “bang” (“and all of a sudden (.) bang” in line 45), this time combining it with a kinesic enactment of dropped head and closed eyes to depict himself passing out.

---

6The held gesture here appears to be a gesturally iconic method of informing the recipient of the ongoing nature of the action during the reported events.
A notable feature of the enactments and onomatopoeia in Extract 5 is the way in which their use allows Roy to formulate the events extremely economically and with the deployment of very few linguistic resources. By using enactment, here apparently in the form of direct reported thought, to depict how, for example, he reacted to the various stages of the incident of the stroke occurring, Roy is able to tell about the incident without having to describe or mention the details of it. Instead he relies on the pragmatic inferential abilities of his recipient to fill in the gaps about the various unmentioned events from his depicted reactions to them.

Another reason for the extreme economy of Roy’s telling at this point is that, unlike in Extracts 2, 3, and 4 where the construction “person reference plus enactment” is used, here the enactments occur as “freestanding” (Clark & Gerrig, 1990), i.e., without a person reference as well as without a reporting verb. Roy does not refer to himself throughout the telling as the producer of these enactments and instead again relies on Sally’s pragmatic inferential abilities to read in this detail from the context (in particular here the fact that the telling is in response to Sally’s request to Roy to describe the onset of his stroke).

While the enactments in Extract 5 do not occur as part of the particular grammatical practice of “person reference plus enactment” seen in Extracts 2, 3, and 4, they occur within another particular grammatical practice that is recurrent in the dataset, that is as part of a series of (at least two) events where the ordering of the events is demonstrated by temporal iconicity (Fischer & Nanny, 2001). Thus in Extract 5, after setting the scene for this part of the telling by saying that he was waterskiing (lines 27 to 29) Roy produces the enactments and onomatopoeia in lines 31 to 45 in the same order as the events that they purport to depict. Temporal iconicity, like the other forms of iconicity discussed in this article, can be seen to be useful for agrammatic speakers in that the form itself contributes to the meaning. Here, however, unlike the individual occurrences of enactment and onomatopoeia, it is the ordering of the elements in the unfolding turn that displays something of the meaning, or relationship, between two or more elements, or, in this case, events. Thus by this method Roy is able to depict the relationship between events while avoiding grammatical constructions in the form of, for example, “before X happened, Y happened,” which would necessitate the use both of subordination and of other linguistic resources that would be more difficult for Roy, such as verbs. Rather, he is able here to rely on the sequential placement of the depiction of events and on coordination, a grammatical construction that is simpler for him than subordination and that allows him to show the different stages of the event by using “and” (including variations on “and” such as “and all of a sudden” in line 45 to mark that the telling is reaching a narrative climax).

The use of temporal iconicity in agrammatic talk is a regular occurrence as will be seen following in Extracts 6b, 7, 8, and 9.

**NO**

A third form that enactments commonly take in agrammatic talk is *no*, either as a complete enactment by itself or as part of a phrase including, for example, *sorry*. *No* in these extracts is used to depict a refusal or declination, a second pair-part action occurring in response to actions such as requests or offers/invitations (Heritage, 1984a; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973).

In Extract 6a, for instance, Roger, a man with aphasia, has been asked by his speech and language therapist, Jill, about whether a friend of his who has gone on to train as a speech and
language therapist ever gives Roger any therapy (line 01). As part of his response Roger uses the person reference and enactment construction also seen in Extracts 2, 3, and 4, here referring to himself as the producer of the enactment by using “me” and pointing to himself (lines 03 and 04). He then follows this with a kinesic enactment, using his hand to shield his face while smiling and turning away in an exaggerated depiction of embarrassment (line 05):

Extract 6a (Roger and Jill):

01 Jill: and so has he ever given you any therapy?
02 Roger: (finishes drinking tea)
03 yes but [me, ]
04 [((points to self)) ]
05 → (mimes hiding face in embarrassment while smiling))
06 Jill: "heh"
07 → Roger: ehm .hh (0.3) eh (0.2)
08 no!
09 → (looking beyond Jill; screwing up face; smiling))
10 [ (0.2)
11 [ ((turns eyes away))
12 → [no!]
13 → ((looking beyond Jill; screwing up face; smiling))
14 Jill: ghh [heh
15 Roger: [hih heh

