

The origins of nonhuman primates' manual gestures

Journal:	<i>Philosophical Transactions B</i>
Manuscript ID:	Draft
Article Type:	Review
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Call, Josep; Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Developmental and Comparative Psychology
Issue Code: Click here to find the code for your issue.:	Action to language, ACTION
Subject:	Evolution < BIOLOGY, Behaviour < BIOLOGY, Cognition < BIOLOGY
Keywords:	gesture , manual, ontogenetic ritualization, phylogenetic ritualization, laterality, great apes

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5 1 Title: The origins of nonhuman primates' manual gestures
6
7 2
8
9

10 3 Authors: Katja Liebal^{1, 2, 3} & Josep Call³
11
12 4
13

14 5 ¹ Freie Universität Berlin, Cluster Languages of Emotion, Department of Educational Science
15
16 and Psychology, Evolutionary Psychology, Habelschwerdter Allee 45, 14195 Berlin,
17
18 Germany
19
20

21 8 ² University of Portsmouth, Department of Psychology, King Henry 1st Street, PO1 2DY
22
23
24 9 Portsmouth, UK
25

26 10 ³ Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Department of Developmental and
27
28 Comparative Psychology, Deutscher Platz 6, Leipzig, Germany
29
30
31 12

32
33 13 Correspondence: Katja Liebal, Freie Universität Berlin, Cluster Languages of Emotion,
34
35 Department of Educational Science and Psychology, Evolutionary Psychology,
36
37 Habelschwerdter Allee 45, 14195 Berlin, Germany, katja.liebal@fu-berlin.de
38
39
40 16

41
42 17 Address where work was carried out: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology,
43
44 Department of Developmental and Comparative Psychology, Deutscher Platz 6, Leipzig,
45
46 Germany
47
48
49

50 20

51
52 21

53
54 22

55
56 23

57
58 24

59
60

1
2
3
4
5 1 *Abstract*
6

7 The increasing body of research into human and non-human primates' gestural
8 communication reflects the interest in a comparative approach to human communication,
9 particularly possible scenarios of language evolution. One of the central challenges of this
10 field of research is to identify appropriate criteria to differentiate a gesture from other non-
11 communicative actions. After an introduction to the criteria currently used to define non-
12 human primates' gestures and an overview of ongoing research, we discuss different
13 pathways of how manual actions are transformed into manual gestures in both phylogeny and
14 ontogeny. Currently, the relationship between actions and gestures is not only investigated on
15 a behavioural, but also on a neural level. Here we focus on recent evidence concerning the
16 differential laterality of manual actions and gestures in apes in the framework of a functional
17 asymmetry of the brain for both hand use and language.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

14 Keywords: gesture, manual, ontogenetic ritualization, phylogenetic ritualization, laterality,
15 great apes
16
17

1
2
3
4
5 1 *Introduction*
6

7 2 Dolphins are one of the most gracile and elegant creatures of the sea. However, before
8
9 3 dolphins became what they are today, they underwent a remarkable transformation. The
10
11 4 terrestrial ancestor of dolphins was a pig-like creature that walked on all fours and lacked the
12
13 5 stylized forms, and presumably the elegant movements, of its marine descendant. Over the
14
15 6 last 50 millions years, dolphins have been evolving into what they are today. This remarkable
16
17 7 transformation teaches us an important lesson. Complex structures such as legs and snouts
18
19 8 can be transmuted over time into equally complex but functionally equivalent structures such
20
21 9 as fins and blowholes, respectively.
22
23
24
25

26 10 The relation that exists between gesture and action is in some ways analogous to the
27
28 11 relation that exists between fins and legs or between noses and blowholes. A central thesis of
29
30 12 this contribution is that many of the gestures displayed by apes began their existence as
31
32 13 actions devoid of a communicative function, but over time they became co-opted and
33
34 14 transformed into communicative devices that accomplished similar functions [1]. Moreover,
35
36 15 just like fins and legs, this change took place over evolutionary time, but in the case of
37
38 16 gestures it can also take place during the lifetime of one individual. In both cases, however,
39
40 17 one can find clues that inform us about their origin. Comparing the communicative
41
42 18 repertoires of monkeys and apes to those of humans can play a crucial role in the quest for
43
44 19 the roots of human language, and more specifically in the role that gestures might have
45
46 20 played in the evolution of language.
47
48
49
50

51
52 21 The focus of this paper is twofold. First, we will explore the question of how actions
53
54 22 are transformed into gestures both from a phylogenetic and an ontogenetic perspective. To
55
56 23 this end we will present the latest advances on ape gestural communication including some of
57
58 24 the controversies in the field. We will begin by defining gestures, briefly presenting some of
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 1 the features of the apes' gestural repertoires and discussing three ways in which individuals
6
7 2 can acquire gestures. Second, having established the connection between actions and
8
9 3 gestures, we will turn our attention to the role that gestures may have played in language
10
11 4 evolution. First, we will note the increasing interest in gestural communication of our closest
12
13 5 living primate relatives in the framework of the proposed close link between action and
14
15 6 language in humans. Then we will link recent data on ape laterality in gestural use with
16
17 7 language hemispheric specialization.
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 9 Gesture origins (out of actions)

25 26 27 10 *Defining a gesture*

28
29 11 Human gestures are usually very broadly referred to as “manner of carrying the body”
30
31 12 and “movements of the body or limbs as an expression of feeling” [2, p. 476). According to
32
33 13 Kendon [3), a gesture is a form of non-verbal communication in which visible bodily actions
34
35 14 communicate particular messages, either in place of speech or together and in parallel with
36
37 15 spoken words. Before children start to speak, they use a variety of gestures to communicate
38
39 16 with their caregivers such as showing objects and pointing to objects, events, or persons in
40
41 17 their environment [4-7). Even when they acquire their first words, gestures are not simply
42
43 18 replaced but are incorporated in their verbal communication [8, 9).
44
45
46
47

48 19 In adults, a substantial body of research addresses the kinds of manual gestures
49
50 20 produced by humans while speaking [3, 10-12). If spoken language is not possible, then
51
52 21 manual gestures can convey very specific and complex information even replacing spoken
53
54 22 language, thus becoming a form of a highly conventionalized sign system [13, 14). Thus, in
55
56 23 humans, gestures can vary in their degree of conventionalization and therefore the degree to
57
58 24 which they are linked to or even replace spoken language [15, pp. 37-40). The question
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 1 arising here is whether nonhuman primate species, which are clearly lacking spoken language
6
7 2 but with bodies and particularly forelimbs sharing many characteristics with human beings,
8
9
10 3 use gestures to communicate with conspecifics. At this point, it is important to emphasize
11
12 4 that research into human gestures is a highly diverse field, since it covers very different kinds
13
14 5 of gestural communication, such as speech-accompanying gestures, gestures of pre-linguistic
15
16 6 children or even gestures co-occurring with sign language. To tackle the question of gestural
17
18 7 communication in nonhuman species and to enable any comparison with humans at all, we
19
20 8 need to focus on human gestures not used in combination with language (either spoken or
21
22 9 signed) and thus on the gestural communication of pre-linguistic children. By adopting the
23
24
25
26 10 corresponding criteria, a gesture is defined as a behaviour that unlike an action is motorically
27
28 11 ineffective. It requires the active participation of a partner to fulfil its purpose, it is produced
29
30 12 in the presence of an audience, and is tailored to the attentional state of the audience.
31
32
33 13 Furthermore, it involves gaze alternation or visual checking between social partners and
34
35 14 distant objects or events, is characterized by the sender's waiting for the recipient's response,
36
37 15 and it displays persistence and elaboration of communicative behaviour when communicative
38
39 16 attempts fail [16-19].
40
41

42
43 17 As our previous introduction to the term *gesture* pointed out, gestures are not restricted
44
45 18 to the use of hands, but often include movements of limbs but also head and body movements
46
47 19 as well as postures. Some scholars even include facial expressions as gestures [20, 21].
48
49
50 20 However, here we only focus on manual gestures in nonhuman primates, that is, gestures
51
52 21 produced with the whole arm or hands. We also mainly discuss studies of gestural
53
54 22 communication in great apes; this is not to neglect gibbons and monkeys, but there is still
55
56 23 little evidence of hand use for the purpose of communication in non-great ape species [22,
57
58 24 but see 23, 24, 25).
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 1 One of the biggest challenges in gestural research lies in determining when an
6
7 2 instrumental action has crossed the threshold and becomes a gesture. Some gestures are easy
8
9
10 3 to distinguish from instrumental actions, but there are others that are much more difficult to
11
12 4 differentiate. For instance, we would include as gestures the subtle touches and presses that
13
14 5 dancers use to inform their partner about their impending actions or to direct them in a certain
15
16 6 way. In contrast, we would not consider as gestures holding an infant when she is beginning
17
18 7 to walk because here the main function would be to help the infant to maintain her
19
20 8 equilibrium.
21
22

23
24 9 The problem of deciding between gestures and actions is further compounded when
25
26 10 multiple species are considered. Although the potential for confusing actions and gestures
27
28 11 represents a potential analytic weakness, it can become a strength since it tell us something
29
30 12 about the origin of gestures. In particular, it suggests that at least some gestures may have
31
32 13 begun their existence as actions before they were transformed into a communicative function.
33
34

35 14 From a more practical point of view, one approach that we find useful in distinguishing
36
37 15 actions from gestures is to consider how many of the criteria outlined above are met. Thus,
38
39 16 faced with a potential candidate as a gesture we must ask if 1) it is motorically ineffective, 2)
40
41 17 there is response waiting, 3) gaze alternation, and 4) persistence. The more criteria are met,
42
43 18 the more sure we can be that a given behaviour qualifies as a gesture. One cannot be 100%
44
45 19 sure but at least this method can help reducing our uncertainty.
46
47
48
49

50 20 In the next two sections we present a brief overview of the gestural communication of
51
52 21 the great apes (see [18] for a more detailed treatment) and then discuss their potential origins.
53

54 22 *Gestures of nonhuman primates*

55
56
57 23 Unlike research into human gestures mostly restricting the focus on the visual channel
58
59 24 [3], researchers investigating primate gestures also consider tactile gestures such as *push* or
60

1
2
3
4
5 1 *throw objects* and gestures with an auditory component such as *hand clap* and *chest beat*.
6
7 2 Including gestures that transfer information via non-visual channels captures the richness and
8
9 3 subtleties of non-vocal communication. However, it also raises potential problems when it
10
11 4 comes to distinguishing gestures from instrumental actions. For instance, a gesture called
12
13 5 *reach* that consists of extending an arm in the direction of a conspecific is easier to identify as
14
15 6 gesture than a gesture called *touch-side* that consists of touching an individual on her side to
16
17 7 make her move. The reason for this is simple. The lack of physical contact between the two
18
19 8 interacting individuals automatically makes *reach* motorically ineffective, one of the first
20
21 9 criteria to identify a gesture as such. After all, it is conceivable that the *touch-side* gesture
22
23 10 involved enough force to make the individual move, thus making this action motorically
24
25 11 effective and automatically disqualifying it as a gesture. In sum, researchers investigating
26
27 12 nonhuman primates have faced a trade-off between capturing the richness and subtleties of
28
29 13 non-vocal communication in primates at the expense of making the distinction between
30
31 14 gestures and instrumental actions less clear-cut than in human research.
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 15 In a recent summary of a systematic comparison of the four great apes, siamangs, and
39
40 16 Barbary macaques, Call and Tomasello [18] concluded that those species differed in
41
42 17 repertoire size, composition, and function of their gestures. They reported between 20 and 35
43
44 18 different gesture types depending on the species, which meet the above-mentioned criteria of
45
46 19 being motorically ineffective and are accompanied by response waiting and/or gaze
47
48 20 alternation, as well as persistence in case the recipient did not react. Out of those reported
49
50 21 gestural repertoires, at least 50% of each species' repertoire consisted of manual gestures
51
52 22 with the highest proportion found in gorillas (73%). (It is important to note that those
53
54 23 numbers refer to the total repertoires found across different groups of one species, not
55
56 24 average proportions). For example, tactile gestures, which included some kind of physical
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 1 contact with another individual (e.g., *touch*, *pull*, or *slap*) were used by all great apes,
6
7 2 siamangs, and Barbary macaques [18]. Auditory gestures often included the individual's own
8
9 3 body used to produce that noise, such as *hand clap* in chimpanzees [26], and *chest beat* and
10
11 4 *body beat* in gorillas [27]. Alternatively, noise can be produced by using objects while
12
13 5 performing gestures such as *ground slap*, *push objects*, or *throw objects*, which are gestures
14
15 6 particularly reported for chimpanzees [26]. On the other hand, examples for silent gestures
16
17 7 not involving physical contact include gestures like *extend arm (reach)*, *arm raise*, and *wave*
18
19 8 *arm* [18]. As opposed to bonobos, siamangs, and Barbary macaques, chimpanzees and
20
21 9 orangutans often incorporated objects to their gestural displays (15% of the gestures). For
22
23 10 example, orangutans offer food to other individual by extending one arm with food in their
24
25 11 hand to another individual [28] and chimpanzees use branches, which they shake vigorously
26
27 12 to get the attention of another group member [26]. The higher values for gestures involving
28
29 13 objects for chimpanzees and orangutans are interesting in light of their higher propensity to
30
31 14 use tools in the wild than the other species and may be indicative of a common neural
32
33 15 substrate for tool-use and gestural communication.

34
35
36
37
38
39
40 16 So far, we have mostly presented the results of our own research project into gestural
41
42 17 communication of nonhuman primates that started with the work by Tomasello and Call and
43
44 18 their colleagues in [29]. Of course, there are many more scholars working on the question of
45
46 19 which gestures nonhuman primates use, how they acquire them, and what the underlying
47
48 20 socio-cognitive skills are, both in wild and captive settings. The first pioneering field studies
49
50 21 report several gestures as parts of ethograms for orangutans [30], gorillas [31], chimpanzees
51
52 22 [32], and bonobos [33], but also for gibbons [34, 35] and monkeys [36]. Lately, there is an
53
54 23 increase in more systematic, mostly observational studies investigating gesture use within
55
56 24 social groups of great apes [37, 38] and monkeys [22, 24, 39-41]. This increasing body of
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 1 research reflects the interest in the role gestures might have played for the evolution of
6
7 2 human language [42-45], although studies addressing facial expressions or vocalizations still
8
9
10 3 outnumber studies concerning gestures [46].

11 4 However, the reported gestural repertoires for the different species vary considerably
12
13
14 5 between studies. For instance, while Pika and colleagues [27] described 33 gestures for
15
16 6 gorillas, Genty and colleagues [37] reported more than 100 gestures for this species.
17
18 7 Furthermore, very different names are often used to categorize the same behaviour,
19
20 8 complicating comparisons across studies and species. These discrepancies may be attributed
21
22 9 in part to the sampling effort and the differences in the detail of the coding schema across
23
24 10 studies [47], but it remains a fact that gestures are, first of all, difficult to differentiate from
25
26 11 actions, and second, although the majority of gestures are not gradual signals like in the case
27
28 12 of facial expressions, they are difficult to categorize because of the often different criteria
29
30 13 used across studies to define a gesture. This is closely related to a third reason, namely that
31
32 14 gestures are often defined based on their function or the context they are used in (e.g., *food*
33
34 15 *offer*) resulting in a conflation of form and function rather than referring to form and meaning
35
36 16 as separate variables.
37
38
39
40
41

42 17 However, although the paucity of data both in terms of the number of species and
43
44 18 groups investigated but also in terms of consistency of definitions used across studies
45
46 19 prevents us from concluding that there are any systematic differences between species (yet);
47
48 20 at the very least we can say that hands play an important role in gestural communication
49
50 21 among primates.
51
52
53

54 22 Considering the function of gestural communication, monkeys and apes use the
55
56 23 majority of their gestures to request actions like grooming, play, or mating. They use their
57
58 24 gestures in a dyadic way and usually not to communicate about events or objects outside their
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 1 dyad, but to request certain actions, expecting an immediate response [48]. In case the
6
7 2 recipient is not reacting, they will continue to gesture until they finally receive the
8
9 3 appropriate response of their social partner [49-51]. Apes do take into account the visual
10
11 4 access of others (see [52], for a review), use visual gestures only, if the recipient is attending
12
13 5 [18, 53], or use other strategies like moving into someone's visual field before starting to
14
15 6 gesture [50, 54]. In other words, they take into account the behaviour of others and adjust
16
17 7 their communicative means accordingly. However, there are inconsistent results as to what
18
19 8 extent apes are actually able to alter their gestures if their first gesture was not successful - for
20
21 9 chimpanzees and orangutans it is shown that most often the same gesture is repeated [50, 55],
22
23 10 while gorillas seem to show more flexibility in alternating the gestures they use to achieve a
24
25 11 certain goal [49]. It should be considered that for interactions with a human experimenter,
26
27 12 both chimpanzees and orangutans were shown to not only substitute, but also to elaborate
28
29 13 their gestures depending on the behaviour of a human in case their goal was not met [19, 56].
30
31
32
33
34

35 14 Another much-debated topic is the question of pointing in nonhuman great apes. In
36
37 15 captivity, great apes and also some monkey species point to request food, tools, or particular
38
39 16 actions from humans [57-61]. Pointing in great apes represents a flexible, intentional
40
41 17 behaviour, since the use of this gesture is adjusted to the attentional state of the human and it
42
43 18 occurs in combination with other signals such as facial expressions and vocalizations [19, 57,
44
45 19 62, 63]. Pointing is also frequently used by language-trained apes [60, 64, 65], where it often
46
47 20 resembles the form of the pointing gesture of Western cultures with the arm and index finger
48
49 21 extended [66].
50
51
52
53
54

55 22 However, unlike human infants that also point to show objects, to share attention upon
56
57 23 things, or even inform others like human infants [67], nonhuman primates usually point to
58
59 24 request things or actions in their interactions with humans. The vast majority of great apes'
60

1
2
3
4
5 1 pointing gestures therefore fall within the category of so-called imperative gestures, which
6
7 2 consist of the ape using the gesture to obtain something that they want from the human (see
8
9 3 [68], for a review). Informative pointing aimed at providing information such as indicating
10
11 4 the location of a hidden tool so that the human can use it to retrieve food for the ape [61].
12
13 5 Unlike humans, however, nonhuman primates rarely (if ever) use pointing or other gestures
14
15 6 aimed at sharing an attitude about the designated referent (expressive declaratives *sensu*
16
17 7 Tomasello [69], e.g., [70, 71]).