Roger’s kinesic enactment gets a small laugh from Jill (line 06). He then follows this (line 08) with a second enactment; he says “no!” and screws up his face while not gazing at his recipient (a feature of enactments also seen in some other examples such as Extracts 2 and 3) but rather gazing to the left of her. After turning his eyes and head back to the right he repeats the enactment, again saying “no!” while screwing up his face and looking to the left of Jill (lines 12–13). The depiction here is an exaggerated and comic version of Roger declining his friend’s therapy with some peevishness. In response Jill laughs and Roger joins in with this laughter (lines 14 and 15).

The same form of enactment seen in Extract 6a is produced again as the talk between Roger and Jill continues (as seen in Extract 6b). In this latter case, however, the “person reference plus enactment” construction is produced as part of a larger grammatical practice that, as in Extract 5, consists of a series of events, or parts of the same event, where the ordering is demonstrated by temporal iconicity. However, in Extract 6b (and other examples in the dataset such as Extracts 7, 8, and 9 discussed following) the temporal ordering is presented in the grammatical format of a compound turn-constructional unit, i.e., a turn unit in which a preliminary component projects a final component, meaning that the resulting turn unit can consist of two components, or clauses, for example of the form “if X, then Y” (Lerner, 1991, 1996). In the agrammatic examples discussed here a regularly occurring form of the construction is where the compound turn-constructional unit has the format of “at first . . . but then” with a time formulation at or near the beginning of the first clause. For example in Extracts 6b, 7, and 8 the agrammatic speakers deploy a compound turn-constructional unit where the first of the two clauses takes the form of “at first X is/seems positive/fine” followed in the second clause by “but then Y ends up as negative or problematic.” The negative or problematic nature of the event in these extracts is depicted by the enactment “no” or an enacted phrase containing “no.”

The first example of this enactment practice is Extract 6b, which continues on from Extract 6a. In line 16 Jill picks up on Roger’s depiction of himself as peevishly declining his friend’s therapy
by asking “is it difficult when you: ‘re-when he’s a friend to- (0.5).’” While Jill’s question projects a “yes” answer confirming that the situation is indeed difficult, Roger informs her with “no actually” (see Clift, 2001) that this is not in fact the case and then goes on to elaborate. He does this in the form of a compound turn-constructual unit in which the first clause contains a time reference (“now and then and maybe uh: (0.4) ten minutes or (. ) eh (. ) half (0.6) quarter of an hour” in lines 19–22), followed by Roger waving his hands (presumably iconically depicting back-and-forth talk) and ending with a positive assessment of “fine” (line 23). The second clause then follows (coordinated by “and then” in line 23) with Roger repeating his earlier enactment (“no!”) depicting himself as peevishly declining (further) therapy (lines 25 and 26). The meaning here appears to be that Roger and his friend are fine doing therapy together for a short while now and again but after that Roger has had enough:

Extract 6b (Roger and Jill):

14 Jill: ghh [heh
15 Roger: [hih heh
16 Jill: is it diffic [ult when you: ‘re-when he’s a friend to-
17 Roger: [hih (. )'hh'
18 (0.5)
19 no [ actually I mean eh now and then and maybe
20 Jill: (no?)
21 Roger: uh: (0.4) ten minutes or (. ) eh (. ) half (0.6) quarter of an
22 hour and ehm; (0.3) teh
23 [ (0.5) fine you know and then
24 [(waves hands)]
25 → [me, ( )] [no!]
26 → [((points to self))] [((screwing up face )]
27 (.)
28 or something (. ) [heh
29 Jill: [ri:ght. when you say
30 Roger: [no do you mean you (. ) didn’t want-
31 Jill: couldn’t do it or you didn’t [want to do it.]
32 Roger: [‘hh’ (0.3) ‘hh’
33 [well] eh second.