18
19 8 Most importantly, pointing *for* conspecifics and thus the sharing of information is a
20
21 9 rather rare event in nonhuman primates [72]. There is one report about one incidence of
22
23 10 pointing in wild bonobos [73] and some studies with language-trained apes mention the use
24
25 11 of pointing gestures in interactions with other apes [65]. However, note that the
26
27 12 communicative behaviour of those language-trained apes is largely influenced by their raising
28
29 13 history and thus their close proximity to the human culture [66, 74]. Therefore, pointing for
30
31 14 other conspecifics is extremely rare among wild and captive, non-enculturated apes. The
32
33 15 flexible and intentional use of this gesture has been only systematically documented for
34
35 16 interactions with humans. Gómez [75] argues that captive nonhuman primates are restricted
36
37 17 by cages and therefore use humans as tools to make them do things for them. Interestingly, an
38
39 18 uncaged hand-reared gorillas grabbed the hand of the human and took him to the desired
40
41 19 object or target of action and therefore preferred contact gestures instead of pointing [70].
42
43 20 Therefore, it seems unlikely that they simply learn to point by trial and error, but it is
44
45 21 suggested that they exapt existing cognitive skills into this referential form of communication
46
47 22 [75]. For monkeys, the situation seems to be different, since pointing seems to be ritualized
48
49 23 from previously reaching for the food [76].
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 1 To summarize, apes and monkeys use a variety of manual gestures to communicate
6
7 2 with other group members and use them mostly to request immediate actions of their social
8
9
10 3 partner. Thus, they use their gestures mostly in a dyadic, imperative way imperative way to
11
12 4 get others to do something for them. Interestingly, Bard [77, 78] referred to gestural
13
14 5 communication as “social tool use”, which is also reflected in the use of pointing gestures in
15
16 6 interactions with humans. Unlike humans, nonhuman primates do not point for conspecifics
17
18 7 and their gestures are often derived from functional actions rather than created as arbitrary
19
20 8 ones for communicative purposes [15, p. 37 - 40, 79], although there are single reports about
21
22 9 iconic gestures in gorillas and the use of pantomime in orangutans [80, 81]. One possible
23
24 10 explanation for those observed differences between different groups of great apes may be
25
26 11 based on the different ways in which gestures are acquired. In the next section we turn our
27
28 12 attention to this issue.
29
30
31
32

33 *Gesture origins*

34
35 14 Since the focus of this paper is on hand-based gestures, we begin this section with a
36
37 15 brief description of how hands are used for the purpose of communication by great apes and
38
39 16 monkeys. Hands did not evolve as communicative devices in the first place. In fact, the hands
40
41 17 of primates are characterized by an extraordinary degree of primitiveness [82], since the
42
43 18 basic, five-fingered appearance is shared not only with other mammals, but even other
44
45 19 vertebrates. Still, only in primates does the hand serve a variety of functions including
46
47 20 locomotion, manipulation, and communication [83]. Moreover, each of these functions is
48
49 21 represented by a variety of forms. Thus, locomotion can include things like walking,
50
51 22 climbing, jumping, or brachiating. Manipulation can include actions such as touching,
52
53 23 holding, or grasping and more complex forms that combine these basic forms with other
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 1 more elaborate actions that enable primates to engage in a range of fine-grained activities
6
7 2 such as grooming and tool-use.
8

9
10 3 From an evolutionary point of view, Napier [82, p. 14] noted a “...trend ... to
11
12 4 emancipate the hands from weight-bearing to sensitive and delicate multipurpose tools”.
13
14 5 However, those different functions are not representative for all primate species but very
15
16 6 much depend on the differentiation of the hand in the different taxa. While many monkeys
17
18 7 and apes have prehensile hands with nails and in some cases even independently movable or
19
20 8 opposable thumbs, other primates such as marmosets and tamarins lack those features.
21
22 9 Moreover, the gradual shrinkage of the hands’ palmar pads in phylogeny correlates with an
23
24 10 increase in prehensility and tactile sensitivity [82]. With the emancipation of forelimbs for
25
26 11 manipulatory purposes, the stage is set for the development of hands as communicative
27
28 12 devices. Indeed, it is not hard to find potential commonalities between manipulative activity
29
30 13 and communicative displays. For instance, monkeys and apes touch, push or pull other’s fur
31
32 14 during communication. Apes beg for food by placing a cupped hand under the chin of a
33
34 15 potential food donor as if it to catch food that may fall out. Even in the case of locomotor
35
36 16 activity, we can find connections between locomotion and communication.
37
38
39
40
41

42
43 17 An intriguing and contentious issue refers to the origin of those communicative
44
45 18 displays. One possibility is that they evolved over evolutionary time solely for
46
47 19 communicative purposes or that they originally evolved for one function (e.g., locomotion)
48
49 20 and were co-opted and reused for a communicative function. Alternatively, communicative
50
51 21 gestures may have become ritualized not over evolutionary time but in interactions between
52
53 22 individuals and thus over a much shorter time span, an individual’s lifetime. Next we turn
54
55 23 our attention to the possible changes involved in gesture origin depending on whether
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 1 changes take place over evolutionary time (phylogenesis) or an individual's lifetime
6
7 2 (ontogenesis).
8

9
10 3 *Phylogenetic origins*
11

12 4 Animal communication can be very complex and highly ritualized. Perhaps the most
13
14 5 famous example is the bee "language" consisting of different dances to indicate the position
15
16 6 of food resources to other members of the hive [84]. Ritualized communication is not only
17
18 7 found in invertebrates. There are many examples from vertebrates including the complex
19
20 8 mating display dance of the stickleback or some lek breeding birds [85, 86]. In some cases,
21
22 9 the communicative displays are composed of a set of discrete actions that follow a fixed
23
24 10 sequence, while in other cases they are constituted by single units. Such signals are displayed
25
26 11 by all individuals of the species under a set of predetermined conditions and, critically, they
27
28 12 appear even if individuals had no opportunity to observe or interact with other individuals to
29
30 13 acquire them.
31
32
33
34

35 14 Whereas some communicative displays seem to have evolved for communicative
36
37 15 purposes only, other displays appear to have been 'borrowed' from other contexts and thus
38
39 16 from movements that previously had no communicative function via a process called
40
41 17 phylogenetic ritualization [87]. For instance, dominance signals such as mounting in
42
43 18 monkeys are likely to have evolved from mating behaviour, while some courting displays in
44
45 19 birds include elements of foraging behaviour. This *principle of derived activities* [88] refers
46
47 20 to actions that originally served a different function but were borrowed and modified to some
48
49 21 extent to accomplish a communicative function, in some cases even in a different context
50
51 22 from its original one.
52
53
54
55

56
57 23 If we assume that phylogenetic ritualization is the main mechanism underlying gestural
58
59 24 communication in nonhuman primates, then repertoires of each species should be highly
60

1
2
3
4
5 1 uniform and species-specific gestures should be used even if individuals never had contact
6
7 2 with another conspecific. Gestures appear fully formed even when subjects have not had a
8
9
10 3 chance to interact with other individuals. Ground-slapping and chest-beating would be
11
12 4 examples of these behaviours [89]. However, that they are phylogenetically ritualized does
13
14 5 not mean that they are totally inflexible because at the very least, they are deployed in the
15
16 6 right circumstances and the existence of appropriate substrates/elements determines their
17
18 7 appearance. A phylogenetic origin of gestures would mean that all members of a given
19
20 8 species should inherit their gestural repertoire, as is the case for vocalizations and, provided
21
22 9 with the right conditions, all members of the species would display them. However, it is
23
24 10 important to consider that some gestures might be limited to certain developmental stages
25
26 11 resulting in species typical gestures that are restricted to particular age classes.

30 12 *Ontogenetic origins*

33 13 An alternative mechanism for the origin of gestures entails individuals acquiring them
34
35 14 during their interactions with conspecifics during their life times rather than inheriting them
36
37 15 as postulated above. One such process that involves two individuals mutually shaping each
38
39 16 other's behaviour during the course of repeated interactions is called ontogenetic ritualization
40
41 17 [29, 90]. Initially individuals use functional behaviours to affect their partner's behaviour.
42
43 18 For instance, when they want to embrace their partner, initially they simply pull their partner
44
45 19 towards themselves and when they are within reach, they embrace them. Over repeated
46
47 20 interactions, partners begin to anticipate the individual's goal and react before the individual
48
49 21 actually has a chance to pull the partner. Next, the individual (anticipating that their partner
50
51 22 will react appropriately) does not actually pull but give an even more abbreviated version of
52
53 23 the pull and their partner reacts. Once this stage is reached, we can say that the instrumental
54
55 24 action of pulling has become ritualized into a communicative signal.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 1 Ontogenetic ritualization as the main mechanisms of gesture acquisition would result in
6
7 2 a high degree of variability of individual repertoires and particularly in the occurrence of
8
9
10 3 idiosyncratic gestures, which are exclusive for single individuals only [27]. Idiosyncratic
11
12 4 gestures, which were found in all great ape species (for an overview, see [18]), seem to rule
13
14 5 out phylogenetic ritualization and thus a genetic determination of an individual's gestural
15
16 6 repertoire, since those instances clearly indicate that new gestures can be acquired during an
17
18 7 individual's lifetime. Although we still know very little about how such an individually
19
20 8 learned new gesture spreads across other group members, there is some evidence that such a
21
22 9 transmission takes place, as was shown for the *grooming handclasp* in a captive group of
23
24 10 chimpanzees [91].
25
26
27

28 11 Variability between groups is evident in the occurrence of group-specific gestures,
29
30 12 which are used by the majority of individuals in one group, but are absent in another group.
31
32 13 Although group-specific gestures are infrequent, they are reported for chimpanzees [26],
33
34 14 gorillas [27, 38] and orangutans [28] in captive settings, but also in wild populations, like the
35
36 15 *grooming handclasp* of wild chimpanzees [92].
37
38
39

40 16 Two basic kinds of gestures have been described in this context: intention movements
41
42 17 and attention-getters [93]. Intention movements result from the abbreviations of full-fledged
43
44 18 behaviour. For instance, the gesture arm raise has been hypothesized to originate from play
45
46 19 hitting, initially a functional behaviour that acquires a value as a signal of impending actions.
47
48 20 Intention movements typically convey a clear message and are used in a restricted set of
49
50 21 social contexts. Moreover, their meaning and origin can be deduced based on use in those
51
52 22 contexts. The second kind of gesture is the so-called attention-getters. It is true that the name
53
54 23 attention-getter is not very fortunate because unlike what its name suggests, attention-getters
55
56 24 are not just designed to capture attention. In fact, their main function may be to trigger others
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 1 into action, not to call their attention. That they also serve to capture attention may be a by-
6
7 2 product. However, there are inconsistent results in terms of whether great apes actually use
8
9 3 their gestures to attract the attention of others. In interactions with conspecifics, chimpanzees
10
11 4 use either *poke at* or *throw stuff* - both heavily tactile gestures - to attract the attention of the
12
13 5 unattending individual [93]. However, this seems to account only for those particular
14
15 6 gestures, since further research found that chimpanzees use also auditory gestures more often
16
17 7 towards an attentive recipient and tactile gestures were used regardless of the attentional state
18
19 8 of the recipient [26, 50]. In other words, tactile and auditory gestures are not used particularly
20
21 9 often if the recipient is not attending.
22
23
24
25

26 10 However, in interactions with humans, orangutans, gorillas, and chimpanzees do use
27
28 11 attention-getting behaviours more when they interact with a human who is facing away
29
30 12 compared to situations when the human is facing them [53, 94-96]. The different findings for
31
32 13 interactions between conspecifics on the one hand and interactions with humans on the other
33
34 14 hand might also be explained by the constraints of the captive setting. When apes
35
36 15 encountered a human with her back turned and they were given a choice between positioning
37
38 16 themselves in front of a human or using an auditory gesture to call the human's attention, all
39
40 17 great apes species preferred to walk in front of the human to gesture [54]. Thus, similar to the
41
42 18 use of pointing gestures, the use of attention-getters might depend very much on the restraints
43
44 19 of captivity.
45
46
47
48
49

50 20 Compared to intention movements, attention-getters appear to be less context-
51
52 21 dependent as they appear in multiple contexts for multiple purposes. Additionally, unlike
53
54 22 intention movements it is not easy to envisage a history of ontogenetic ritualization from pre-
55
56 23 existing social behaviours as their origin, so that they are possibly also phylogenetic in origin.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 1 There is a second way in which individuals could acquire gestures during ontogeny
6
7 2 without requiring ritualization: Learning gestures by observation. One possibility is that the
8
9 3 individual would copy the gestures that another individual is directing to her (second person
10
11 4 imitation). Another possibility is that the individual could observe two individuals gesturing
12
13 5 to each other and acquires those gestures herself without directly interacting with others
14
15 6 (third person imitation). Interestingly, gestures learned by observation walk an opposite path
16
17 7 from those that are ontogenetically ritualized. They are acquired fully formed, the individual
18
19 8 does not transform an existing behaviour into a streamlined version that becomes the gesture.
20
21 9 The individual copies the streamlined version. The resulting outcome would be a high degree
22
23 10 of uniformity within the group paired with substantial differences between groups because
24
25 11 each group may have developed their own idiosyncratic gestures and transmitted them across
26
27 12 generations. This is clearly the case in humans but it is unclear that is also the case in
28
29 13 nonhuman primates.

30
31
32
33
34
35 14 *Phylogenetic vs. ontogenetic origins of gestures?*

36
37
38 15 There is currently some debate about what may be the most likely origin of gestures.
39
40 16 We have indicated three potential origins for gestures. Historically, observational learning
41
42 17 had been proposed as a main mechanism for gesture acquisition. However, there are very
43
44 18 little data supporting the idea that apes learn gestures, especially visual gestures, by imitation
45
46 19 [26]. Note that the variability in gestural use within groups is as large as between groups.
47
48 20 This is not what one would expect based on imitation and cultural transmission since
49
50 21 between-group variability should be higher than within-group variability as it is the case in
51
52 22 humans.

53
54
55
56
57 23 Unlike observational learning, ontogenetic ritualization can explain this pattern of
58
59 24 results because the homogeneity within groups would be reduced by the presence of
60

1
2
3
4
5 1 idiosyncratic gestures developed by some individuals but not others. The reason for
6
7 2 idiosyncrasy stems from the fact that certain dyadic interactions between individuals are
8
9
10 3 unique, for instance, mothers and infants may follow different caregiving routines. In fact,
11
12 4 according to Tomasello and colleagues [29], the presence of idiosyncratic gestures is a key
13
14 5 indicator of ontogenetic ritualization and evidence against a phylogenetic origin of gestures,
15
16 6 which should be common to all individuals.

17
18
19 7 Genty and colleagues [37] have recently challenged this idea and proposed that ape
20
21 8 gestures are not ontogenetically ritualized but appear fully formed in individuals. This
22
23
24 9 phylogenetic origin of gestures leaves no room for modification over time. They argue that
25
26 10 the differences between groups and the idiosyncrasy that has been described are a
27
28 11 consequence of the sampling methods that have been used. In particular, not enough hours
29
30
31 12 have been observed to be able to obtain the whole repertoire of gestures. Thus, idiosyncrasy
32
33 13 results from a low sampling effort as opposed to individualized experiences with other
34
35 14 conspecifics. An increase in the sampling effort showed that all individuals used the same
36
37
38 15 gestures and virtually eliminated idiosyncratic gestures from the sample. This result cast
39
40 16 some doubt not only on ontogenetic ritualization but also on observational learning as
41
42 17 acquisition mechanisms because there were no differences between groups.

43
44
45 18 However, one limitation of these studies was that they were not longitudinal and
46
47 19 therefore they could not detect change either within an individual's lifespan or across
48
49
50 20 generations. So although all individuals use the same gestures, this does not prove that
51
52 21 gestures have not undergone an ontogenetic ritualization process. What is needed are long-
53
54 22 term studies actually investigating whether the gestures of great apes (and monkeys) change
55
56 23 over time. Additionally, studies that have investigated gestural acquisition of apes in contact
57
58 24 with humans have described the ritualization process [97]. One could argue that apes in
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 1 contact with humans would be different, but this is hard to reconcile with the idea that
6
7 2 human-reared apes were requesting the same things (e.g., go to another location) as the ones
8
9
10 3 living with their biological mothers. Nevertheless, it is true that the case for ontogenetic
11
12 4 ritualization may have been overstated because as Genty, Byrne and colleagues point out
13
14 5 [37], it is difficult to envisage a history of ontogenetic ritualization for some gestures such
15
16 6 chest beating or ground slapping, although it is also true that ontogenetic ritualization may
17
18 7 still be a viable alternative for other gestures such as gentle touch or arm raise.