Unlike her response to Roger’s first use of the enactment in Extract 6a (line 14), this time Jill does not respond to the enactment with laughter (see line 27) but instead other-initiates repair, attempting to clarify what Roy meant by his use of “no” here (lines 29 to 32).

Time formulations are one common way in which stories are launched and further story-relevant talk projected in conversation (see Jefferson, 1978, and also Extract 5, lines 01–02 where Roy uses a time formulation at the beginning of the story he is launching in response to Sally’s request). The use of time formulations by agrammatic speakers in the first clause of compound turn-constructual units such as that seen in Extract 6b appears to have a similar function of projecting a telling or informing about an event or events that will be produced over more than one clause and that will have the structure of “at first … but then.” In some extracts this projection is carried out by other means. In Extracts 7 and 8, for instance, Roy in his interaction with Sally uses the adverb “originally” to project both the first part of the informing and the existence of a further part to come in a second clause. In both extracts too the negative or problematic nature of the outcome is also projected with an adverb (in both cases “unfortunately”):
In Extract 7 Sally and Roy, who are sitting in Roy’s recently acquired bungalow, have been discussing the decoration, and Roy has displayed some reservations about the kitchen, leading Sally to ask him whether he plans to change it (line 01). Roy starts his response with “well: yes but (.) eh (. ) be- because, (0.3) uhm ( (lip smack) )” then produces the first clause of the compound turn-constructional unit, which presents the “at first” part of the situation when events were unproblematic (“originally:; chalet you see,” in line 03), before in the second clause informing Sally of how later the situation became problematic (“( ) eh but unfortunately, (0.3) five months, ( .) eh and eh (1.2) eh (. ) no,” in lines 03 to 05). The verbal enactment depicting a refusal is accompanied by a
horizontal hand gesture that appears to depict some kind of definiteness or finality. As in Extract 5, the enactment here is freestanding with no speaker identified. Following the enactment Roy appears to unpack it by informing Sally that the “house,… collapsed.” The meaning of Roy’s talk and its sequential relation to Sally’s question in line 01 appears quite opaque here, and indeed Sally’s lack of uptake in the form of a 3.5-s silence in line 12 is hearable as displaying to the aphasic speaker that (as with Sam’s silence in Extract 4) the talk here is difficult to understand. Eventually Sally displays a candidate understanding (lines 16–21), perhaps cued in by Roy’s pointing over his shoulder, that Roy has been talking about a different property than the one he is now living in and that Roy’s attempt to purchase that property fell through (i.e., when the owner, after 5 months, declined to sell).

Extract 8 occurs after Sally and Roy have been discussing the fact that Roy can no longer drive after experiencing fits following his stroke. In this extract Roy goes on to tell Sally that he was driving after the stroke (presumably in a specially adapted car due to the dense hemiplegia in his right arm) but was stopped from doing so after a medical examination. He is able to inform her of this using the same construction seen in Extract 7; after “because” he projects the first (positive/normal) part of the telling with “originally” (line 01), before projecting the second, negative, part with “unfortunately” (line 05). As with Extracts 6b and 7 the informing ends with a verbal enactment containing “no” (in this case a refusal in the form of “sorry sir no.” in line 11), here accompanied by a mime of the speaker shaking his/her head and moving a letter or file away. While, as with Extracts 5 and 6a, the enactment here is freestanding, the meaning and general identity of the enacted speaker seems unproblematic due to the fact that the enactment has been preceded by a clear formulation of the setting/occasion (“medical,” in line 05) and a kinesic enactment of someone opening a letter or file (line 09).