19
20
21 8 After discussing the origins of gestures in nonhuman primates and their close link to
22
23 9 actions, we will now briefly refer to some of the current theories on language evolution and
24
25 10 the role gestures might have played, before we will address the question of laterality in
26
27 11 gesture use in nonhuman primates.
28
29
30
31
32

33 13 Language origins (out of actions)

34 14 *Gestural origin of human language*

35
36
37
38 15 The origin of human language is a fiercely debated question, with some scholars
39
40 16 favoring a vocal origin (e.g., [98]) and others emphasizing gestures as precursors to human
41
42 17 language (e.g., [43]). To our knowledge, there is no coherent theory currently available that
43
44 18 has attempted to reconcile the two opposing sets of theories, which usually see themselves as
45
46 19 mutually exclusive [46]. Gestural theories usually refer to the very flexible use of gestures
47
48 20 across different contexts and the fact that new gestures can be learned and incorporated into a
49
50 21 species repertoire [99]. The discovery of a mirror-neuron system for grasping in monkeys
51
52 22 [100] has nourished a variety of evolutionary scenarios focusing on the role of gestures in this
53
54 23 process, since mirror neurons represent the link between manual, practical actions and
55
56 24 communication.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 1 *From action to language*
6

7 2 Mirror neurons allow macaques to establish a link between performing an action and
8
9 3 being able to recognize it [100]. Interestingly, these neurons are located in a brain area that is
10
11 4 homologous to Broca's area in the human brain responsible for processing language. Mirror
12
13 5 neurons therefore might have played an important role in the evolution of human language,
14
15 6 since they were already present in our ancestors representing the neural prerequisite for the
16
17 7 development of inter-individual communication and finally of speech [101]. Next, we will
18
19 8 give a brief overview of theories suggesting a gestural origin, and second, we will turn to the
20
21 9 lateralization of hand use while gesturing and the evidence currently available for non-human
22
23 10 primates.
24
25
26
27

28 11 *Gesture and laterality*
29
30

31 12 Gestural theories of language evolution often refer to the link between
32
33 13 lateralization of hand use and language [43]. In humans, the motor systems controlling
34
35 14 both manual and oral movements are usually lateralized to the left hemisphere [102].
36
37 15 Therefore, the majority of the human population is right-handed with the left
38
39 16 hemisphere controlling movements of the right hand. Furthermore, both language
40
41 17 production and comprehension are located in distinct areas of the left brain hemisphere
42
43 18 [103]. The close link between language and manual actions becomes evident in studies
44
45 19 showing that while speaking, humans gesture significantly more with their right and
46
47 20 compared to their left hand [104]. This suggests that the functional asymmetry is not
48
49 21 specific for one modality only, and that the production of speech apparently activates also
50
51 22 motor areas in the left hemisphere resulting in an increased use of the right hand [105]
52
53
54
55
56

57 23 Comparable evidence has been found for nonhuman primates since they show a
58
59 24 preference for using their right hand for different manual actions including gestures
60

1 while vocalizing [106, 107]. These findings suggest that the lateralization of manual
2 and oral movements represents a trait shared by both human and other primates.

3 However, results for the preference for one hand and particularly the right hand
4 are not completely consistent [108, 109]. Although a hand preference is found in many
5 monkey and ape species for different manual actions such as carrying, tool use, and
6 locomotion [106, 110-112], hand preference is often task-specific and often only
7 evident on an individual-, but not species-level [113, 114]. So far, there is little evidence
8 that gestures used to communicate with conspecifics - and thus not in interactions with
9 humans when begging for food - are mainly produced with the right hand. To our
10 knowledge there is only one study showing that baboons use their right hand while they
11 gesture, but not when they perform non-communicative actions [22]. In interactions
12 with humans, however, there is clear evidence that chimpanzees use their right hand
13 preferentially while gesturing [115-117], and they also used their right hand
14 significantly more while producing gestures compared to other manual actions. Hopkins
15 and colleagues [118] therefore concluded that the left-hemisphere specialization for
16 language may have evolved initially from asymmetries in manual gestures in the
17 common ancestor of chimpanzees and humans, rather than from hand use associated
18 with other, non-communicative motor actions such as tool use and bimanual actions.
19 The laterality of hand use in chimpanzees is also reflected in neuroanatomical
20 asymmetries, since chimpanzees that preferably gesture with their right hand also have
21 larger inferior frontal gyri in the left hemisphere than those apes that do not show
22 consistent hand use while gesturing [119].

23 To summarize, those studies indicate that manual gestures of at least chimpanzees
24 are lateralized, and this functional asymmetry is also associated with asymmetries in

1
2
3
4
5 1 the corresponding neural substrate. Hopkins and colleagues [118] therefore suggest
6
7 2 that the dominance of the left hemisphere for language has evolved from a gestural
8
9
10 3 communication system already lateralized in the left hemisphere in our common
11
12 4 ancestor 5 to 7 million years ago.
13

14 *Conclusion*

15
16
17 6 In our contribution, we wanted to highlight that the hands of nonhuman primates, and
18
19 7 particularly those of the great apes, are suitable tools to perform a variety of gestures of
20
21
22 8 different modalities. They are used to achieve a range of different social goals and display a
23
24 9 high degree of flexibility as indicated by the possibility of acquiring new gestures often
25
26
27 10 outside of what would be the species-specific repertoire. Still, gestures of nonhuman primates
28
29 11 are different from human gestures in many aspects, since they are mostly used in a dyadic
30
31 12 and imperative way, and they also lack the high level of abstraction typical for human
32
33
34 13 gestures. Thus, gestures of nonhuman primates may emerge from actions via three potential
35
36 14 pathways.
37

38
39 15 The high degree of variability between individual repertoires, the occurrence of
40
41 16 idiosyncratic gestures and thus the creation of new gestures support the idea that ontogenetic
42
43 17 ritualization may be involved in the origin of some gestures. However, other gestures appear
44
45 18 more or less fully formed even in the absence of conspecifics, thus indicating a strong genetic
46
47
48 19 predisposition to develop certain gestures. Finally, some form of social learning might also
49
50 20 be implicated either in the form of facilitating the appearance of some gestures or perhaps
51
52 21 even the acquisition of novel gestures, although this still needs to be supported by empirical
53
54
55 22 evidence.
56

57
58 23 After elaborating on the close link between manual actions and gestural
59
60 24 communication, we turned to the question of whether gestures of nonhuman primates are

1 lateralized as many human manual actions including certain gesture types are. There is some
2 evidence for right-handedness at least in captive chimpanzees, and, interestingly, they use
3 their right hand even more while vocalizing, thus suggesting a close link between the manual
4 and oral movements. This fact is often used to support a gestural origin of human language,
5 since the function asymmetry of hand use while gesturing is also present in the neural
6 substrate of chimpanzees, suggesting some continuity in our phylogenetic history. However,
7 one must keep in mind that the evidence of laterality in chimpanzees and other nonhuman
8 primate species at the population level is quite mixed. This means that it may be too early to
9 generalize a right-hand preference for gesture use in our closest relatives.

10 There is much to be done in the future to trace the origins of gestures. Longitudinal
11 studies are especially important as they can throw light on how gestures actually emerge in
12 both monkeys and apes. Some research effort devoted to non-great ape species would be
13 particularly welcome. Otherwise the field runs the risk of underestimating what aspects of
14 gestural communication that are common to human and nonhuman apes are already present
15 in monkeys. Finally, there is much work to be done in terms of unifying concepts and criteria
16 across the various disciplines that conduct research on gestural communication.

17 18 *Acknowledgements*

19 We would like to thank Michael Tomasello, Simone Pika, and Cornelia Mueller for fruitful
20 discussions on this topic, and Daniel Haun as well as Erica Cartmill and an anonymous
21 reviewer for their very helpful comments on the manuscript.