The grammatical constructions containing enactments described in Extracts 6b, 7, and 8 display obvious similarities to constructions containing what Sacks (1992) termed “first verbs,” where a clause containing a verb such as wanted or thought can both project a second clause and project also something of the outcome described in that clause, i.e., that the person failed to get what s/he wanted or realized s/he was wrong (see also Jefferson, 2004; Schulze-Wenck, 2005). A notable feature of the agrammatic constructions, however, is that verbs are not essential for their construction here; there are no verbs at all, for example, within the constructions in Extracts 6b and 7. Rather, what these speakers do is use a temporal formulation to project an “at first . . . but then” construction that sets up a contrast and ends, at the end of the second clause, with an enactment. One attraction of such constructions may be that enactments, time formulations, and contrast clauses can each provide a resource for the speaker to incorporate into the talk some of the dynamic qualities of change and time that are central in formulations of actions and events and that

---

7It is notable that while Roy here is able to convey an action and event by a more conventional method and without using enactment (i.e., by using a verb as part of the subject–verb construction “house collapsed”), the verb “collapsed” is only produced after a 5.2-s delay after “house,” during which time Roy displays a search for the word in the form of search tokens such as “eh.” One effect of this attempt to use a more conventional method for formulating an action/event, therefore, is the occurrence of repair, here in the form of a word search (Schegloff et al., 1977), which delays the progressivity of the word-by-word production of the utterance (see Lerner, 1996). This ability of Roy’s to be able to produce certain verbs within grammatical constructions but only after a significant delay is also seen in his performance within clinical tests. For example, in a picture-description task where he has been asked to describe a picture of a girl kicking a snake he says “um right (1.7) girl, (3.4) girl (11.6) kick, (1.7) snake” (see Beeke [2005] where a detailed comparison is provided of Roy’s performance in conversation and in clinical tests).
are often encoded in verbs (Frawley, 1992). The use of contrast and of enactment can also allow
the speaker to, to some extent, dramatize the telling or informing. Another attraction is that the
construction allows the agrammatic speaker to project for him/herself at or near the beginning of a
turn a space and opportunity for further talk (i.e., at least one further TCU) rather than perhaps
having to negotiate that space and opportunity as the turn unfolds (a task that might be more
difficult in light of the speaker’s limited linguistic, and particularly limited grammatical,
resources).

It may also be that the opportunity to deploy these types of resources are part of the reason why
agrammatic speakers appear to make quite widespread use of narrative structures such as those
used in storytelling (see, for example, Heeschen & Schegloff, 1999; Wilkinson, 1995).

**OH NO**

The fourth and final form of agrammatic enactment we describe here is *oh no*, as seen in Extract 9. Preceding the talk shown in the extract, Di has been admiring Roy’s pine furniture and, after telling
him that she and her boyfriend are looking for a chest of drawers for their bedroom to match their
wardrobe, she asks him where he got his pine furniture from. After an extended repair
sequence involving both of them attempting to locate the shop, Roy is able to convey that it is near
the Duke’s Head, a local pub, and Di then conveys that she is aware of the shop, saying “oh! is
there a- there’s a little pine shop isn’t there right . . . yeah I know where you mean.” After some
passing turns the conversation then proceeds as follows:

Extract 9 (Roy and Di):

01 Roy: yeah (0.3) uh- a:nd (0.5) [nice an’ all]
02 Di: yeah it’s really really nice isn’ it.
03 Roy: =[’(yeah-)’]
04 Di: =[ d’you know someone who works in there or,
05 Roy: (. ) no (. ) no [just ehm]
06 Di: [>jus’ wen’ in there<]
07 Di: do they- do they have nice chest of [drawers an’]
08 stuff in there
09 Roy: (. ) yeah (. ) and (0.2) o- o- (0.2)
10 Di: is it reaso[nable]
11 Roy: /[tarend/]
12 [((arm extended, hand curved, fingers down))]
13 (0.2)
14 Roy: yeah! (.) [really!]
15 Di: [((right ) (“oh”)]
16 Roy: (’yeah=”)
17 Di: = >(have)< t’go in there ‘n’ ‘ave a look
18 Roy: (0.3) yeah, a:nd, (0.2)
19 uh- [sort of]
20 → [((moves hand as if opening a door))]
21 → [now,]
22 → [((head forward, looking, as if through the opened door))]
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While there is much that could be said about this extract, we will focus here on issues concerning the enactments and the grammatical practice within which they are produced (in particular lines 19 to 24). From lines 01 to 16 the pine shop under discussion is presented by both speakers in a positive light; in line 01, Roy assessed the shop as being “nice” and Di upgrades the assessment to “really really nice” (line 02); in lines 07–08 it is confirmed that the shop has a “nice chest of drawers and stuff,” i.e., the piece of furniture that Di is specifically looking for, and, in lines 10–14, that the shop is reasonable in terms of its prices. Di thus concludes that she will have to go in to the shop and have a look (line 17). After agreeing with her (line 18), Roy then starts what turns out to be a series of enactments that skilfully combine verbal and kinesic enactments in what appears to be the construction of a small hypothetical scenario. First, as Roy says “sort of,” he moves his left hand as if opening a door. This is thus the first sign that Roy is moving from the here and now to an enacted scene. Next he says “now,” and as he does so he moves his head forward and looks ahead, away from Di, as if looking through the door (lines 21 and 22). Following this, he starts to grimace and moves his hand, possibly depicting closing the door, while returning his eye gaze to Di and saying “oh hno.” (lines 23 and 24). While saying “uh uh-” his hand rests for a moment, while moving slightly, in front of his body, with the palm open to Di before he then says “but-” and while doing so starts to move his arm to the front and left of his body with the hand curved and fingers down (lines 25 to 28).

It can be seen that this stretch of talk is similar to Extracts 6, 7, and 8 in the following ways: The talk here displays enactments produced within a compound turn-constructional unit with the temporally iconic structure of “at first . . . but then”; the first of the two clauses has a temporal formulation at or near its beginning (“now,” in line 21, albeit in a rather semantically empty form); and the two components of the unit are used to construct a contrast between a situation that is/
seems positive/fine and one that is/seems negative/problematic. In this case, however, there are also differences compared to those earlier extracts in that the verbal enactment is “oh no” rather than “no,” the enactment occurs at the end of the first clause rather than the second (line 23), and the relationship between the presentation of the positive/fine and negative/problematic aspects of the situation or event is reversed in that in this example the seemingly negative/problematic nature of the event is produced first. As Roy’s arm then starts to extend towards the front and left of him, Di produces an anticipatory completion (Lerner, 1991, 1996) of Roy’s turn with “it goes back” (lines 29 to 31).

The meaning of Roy’s utterance here as it is completed by Di appears to be that when Di (or perhaps anyone) first looks into the shop, they will first think something negative (e.g., the shop is small and/or, perhaps, there is no furniture in view that looks appealing) but that actually the shop extends further back (with the implication, perhaps, that there is more appealing furniture beyond the front of the shop). It is notable that in his utterance here Roy is able to communicate this quite complex notion to Di extremely economically and using only minimal lexical resources (primarily “no:w,” and “o:h n”). One element of Roy’s construction of the turn crucial to this achievement is his skilful combination of verbal and kinesic enactments. Another is his ability to project both that a compound turn-constructional unit is underway (e.g., by using “no:w,”) and that the second component will concern a positive aspect of the shop (as Di can be seen to predict from her anticipatory completion in lines 30–31). The latter feature here is achieved largely through the formulation of a negative/problematic stance toward the shop in the first component (lines 23 and 24) followed by a contrasting “but” (line 27) produced within a sequential context of preceding talk (lines 01–17) where the shop has been described in positive terms by both speakers.

**DISCUSSION**

In this article we have discussed the use of enactment by speakers with agrammatic aphasia within talk-in-interaction. In particular we noted that while the enactment can occur in the form of a sentence (i.e., “where’s the paper?” in Extract 1), it is much more common in the data for it to occur in a nonsentential form, to contain no verb, and to consist of either very few lexical items (commonly one) or none at all. We observed that a common feature of the forms used was that they could function as seconds, i.e., as reactions or second pair-part responses, and we discussed four types: kinesic enactment with or without vocalization, oh and assessments, no, and oh no.