22 23 *References*

- 1
2
3
4
5 1 1 Gómez J. C. 1990 The emergence of intentional communication as a problem-solving
6 strategy in gorilla. In *'Language' and intelligence in monkeys and apes* (eds. S. T.
7 2 Parker & K. R. Gibson), pp. 333-355. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
8
9 3
10
11 4 2 Simpson J. A. & Weiner E. S. C. (eds.) 1998 *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed.
12 Oxford: Oxford University Press.
13
14 5
15
16 6 3 Kendon A. 2004 *Gesture: visible action*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
17
18 7 4 Liszkowski U., Carpenter M., Henning, Striano T. & Tomasello M. 2004 Twelve-
19 months-olds point to share attention and interest. *Developmental Sci.* **7**, 297–307.
20
21 8 (DOI 10.1111/j.1467-7687.2004.00349.x.)
22
23 9
24
25 10 5 Butterworth G. & Grover L. 1988 The origins of referential communication in human
26 infancy. In *Thought without language* (ed. L. Weiskrantz), pp. 5-24. Oxford:
27 11 Clarendon Press.
28
29 12
30
31 13 6 Franco F. & Butterworth G. 1996 Pointing and social awareness: Declaring and
32 requesting in the second year. *J Child Lang.* **23**, 307-336. (DOI
33 14 10.1017/S0305000900008813)
34
35 15
36
37 16 7 Carpenter M., Nagell K. & Tomasello M. 1998 Social cognition, joint attention, and
38 communicative competence from 9 to 15 months of age. *Monogr Soc Res Child Dev.*
39
40 17 **63**, 176.
41
42 18
43 19 8 Volterra V., Caselli M. C., Capirci O. & Pizzuto E. 2005 Gesture and the emergence
44 and development of language. In *Elizabeth Bates: A Festschrift* (eds. M. Tomasello &
45 D. Slobin). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
46
47 20
48 21
49 22 9 Capirci O., Montanari S. & Volterra V. 1998 Gestures, signs, and words in early
50 language development. *New Dir Child Dev.* **79**, 45-60.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 1 10 Alibali M. W., Kita S. & Young A. J. 2000 Gesture and the process of speech
6
7 2 production: We think, therefore we gesture. *Lang Cognitive Proc.* **15**, 593-613.
8
9 3 (DOI 10.1080/016909600750040571)
10
11
12 4 11 Goldin-Meadow S. 2002 Constructing communication by hand. *Cognitive Dev.* **17**,
13
14 5 1385-1405. (DOI 10.1016/S0885-2014(02)00122-3)
15
16
17 6 12 McNeill D. 2000 *Language and gesture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
18
19 7 13 Goldin-Meadow S. 2003 *The resilience of language: What gesture creation in deaf*
20
21 8 *children can tell us about how all children learn language*. New York: Psychology
22
23 9 Press.
24
25
26 10 14 Senghas A., Kita S. & Özyürek A. 2004 Children creating core properties of
27
28 11 language: evidence from an emerging sign language in Nicaragua. *Science.* **305**,
29
30 12 1779-1782. (DOI 10.1126/science.1100199)
31
32
33 13 15 McNeill D. 1992 *Hand and mind: what gestures reveal about thought*. Chicago: The
34
35 14 University of Chicago Press.
36
37
38 15 16 Bates E. 1979 *The emergence of symbols: cognition and communication in infancy*.
39
40 16 New York: Academic Press.
41
42
43 17 17 Bates E., Camaioni L. & Volterra V. 1975 The acquisition of performatives prior to
44
45 18 speech. *Merrill-Palmer Quart.* **21**, 205-226.
46
47
48 19 18 Call J. & Tomasello M. (eds.) 2007 *The gestural communication of apes and*
49
50 20 *monkeys*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
51
52
53 21 19 Leavens D. A., Russell J. L. & Hopkins W. D. 2005 Intentionality as measured in the
54
55 22 persistence and elaboration of communication by chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*).
56
57 23 *Child Dev.* **76**, 291-306. (DOI 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2005.00845.x)
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 1 20 Maestriperi D. 1999 Primate social organization, gestural repertoire size, and
6
7 2 communication dynamics. In *The origins of language: what nonhuman primates can*
8
9 3 *tell us* (ed. B. King), pp. 55-77. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.
10
11
12 4 21 Paukner A., Anderson J. R., Fogassi L. & Ferrari P. F. 2006 Do facial gestures,
13
14 5 visibility or speed of movement influence gaze following responses in pigtail
15
16 6 macaques? *Primates*. **48**, 241-244. (DOI 10.1007/s10329-006-0024-z)
17
18
19 7 22 Meguerditchian A. & Vauclair J. 2006 Baboons communicate with their right hand.
20
21 8 *Behav Brain Res*. **171**, 170-174. (DOI 10.1016/j.bbr.2006.03.018)
22
23
24 9 23 Hesler N. & Fischer J. 2007 Gestural communication in Barbary macaques (*Macaca*
25
26 10 *sylvanus*): An overview. In *The Gestural Communication of Apes and Monkeys* (eds.
27
28 11 J. Call & M. Tomasello), pp. 159-196. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum
29
30 12 Associates.
31
32
33 13 24 Laidre M. E. 2008 Do captive mandrills invent new gestures? *Animal Cognition*. **11**,
34
35 14 179-187. (DOI 10.1007/s10071-007-0121-4)
36
37
38 15 25 Liebal K., Pika S. & Tomasello M. 2004 Social communication in siamangs
39
40 16 (*Symphalangus syndactylus*): Use of gestures and facial expressions. *Primates*. **45**,
41
42 17 41-57. (DOI 10.1007/s10329-003-0063-7)
43
44
45 18 26 Tomasello M., Call J., Warren J., Frost G. T., Carpenter M. & Nagell K. 1997 The
46
47 19 ontogeny of chimpanzee gestural signals: A comparison across groups and
48
49 20 generations. *Evolution of Communication*. **1**, 223-259. (DOI 10.1075/eoc.1.2.04tom)
50
51
52 21 27 Pika S., Liebal K. & Tomasello M. 2003 Gestural communication in young gorillas
53
54 22 (*Gorilla gorilla*): Gestural repertoire, learning, and use. *Am J Primatol*. **60** 95-111.
55
56 23 (DOI 10.1002/ajp.10097)
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 1 28 Liebal K., Pika S. & Tomasello M. 2006 Gestural communication of orangutans
6
7 2 (*Pongo pygmaeus*). *Gesture*. **6**, 1-38.
8
9
10 3 29 Tomasello M., George B., Kruger A., Farrar J. & Evans E. 1985 The development of
11
12 4 gestural communication in young chimpanzees. *J Hum Evol.* **14**, 175-186. (DOI
13
14 5 10.1016/S0047-2484(85)80005-1)
15
16 6 30 MacKinnon. 1974 The behaviour and ecology of wild orang-utans (*Pongo*
17
18 7 *pygmaeus*). *Anim Behav.* **22**, 3-74. (DOI 10.1016/S0003-3472(74)80054-0)
19
20 8 31 Schaller G. B. 1963 *The mountain gorilla: Ecology and behavior*. Chicago: Chicago
21
22 9 University Press.
23
24
25
26 10 32 Goodall J. 1986 *The chimpanzees of Gombe: Patterns of behavior*. Cambridge:
27
28 11 Harvard University Press.
29
30
31 12 33 Kuroda S. J. 1980 Social behavior of the pygmy chimpanzees. *Primates.* **21**, 181-
32
33 13 197. (DOI 10.1007/BF02374032)
34
35 14 34 Baldwin L. A. & Teleki G. 1976 Patterns of gibbon behavior on Hall's Island,
36
37 15 Bermuda: a preliminary ethogram for *Hylobates lar*. In *Gibbon and Siamang* (ed. D.
38
39 16 Rumbaugh), pp. 21-105. Basel: Karger.
40
41
42 17 35 Chivers D. 1976 Communication within and between family groups of siamang
43
44 18 (*Symphalangus syndactylus*). *Behaviour.* **57**, 116-135. (DOI
45
46 19 10.1163/156853976X00136)
47
48
49 20 36 Kummer H. 1968 *Social organization of hamadryas baboons. A field study*. Basel:
50
51 21 Karger.
52
53
54 22 37 Genty E., Breuer T., Hobaiter C. & Byrne R. 2009 Gestural communication of the
55
56 23 gorilla (*Gorilla gorilla*): repertoire, intentionality and possible origins. *Animal*
57
58 24 *Cognition.* **12**, 527-546. (DOI 10.1007/s10071-009-0213-4).
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 1 38 Tanner J. & Byrne R. 1999 The development of spontaneous gestural communication
6
7 2 in a group of zoo-living lowland gorillas. In *The mentalities of gorillas and*
8
9 3 *orangutans*. (eds. T. Parker, S. Milks & R. Mitchell), pp. 211-239. Cambridge:
10
11 4 Cambridge University Press.
12
13
14 5 39 Maestriperi D. 1996 Gestural communication and its cognitive implications in
15
16 6 pigtail macaques (*Macaca nemestrina*). *Behaviour*. **133**, 997-1022.
17
18
19 7 40 Maestriperi D. 1996 Social communication among captive stump-tailed macaques
20
21 8 (*Macaca arctoides*). *International Journal of Primatology*. **17**, 785-802. (DOI
22
23 9 10.1007/BF02735264)
24
25
26 10 41 Maestriperi D. 1997 Gestural communication in macaques: usage and meaning of