These enactments were recurrently produced as part of distinctive grammatical practices. Regular features of these practices included the fact that no reporting verb (e.g., said) preceded the enactment, and that the enactment was produced as a possible end of a turn, TCU, or, as in Extract 9, a component/clause of a compound TCU. One practice consisted of the construction “person reference(s) plus enactment” (Extracts 2, 3, 4, 6a, and 6b). Another practice (in which the enactment occurred either following a person reference or as a freestanding enactment) consisted of a series of at least two events or parts of an event/scenario where the ordering of the telling of the events iconically mirrored the order of their purported actual occurrence (Extracts, 5, 6b, 7, 8, and 9). In particular this practice regularly took the form of a compound turn-constructional unit with the format “at first . . . . but then” (Extracts 6b, 7, 8, and 9).

While these distinctive turn-constructional practices are produced recurrently and by different agrammatic speakers, there is no evidence that these speakers have been explicitly taught or
encouraged to use these formats (for example, through the intervention of speech and language therapists). Rather, these appear to be methods that each of these speakers has arrived at independently, presumably because they assist them in attempting to deal with the demands involved in constructing particular meaningful and consequential social actions within turns-at-talk in talk-in-interaction. Specifically enactments were seen to be a useful resource for these speakers in formulating actions and events in light of their linguistic limitations, in particular their limitations in relation to grammar and the deployment of verbs.

In these data it was possible to see that agrammatic speakers made use of iconicity, not only in the form of iconic gestures, as has previously been discussed in the aphasiological literature, and in the form of verbal, prosodic/paralinguistic, and kinesic enactments, which themselves have iconic features (Clark, 1996; Clark & Gerrig, 1990) but also in the use of onomatopoeia and of temporal iconicity. An advantage of iconicity for these aphasic speakers appears to be that form (of, for example, the word, gesture, or sequential ordering of elements in interaction) can contribute to meaning, assisting these speakers in constructing understandable contributions to the interaction using simpler linguistic forms than might otherwise be necessary.

Enactment in particular can be seen to be a useful resource for agrammatic aphasic speakers in a number of ways. First, by allowing the agrammatic speaker to depict what a reported speaker said or did without having to paraphrase or describe it, enactment provides a resource for the speaker to formulate actions or events while using often very limited linguistic resources. It is notable for example that none of the enactments in Extracts 2 to 9 contain verbs. Second, the fact that enactment, unlike for example indirect reported speech, can occur in an utterance with few syntactic restrictions and can thus be produced as a relatively self-sufficient element grammatically makes it an attractive resource for these aphasic speakers who regularly have difficulty in producing grammatical constructions. Third, a property of enactment regularly made use of by these speakers is the fact that it can convey something of the relationship of the original utterance or action to the context or situation in which it is purported to have been produced (Holt, 1996; Schegloff, 2000a). As was seen in Extracts 2 to 9, this property of enactment allows these aphasic speakers to use indexical language forms, particularly seconds, in relatively simple linguistic forms such as oh and no, in order to draw on recipients’ inferential ability to read in features of the events or scenarios that are invoked by the enactment but are not explicitly mentioned. Fourth, enactment allows agrammatic speakers to make significant use of their kinesic and/or prosodic/paralinguistic resources, which, apart from possible limitations due to physical weakness to the mouth or dominant arm/hand, are regularly relatively intact in most of these speakers. In some instances (e.g. Extracts 2 and 3) these resources are used to depict actions without the need for any lexical items. In other instances speakers combine these resources with relatively simple linguistic forms to create often quite complex meanings. In Extract 9, for example, Roy is able to

---

8As can be seen from the previous examples, many of the forms of enactment, such as no or oh are used by more than one of the aphasic speakers analyzed here, although Roy is the only aphasic speaker here to use each of the four forms discussed.

9The use of gesture as a resource for people with aphasia within interaction has been explored by a number of researchers including C. Goodwin (for example, C. Goodwin 2003, 2006), Klippi (1996), and Lind (2002). One distinctive feature of the gestures and other kinesic behavior observable in the present article is the way in which they can regularly be seen to be creatively combined with verbal/vocal behavior, particularly in the form of multimodal enactments, to produce quite complex meaning (as seen, for instance, in Extract 9).
inform Di of a hypothetical scenario by using his prosodic/paralinguistic and, especially, kinesic resources in combination with relatively simple linguistic forms such as “now” and “oh no.”

The enactments here do not appear to be produced by speakers as if they were authentic representations of what was actually said or done in the reported situation; it would seem difficult to believe that Roy, for example, is expecting his recipient to believe that what the female house seller in Extract 7 actually said was simply “no” with an adamant hand gesture, or that the women depicted in Extract 2 did not speak about their thoughts on the possibility of a party but rather only moved their mouths and heads as depicted by Roy. Rather, the enactments produced by the agrammatic speakers here would appear instead to function by being constructed to be richly interpreted by their recipients. For example, an enactment of a single utterance or physical gesture could be understood as representing an action or a series of actions or events that the agrammatic speaker may have had difficulty in producing using a verb and/or sentence. Thus, for instance, Roy’s “‘sorry sir no’” enactment in Extract 8 may be produced to be understood by the recipient primarily as communicating a refusal by the medical board, where it is implicitly understood by the participants that the refusal may not have contained the actual words enacted, may have been delivered by more than one speaker, or indeed may never have been delivered in spoken form at all (in the case of Extract 8, for example, the enactment could represent the refusal by the medical board being communicated to Roy by letter).

A final possible advantage of enactment as a resource for agrammatic speakers that we will note here is that it provides a method of formulating actions while minimizing the delays to the progressivity of talk that may occur when these speakers attempt to use more conventional linguistic resources for formulating actions, i.e., verbs, and, in particular verbs produced within grammatical constructions. Schegloff (1979, p. 268, n. 9) notes that there is a “preference for progressivity” in talk, that is, a preference for “‘next parts’ of structured units (e.g., turns, turn-constructional units, like sentences, stories, etc.) to come next” (see also Lerner, 1996). There is evidence from the data here that on the relatively rare occasions in talk-in-interaction when these agrammatic speakers do attempt to formulate an action in a more conventional way (for example, by producing a verb within a grammatical structure such as a subject–verb construction), one cost of attempting to speak in this way is repair and hence a delay in producing the projected next part of the TCU. This was seen, for example, in Extract 7 where Roy produced the subject–verb construction “house collapsed” but only after a long delay before producing the verb “collapsed.”

Thus while agrammatic speakers, such as Roy, may in some instances be able to produce talk using more conventional methods, for example using a verb within a grammatical subject–verb construction, such occasions may be quite rare in the data, in part because the delays in progressivity, and hence potential highlighting of the speaker’s linguistic incompetence, constitute too high a social cost. In contrast, a possible advantage for these speakers of the constructions using enactment discussed in this article is that they provide a method of producing turns with action formulations while minimizing delays to the progress of the turn toward possible completion. As such, these constructions can be seen as being adaptations to the context of their production (Heeschen & Schegloff, 1999; Wilkinson, 2007; Wilkinson et al., 2003; Wilkinson et al., 2007), i.e., methods of talking, which, while unconventional, can be seen to have advantages.
for these aphasic speakers in allowing them to construct contributions within turn-constructional units (and the wider context of the turns and sequences within which the TCU is produced) while orienting to the normative expectations of turn construction, such as the preference for progressivity.\footnote{While the adaptations discussed here relate to nonfluent, agrammatic speakers, a similar argument is used by Wilkinson et al. (2003) in relation to fluent aphasic speakers, i.e., that although on occasion they can be seen to produce utterances using the conventional linguistic methods they would have done before the onset of aphasia, such methods regularly result in repair and delays in progressivity. An advantage of the unconventional methods they can be seen to use for turn construction include the fact that these methods minimize repair and delays in progressivity.}