27
28 11 nonvocal signals. *Evolution of Communication*. **1**, 193-222. (DOI
29
30 12 10.1075/eoc.1.2.03mae)
31
32
33 13 42 Arbib M. A., Liebal K. & Pika S. 2008 Primate vocalization, gesture, and the
34
35 14 evolution of human language. *Curr Anthropol*. **49**, 1053-1076. (DOI 10.1086/593015)
36
37
38 15 43 Corballis M. C. 2003 From mouth to hand: Gesture, speech, and the evolution of
39
40 16 right-handedness. *Behav Brain Sci*. **26**, 199-260. (DOI
41
42 17 10.1017/S0140525X03000050)
43
44
45 18 44 Hewes G. W. 1973 Primate communication and the gestural origin of language. *Curr*
46
47 19 *Anthropol*. **12**, 5-24.
48
49
50 20 45 Pollick A. S. & de Waal F. 2007 Ape gestures and language evolution. *Proceedings*
51
52 21 *of the National Academy of Sciences*. **104**, 8184 – 8189. (DOI
53
54 22 10.1073/pnas.0702624104)
55
56
57 23 46 Slocombe K., Waller B. & Liebal K. 2011 The language void: the need for
58
59 24 multimodality. *Anim Behav*. (DOI 10.1016/j.anbehav.2011.02.002)
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 1 47 Cartmill E. A. & Byrne R. W. 2010 Semantics of primate gestures: intentional
6 meanings of orangutan gestures. *Animal Cognition*. **13**, 793-804. (10.1007/s10071-
7 2 010-0328-7)
8
9
10 3
11
12 4 48 Pika S. 2008 What is the nature of the gestural communication of great apes? In *The*
13 *shared mind: perspectives on intersubjectivity* (eds. J. Zlatev, T. P. Racine, C. Sinha
14 & E. Itkonen), pp. 165-186: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
15
16
17 6
18
19 7 49 Genty E. & Byrne R. 2010 Why do gorillas make sequences of gestures? *Animal*
20 *Cognition*. **13**, 287-301. (DOI 10.1007/s10071-009-0266-4)
21
22 8
23
24 9 50 Liebal K., Call J. & Tomasello M. 2004 Use of gesture sequences in chimpanzees
25 (*Pan troglodytes*). *Am J Primatol*. **64**, 377-396. (DOI 10.1002/ajp.20087)
26
27
28
29 11 51 Tanner J. 2004 Gestural phrases and gestural exchanges by a pair of zoo-living
30 lowland gorillas. *Gesture*. **4**, 1-24. (DOI 10.1075/gest.4.1.02tan)
31
32
33
34 13 52 Rosati A. G. & Hare B. 2009 Looking past the model species: diversity in gaze-
35 following skills across primates. *Curr Opin Neurobiol*. **19**, 45-51.
36
37 (10.1016/J.Conb.2009.03.002)
38
39
40 16 53 Hostetter A. B., Cantero M. & Hopkins W. D. 2001 Differential use of vocal and
41 gestural communication by chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*) in response to the
42 attentional status of a human (*Homo sapiens*). *J Comp Psychol*. **115**, 337-343. (DOI
43 10.1037//0735-7036.115.4.337)
44
45
46
47
48
49
50 20 54 Liebal K., Pika S., Call J. & Tomasello M. 2004 To move or not to move: How great
51 apes adjust to the attentional state of others. *Interaction Studies*. **5**, 199-219. (DOI
52 10.1075/is.5.2.03lie)
53
54
55
56
57 23 55 Tempelmann S. & Liebal K. under review Spontaneous use of gesture sequences in
58 orangutans. A case for strategy? *Gesture*.
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 1 56 Cartmill E. A. & Byrne R. W. 2007 Orangutans modify their gestural signaling
6
7 2 according to their audience's comprehension. *Curr Biol.* **17**, 1345-1348. (DOI
8
9 3 10.1016/j.cub.2007.06.069)
10
11
12 4 57 Leavens D. A., Hopkins W. D. & Bard K. A. 1996 Indexical and referential pointing
13
14 5 in chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*). *J Comp Psychol.* **110**, 346-353. (DOI
15
16 6 10.1037/0735-7036.110.4.346)
17
18
19 7 58 Mitchell R. & Anderson J. 1997 Pointing, withholding information, and deception
20
21 8 in capuchin monkeys (*Cebus apella*). *J Comp Psychol.* **111**, 351. (DOI
22
23 9 10.1037/0735-7036.111.4.351)
24
25
26 10 59 Anderson J., Kuwahata H. & Fujita K. 2007 Gaze alternation during 'pointing' by
27
28 11 squirrel monkeys (*Saimiri sciureus*)? *Animal Cognition.* **10**, 267-271. (DOI
29
30 12 10.1007/s10071-006-0065-0)
31
32
33 13 60 Call J. & Tomasello M. 1994 The production and comprehension of referential
34
35 14 pointing by orangutans (*Pongo pygmaeus*). *J Comp Psychol.* **108**, 307-317. DOI
36
37 15 10.1037/0735-7036.108.4.307)
38
39
40 16 61 Zimmermann F., Zemke F., Call J. & Gómez J. C. 2009 Orangutans (*Pongo*
41
42 17 *pygmaeus*) and bonobos (*Pan paniscus*) point to inform a human about the location of
43
44 18 a tool. *Animal Cognition.* **12**, 347-358. (DOI 10.1007/s10071-008-0194-8)
45
46
47 19 62 Leavens D. A. & Hopkins W. D. 1998 Intentional communication by chimpanzees
48
49 20 (*Pan troglodytes*): a cross-sectional study of the use of referential gestures. *Dev*
50
51 21 *Psychol.* **34**, 813-822. (DOI 10.1037/0012-1649.34.5.813)
52
53
54 22 63 Leavens D. A., Hopkins W. D. & Thomas R. K. 2004 Referential communication by
55
56 23 chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*). *J Comp Psychol.* **118**, 48-57. (DOI 10.1037/0735-
57
58 24 7036.118.1.48)
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 1 64 Pedersen J. & Fields W. M. 2009 Aspects of repetition in bonobo–human
6
7 2 conversation: Creating cohesion in a conversation between species. *Integr Psychol*
8
9 3 *Behav.* **43**, 22–41. (DOI 10.1007/s12124-008-9067-6)
10
11
12 4 65 Savage-Rumbaugh E. S. 1986 *Ape language: From conditioned response to symbol*.
13
14 5 New York: Columbia University Press.
15
16
17 6 66 Leavens D. A., Hopkins W. D. & Bard K. A. 2005 Understanding the point of
18
19 7 chimpanzee pointing. *Curr Dir Psychol Sci.* **14**, 185-189. (DOI 10.1111/j.0963-
20
21 8 7214.2005.00361.x)
22
23
24 9 67 Liszkowski U., Carpenter M., Striano T. & Tomasello M. 2006 Twelve and 18-
25
26 10 months-olds point to provide information for others. *J Cogn Dev.* **7**, 297–307.
27
28
29 11 68 Call J. 2011 How artificial communication affects the communication and cognition
30
31 12 of the great apes. *Mind Lang.* **26**, 1–20. (DOI 10.1111/j.1468-0017.2010.01408.x)
32
33
34 13 69 Tomasello M. 2008 *Origins of human communication*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT
35
36 14 Press.
37
38 15 70 Gómez J. C., Sarria E. & Tamarit J. 1993 The comparative study of early
39
40 16 communication and theories of mind: ontogeny, phylogeny, and pathology. In
41
42 17 *Understanding other minds: Perspectives from autism* (eds. S. Baron-Cohen & H.
43
44 18 Tager-Flusberg), pp. 397-426. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
45
46
47 19 71 Tomonaga M., Tanaka M., Matsuzawa T., Myowa-Yamakoshi M., Kosugi D.,
48
49 20 Mizuno Y., Okamoto S., Yamaguchi M. K. & Bard K. 2004 Development of social
50
51 21 cognition in infant chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*): Face recognition, smiling, gaze,
52
53 22 and the lack of triadic interactions. *Jpn Psychol Res.* **46**, 227-235. (DOI
54
55 23 10.1111/j.1468-5584.2004.00254.x)
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 1 72 Gómez J. C. 2007 Pointing behaviors in apes and human infants: A balanced
6 interpretation. *Child Dev.* **78**, 729-734. (DOI 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2007.01027.x)
7
8 2
9 3 73 Vea J. J. & Sabater-Pi J. 1998 Spontaneous pointing behaviour in the wild pygmy
10 chimpanzee (*Pan paniscus*). *Folia Primatol (Basel)*. **69**, 289-290.
11
12 4
13 5 74 Cartmill E. A. & Maestriperi D. in press Socio-cognitive specializations of
14 nonhuman primates: evidence from gestural communication. In *The Oxford*
15
16 6
17 7
18 7
19 8
20 9 75 Gómez J. C. 2007 Pointing behaviors in apes and human infants: a balanced
21 interpretation. *Child Dev.* **78**, 729-734.
22
23 10
24 11 76 Blaschke M. & Ettliger G. 1987 Pointing as an act of social communication by
25
26 12
27 13 77 Bard K. 1990 "Social tool use" by free-ranging orangutans: A Piagetian and
28
29 14
30 15
31 16
32 17 78 Bard K. 1992 Intentional behaviour and intentional communication in young free-
33
34 18
35 19
36 20 79 Kendon A. 1988 How gestures can become like words. In *Cross-cultural perspectives*
37
38 21
39 22
40 23 80 Russon A. & Andrews K. 2010 Orangutan pantomime: elaborating the message.
41
42 24
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 1 81 Tanner J. & Byrne R. 1996 Representation of action through iconic gesture in a
6
7 2 captive lowland gorilla. *Curr Anthropol.* **37**, 162-173.
8
9
10 3 82 Napier J. R. 1976 *The Human hand*. Burlington, NC: Carolina Biological Supply
11
12 4 Company.
13
14 5 83 Schultz A. H. 1968 Form und Funktion der Primatenhände. In *Handgebrauch und*
15
16 6 *Verständigung bei Affen und Frühmenschen* (ed. B. Rentsch), pp. 9 - 30. Bern: Hans
17
18 7 Huber.
19
20
21 8 84 Frisch K. V. 1973 Honeybees: do they use direction and distance information
22
23 9 provided by their dancers? In *Perception: an adaptive process* (ed. T. L. Bennett), pp.
24
25 10 84 - 91: MSS Information Corp.
26
27
28 11 85 Kirkpatrick M. & Ryan M. 1991 The evolution of mating preferences and the
29
30 12 paradox of the lek. *Nature.* **350**, 33-38.
31
32
33 13 86 Tinbergen N. 1954 The origin and evolution of courtship and threat display. In
34
35 14 *Evolution as a process* (eds. A.C. Hardy, J.S. Huxley & E.B. Ford), pp. 233-250.
36
37 15 London: Allen and Unwin.
38
39
40 16 87 Krebs J. R. & Dawkins R. 1984 Animal signals: Mind-reading and manipulation. In
41
42 17 *Behavioral ecology: an evolutionary approach* (eds. J. R. Krebs & N. B. Davies), pp.
43
44 18 380-402. Oxford: Blackwell Scientific Publications.
45
46
47 19 88 Tinbergen N. 1952 'Derived' activities; their Causation, biological significance,
48
49 20 origin, and emancipation during evolution. *Q Rev Biol.* **27**, 1-32.
50
51
52 21 89 Redshaw M. & Locke K. 1976 The development of play and social behaviour in two
53
54 22 lowland gorilla infants. *Dodo.* **13th Annual Report**, 71-86.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 1 90 Plooij F. X. 1978 Some basic traits of language in wild chimpanzees? In *Action,*
6
7 *gesture and symbol: the emergence of language* (ed. A. Lock), pp. 111-131. London:
8
9 Academic Press.
10 3
11
12 4 91 Bonnie K. & de Waal F. 2006 Affiliation promotes the transmission of a social
13
14 custom: handclasp grooming among captive chimpanzees. *Primates.* **47**, 27-34. (DOI
15
16 10.1007/s10329-005-0141-0)
17 6
18
19 7 92 McGrew W. C. & Tutin C. E. G. 1978 Evidence for a social custom in wild
20
21 chimpanzees? *Man.* **13**, 234-251.
22 8
23
24 9 93 Tomasello M., Gust D. & Frost G. 1989 A longitudinal investigation of gestural
25
26 communication in young chimpanzees. *Primates.* **30**, 35-50. (DOI
27
28 10.1007/BF02381209)
29 11
30
31 12 94 Poss S., Kuhar C., Stoinski T. S. & Hopkins W. D. 2006 Differential use of
32
33 attentional and visual communicative signaling by orangutans (*Pongo pygmaeus*) and
34
35 gorillas (*Gorilla gorilla*) in response to the attentional status of a human. *Am J*
36
37 *Primatol.* **68**, 978-992. (DOI 10.1002/ajp.20304)
38 15
39
40 16 95 Hopkins W. D., Tagliatela J. P. & Leavens D. A. 2007 Chimpanzees differentially
41
42 produce novel vocalizations to capture the attention of a human. *Anim Behav.* **73**,
43
44 281-286. (DOI 10.1016/j.anbehav.2006.08.004)
45
46
47 19 96 Leavens D. A., Hostetter A. B., Wesley M. J. & Hopkins W. D. 2004 Tactical use of
48
49 unimodal and bimodal communication by chimpanzees, *Pan troglodytes*. *Anim*
50
51 *Behav.* **67**, 467-476. (DOI 0.1016/j.anbehav.2003.04.007)
52
53
54 22 97 Gómez J. C. 1990 The emergence of intentional communication as a problem-solving
55
56 strategy in the gorilla. In *"Language" and intelligence in monkeys and apes:*
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 1 *comparative developmental perspectives* (eds. S. T. Parker & K. R. Gibson), pp. 333–
6
7 2 355.
8
9
10 3 98 Zuberbühler K. 2005 The phylogenetic roots of language: Evidence from primate
11
12 4 communication and cognition. *Curr Dir Psychol Sci.* **14**, 126-130. (DOI
13
14 5 10.1111/j.0963-7214.2005.00357.x)
15
16 6 99 Tomasello M. 2007 Ape gestures and the origins of language. In *Gestural*
17
18 7 *communication in apes and monkeys* (eds. J. Call & M. Tomasello), pp. 221 - 239.
19
20 8 New Jersey: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.
21
22 9 100 Rizzolatti G. & Arbib M. A. 1998 Language within our grasp. *Trends Neurosci.* **21**,
23
24 10 188-194. (DOI 10.1016/S0166-2236(98)01260-0)
25
26 11 101 Arbib M. A. 2005 From monkey-like action recognition to human language: An
27
28 12 evolutionary framework for neurolinguistics. *Behav Brain Sci.* **28**, 105-124. (DOI
29
30 13 10.1017/S0140525X05000038)
31
32 14 102 Kimura D. 1993 *Neuromotor mechanisms in human communication* Oxford
33
34 15 University Press, USA.
35
36 16 103 Corballis M. C. 1992 *The lopsided brain: Evolution of the generative mind*. New
37
38 17 York: Oxford University Press.
39
40 18 104 Kimura D. 1973 Manual activity during speaking - I. Right-handers.
41
42 19 *Neuropsychologia.* **11**, 45-50. (DOI 10.1016/0028-3932(73)90063-8)
43
44 20 105 Kinsbourne M. & Hicks R. E. 1978 Functional cerebral space: A model for overflow,
45
46 21 transfer, and interference effects in human performance. In *Attention and*
47
48 22 *performance* (ed. J. Requin), pp. 54-68 Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
49
50 23 106 Stafford D. K., Milliken G. W. & Ward J. P. 1990 Lateral bias in feeding and
51
52 24 brachiation in *Hylobates*. *Primates.* **31**, 407-414. (DOI 10.1007/BF02381111)
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 1 107 Hopkins W. D. & Cantero M. 2003 From hand to mouth in the evolution of language:
6
7 2 the influence of vocal behavior on lateralized hand use in manual gestures by
8
9 3 chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*). *Developmental Sci.* **6**, 55-61. (DOI 10.1111/1467-
10
11 4 7687.00254)
12
13
14 5 108 McGrew W. C. & Marchandt L. F. 1992 Chimpanzees, tools, and termites: Hand
15
16 6 preference or handedness. *Curr Anthropol.* **33**, 114-119.
17
18
19 7 109 Cashmore L., Uomini N. & Chapelain A. 2008 The evolution of handedness in
20
21 8 humans and great apes: a review and current issues. *J Anthropol Sci.* **86**, 7-35.
22
23
24 9 110 Westergaard G. & Suomi S. 1993 Hand preference in capuchin monkeys varies with
25
26 10 age. *Primates.* **34**, 295-299. (DOI 10.1007/BF02382624)
27
28
29 11 111 Hopkins W. D., Bennett A. J. & Bales S. L. 1993 Behavioural laterality in captive
30
31 12 bonobos (*Pan paniscus*). *J Comp Psychol.* **107**, 403-410. (DOI 10.1037/0735-
32
33 13 7036.107.4.403)
34
35
36 14 112 Hopkins W. D., Bard K. A., Jones A. & Bales S. L. 1993 Chimpanzee hand
37
38 15 preference in throwing and infant cradling: Implications for the origin of human
39
40 16 handedness. *Curr Anthropol.* **34**, 786-790.
41
42
43 17 113 Sugiyama Y., Fushimi T., Sakura O. & Matsuzawa T. 1993 Hand preference and tool
44
45 18 use in wild chimpanzees. *Primates.* **34**, 151-159. (DOI 10.1007/BF02381386)
46
47
48 19 114 Anderson J., Degiorgio C., Lamarque C. & Fagot J. 1996 A multi-task assessment of
49
50 20 hand lateralization in capuchin monkeys (*Cebus apella*). *Primates.* **37**, 97-103. (DOI
51
52 21 10.1007/BF02382926)
53
54
55 22 115 Hopkins W. D. & Cantalupo C. 2005 Individual and setting differences in the hand
56
57 23 preferences of chimpanzees *Pan troglodytes*: A critical analysis and some alternative
58
59 24 explanations. *Laterality.* **10**, 65-80.
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 1 116 Hopkins W. D. 1996 Chimpanzee handedness: Causes and consequences. *Int J*
6
7 *Primatol.* **31**, 3665-3665.
8
9
10 3 117 Hopkins W. D. & Leavens D. A. 1998 Hand use and gestural communication in
11
12 chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*). *J Comp Psychol.* **112**, 95-99. (DOI 10.1037/0735-
13
14 7036.112.1.95)
15
16 6 118 Hopkins W. D., Russell J., Freeman H. D., Buehler N., Reynolds E. & Schapiro S. J.
17
18 2005 The distribution and development of handedness for manual gestures in captive
19
20 chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*). *Psychol Sci.* **16**, 487-493(487). (DOI 10.1111/j.0956-
21
22 7976.2005.01561.x)
23
24 9
25
26 10 119 Tagliabue J. P., Cantalupo C. & Hopkins W. D. 2006 Gesture handedness predicts
27
28 asymmetry in the chimpanzee inferior frontal gyrus. *Neuroreport.* **17**, 923-927. (DOI
29
30 10.1097/01.wnr.0000221835.26093.5e)
31
32

33
34
35 14 Short title: Gesture origins
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60