However, while these unconventional methods, such as the uses of enactment discussed in this article, may provide agrammatic speakers with means to construct turns in ways that lessen delays in progressivity within the speaker’s turn, it is notable that these turns regularly appear difficult for the recipient to understand. As such, one common site for delays in progressivity in interactions involving these speakers is in the next turn after the aphasic speaker’s talk, where the recipient other-initiates repair (for discussion of other-initiation of repair see Schegloff, 2000b). This is seen, for example, in Extracts 1, 4, and 6b.\footnote{See Heeschen and Schegloff (1999) for another way in which the recipient works to unpack the meaning of the agrammatic speaker’s turn.} In other cases, possible problems with recipient uptake may be visible in either the aphasic speaker attempting to clarify the meaning of the enactment (Extract 7, lines 07–10), or in ‘weak’ displays of understanding from the recipient such as “yeah” (Extract 3, line 13) or laughter (in Extract 6a, line 14).\footnote{Laughter is a simple response in that, while displaying an understanding of a prior turn as joke or nonserious, it does not involve the more complex forms of understanding displays that are typically relevant after a serious utterance (Sacks, 1972, 1992). It is notable, for example, that in this case the laughter later gets replaced as a response by an other-initiation of repair when the aphasic speaker later redoes the enactment (Extract 6b, lines 25–32).} One reason for this would appear to be the often semantic opaqueness of the enactment itself. Evidence of this is seen, for example, in Jill’s other-initiation of repair in Extract 6b (lines 29–32) where she says “when you say no do you mean you (. ) didn’t want- couldn’t do it or you didn’t want to do it,” i.e., she has understood the word “no” in Roger’s enactment but does not know whether Roger is using the word to represent an inability or, on the other hand, a declining due, for example, to lack of motivation. Another reason for recipient problems in displaying understanding may be that the relationship between the enactment and the other item(s) in the speaker’s turn can be unclear. In agrammatic talk it can be seen that regularly what follows one item may not be what would be the next item due in normal talk, and thus recipients have to infer the relationship between the items, often in the absence of conventional grammatical marking. Thus in Extract 7 when Roy says “but unfortunately, (0.3) five months, (. ) eh and eh (1.2) eh (. ) no,” (lines 03–05), one reason for the lack of immediate uptake by the recipient may not only be that the meaning of individual items is opaque to her but that the relationship between the items, such as here the temporal phrase “five months” and the enactment “no,” may also be difficult to understand.

Finally, it can be noted that agrammatic talk appears to display several features of what Givón (1979) terms “the pragmatic mode of communication,” which he suggests is particularly evident in, for example, child language and in pidgins. Properties of the pragmatic mode include (using Givón’s terms) “topic-comment structure,” “loose conjunction” (as opposed to “tight subordination”), and “no use of grammatical morphology” (which in the case of agrammatic talk might be better formulated as “limited use of grammatical morphology”). Givón (1979, 1985) contrasts this
“pragmatic mode” of communicating with the “syntactic mode” (which is evident in, for example, normal adult language and in creoles) and proposes that the former mode makes more use of iconicity and may be both ontogenetically and phylogenetically prior to the latter. He suggests (1985, p. 214), for example, that “the process of syntacticization, via which a more transparent, iconic mode of communication—the pragmatic mode—gives rise eventually to the more abstract and less obviously iconic syntactic mode, is a pervasive fact of language change, language ontogeny, and language evolution.” While much work remains to be done to ground such notions in empirical detail, a framework such as that of Givón does at least provide a starting point for considering aphasia, its similarities to other areas of language use such as child language and pidgins, and possible reasons for these similarities.14 Adapting Givón’s terms, the methods of talking used by agrammatic aphasics we have discussed in this article might be seen as a process of desyntactization (or degrammaticalization) whereby, in order to deal with the linguistic limitations brought about by brain damage, previously competent adult speakers of the language have adapted their methods of talking in interaction, in part by adopting some features of what Givón terms the “pragmatic mode.” In particular here we have investigated the use by these speakers of iconic aspects of language within talk-in-interaction, and specifically the use of enactment. One interest of this and possible future work in this area is the possibility of accounting for features of aphasic language use not only in terms of the brain/mind and its damage or deficits, but also in terms of the interrelationship between language and the structures of social interaction within which language is produced by speakers. In this sense aphasia is of interest because it is one place where the study of the brain, language, and social interaction meet.
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